TRANSGENDER LAB RATS AND POISONED PUPPIES: OVERSIGHT OF TAXPAYER-FUNDED ANIMAL CRUELTY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, AND GOVERNMENT INNOVATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

FEBRUARY 6, 2025

Serial No. 119–3

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform

Available on: *govinfo.gov*
oversight.house.gov or
docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE
58–804 PDF WASHINGTON : 2025

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio
MIKE TURNER, Ohio
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas
GARY PALMER, Alabama
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana
PETE SESSIONS, Texas
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona
NANCY MACE, South Carolina
PAT FALLON, Texas
BYRON DONALDS, Florida
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri
ELI CRANE, Arizona
BRIAN JACK, Georgia
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia
BRANDON GILL, Texas

GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia, *Ranking Minority Member*
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI, Illinois
RO KHANNA, California
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
ROBERT GARCIA, California
MAXWELL FROST, Florida
SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
GREG CASAR, Texas
JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
EMILY RANDALL, Washington
SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
WESLEY BELL, Missouri
LATEEFAH SIMON, California
DAVE MIN, California
AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director
MITCH BENZINE, General Counsel
LAUREN LOMBARDO, Deputy Policy Director
RAJ BHARWANI, Senior Professional Staff Member
DUNCAN WRIGHT, Senior Professional Staff Member
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JAMIE SMITH, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, AND GOVERNMENT INNOVATION

NANCY MACE, South Carolina, Chairwoman

GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin
PAT FALLON, Texas
ELI CRANE, Arizona
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia
Vacancy

SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio, *Ranking Minority Member*
RO KHANNA, California
SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona

C O N T E N T S

WITNESSES

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

* *No additional documents were entered into the record for this hearing.*

TRANSGENDER LAB RATS AND POISONED PUPPIES: OVERSIGHT OF TAXPAYER–FUNDED ANIMAL CRUELTY

Thursday, February 6, 2025

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, AND GOVERNMENT INNOVATION
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:06 p.m., in room 2247, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Nancy Mace [Chairwoman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Mace, Boebert, Burlison, Crane, McGuire, Brown, Khanna, and Subramanyam.

Ms. MACE. All right. Good afternoon, everyone. The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation will now come to order, and welcome. Good afternoon.

Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time.

I recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

Good afternoon. Late last year, the White Coast Waste Project exposed more than $10 million in taxpayer funds that were spent creating transgender mice, rats, and monkeys. These DEI grants funded painful and deadly transgender experiments that forced lab animals to undergo invasive surgeries and hormone therapies at universities across the country. For example, the Biden-Harris Administration spent $2.5 million taxpayer—$2.5 million taxpayer dollars—to study the fertility of transgender mice. Let that sink in. We spent over $2 million studying the fertility of transgender mice. One-point-one million dollars was spent to find out if female rats receiving testosterone therapies to mimic transgender men were more likely to overdose on a party drug commonly used in the LGBTQ community to induce drug-fueled, what is "chemsex."

I asked my staff what was chemsex, and I guess it is something called GHB, which is a date rape drug and also a drug that is used recreationally. So, we spent over $1 million to find out if female rats receiving testosterone therapy were more likely to overdose on a date rape drug. Like, that is what your taxpayer dollars were being spent on. Federal funds were also used to forcibly transition

male monkeys to see if hormone therapy made them more susceptible to HIV. Now, I did not know this until recently, but monkeys cannot be infected with HIV, yet this federally funded experiment forced them to take hormone-altering drugs to study a virus they cannot have.

The Biden-Harris Administration was so eager to propagate their radical gender ideology across all facets of American society that they were surgically mutating animal genitals. Like, taxpayer money went to that. So, my question is, were they castrating mice, castrating monkeys? Were they getting double mastectomies? The language that they used in many of these experiments were "gender-affirming care," which I learned about 3 years ago what that meant. I thought that was maybe just some hormones or something like that, but apparently, gender-affirming care is actually surgical mutilation of genitals, and apparently, it is not just humans they were doing it to. We were doing it with taxpayer dollars to animals.

It is well known that, because of the differences between animal and human biology, animal testing frequently does not produce results relevant for humans. In fact, 90 percent of novel drugs that are successful in animal tests fail in human clinical trials. Today's scientific questions are so complex that we have well surpassed the time where it is useful or appropriate to rely on inhumane animal experiments to answer them. Recently developed technological tools can more accurately model human biology and identify solutions that are more useful for human patients, but it is often the Federal bureaucracy that prevents these new technologies from being used. Instead of adequately investing in these innovative alternatives, the Federal Government has continued to funnel taxpayer dollars toward cruel animal experiments. Today, most of the 27 NIH institutes and centers conduct or support animal testing, as does the Food and Drug Administration, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Defense, and countless other agencies.

We have some Beagle puppies here with us today. Beagle puppies have gone through some of the worst medical experiments, I mean, drugging them with cocaine, having insects eat at them and their bodies so much until they die, drugging them until they die. These are God's creatures, and they are beautiful. And you can see them sitting in the front row today, so we thank the folks who are here and brought these beautiful Beagle puppies here today.

In fact, the U.S. Government spends in excess of $20 billion a year conducting experiments on animals. The White Coat Waste Project found in 2021 that the NIH—the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, a component of NIH, at the time ran by Dr. Fauci—spent $1.68 million force feeding toxic drugs to Beagle puppies between 6 and 8 months old before dissecting and killing them. The conversation we are having today is important.

In 2022, due to public criticism lobbied about Fauci's NAIAD by me and other Members of Congress, another $1.8 million experiment to abuse Beagle puppies in various drug tests was canceled. So, I want to thank the work of White Coat Waste and everyone in the room today, others who have been on the forefront of this fight to end this sick and cruel and barbaric testing of animals today. Thanks to one of our witnesses, Justin Goodman of White

Coat Waste, the Beagles are here. The Beagles are a reminder of the real costs of animal experimentation. So, I am looking forward to this conversation this afternoon regarding wasteful government spending on animal cruelty.

And I also want to say before I yield to the Ranking Member for her opening statement, that this is a nonpartisan issue. Ironically, in Oversight, while we might fight a lot in public, we are actually very nonpartisan here. And some of the most nonpartisan work in Congress comes right through this Committee. So, I want to thank the Ranking Member. I look forward to working with you, and I yield to you for 5 minutes for your opening statement.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, and good afternoon to our three witnesses. Thanks for being here.

Chairwoman Mace, I appreciated working with you last week to introduce a bipartisan bill to strengthen Federal contractor cybersecurity. I was glad our teams were able to connect early into this new Congress, and on a personal note, my team found your staff to be very responsive and helpful.

Ms. MACE. Likewise.

Ms. BROWN. As the Ranking Member of this Subcommittee, I look forward to continuing to work with you to modernize and secure Federal IT systems from potential cyberattacks. Bipartisan solutions like this are critical to protecting our Federal system from cyberthreats. I look forward to finding more common ground and delivering results for the American people.

I am looking forward to having a productive discussion today about the scientific innovations and the need for additional oversight over alternatives to animal testing. Each year, millions of animals, including dogs, cats, and monkeys, are used worldwide for research, and I think it is safe to assume that everyone here in this room would like to see that number reduced. We are living in a moment where there have been extraordinary advancements in medical research, utilizing groundbreaking technology like artificial intelligence, 3D bioprinting, and robotics that allows us to reduce our reliance on animal testing. I am especially proud that much of this innovation is happening in my district, Ohio's 11th, home to world-class research universities and medical institutions. Not only does this offer the chance to save animals from suffering, these methods can actually lead to better and more accurate results.

From a scientific perspective, one of the main issues with animal testing is that these trials often fail to produce results relevant to humans. In fact, 90 percent of new drugs that are shown to work in animal models fail in human trials. Dr. Locke, one of the witnesses here today, is going to explain this phenomenon, and he said that "Animal biology is just too different from human biology. Because of this, a great deal of funding and time is wasted on experiments that, ultimately, do not translate to human trials. By modernizing our research methods to avoid the use of animal subjects, we can also save precious taxpayer dollars."

Thankfully, there are viable alternatives that are more ethical, accurate, and efficient ways to study human biology and disease. We now have the technology to effectively replicate organs in labs, allowing us to better see how the human body will respond to drugs and treatments. We have machine learning systems that can

analyze large sets of health data to develop predictable models of patient response. We have the capabilities of 3D printing tissue and muscle to test cosmetics, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals in a highly realistic way. Just these few examples highlight the amazing work that has already been done and the important need for continued investment in the medical field.

At the time, we must institute strong oversight of the animal testing that is still occurring to ensure that our Federal dollars are being used ethically and transparently and that harm to animals is minimized. I believe it is our moral responsibility to advocate for animals who cannot speak for themselves. Last Congress, I was proud to cosponsor the Humane Cosmetics Act, which addresses the use of animal testing in the cosmetic industry. This bill had massive bipartisan support, demonstrating the progress we can make in this area.

I look forward to hearing more from our witnesses on these important issues, and I look forward to future hearings in the months to come on important topics of cybersecurity, artificial intelligence, and government innovation. Thank you.

Ms. MACE. Great job. I am pleased to introduce our witnesses for today's hearing. Our first witness is Mr. Justin Goodman, Senior Vice President, Advocacy and Public Policy, at the White Coat Waste Project. It is also Mr. Goodman's birthday today, and so I would like to wish you a happy birthday and thank you for being here today. Our second witness is Dr. Paul Locke, Professor of the Department of Environmental Health and Engineering at the John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Our third witness is Ms. Elizabeth Baker, Director of Research Policy at the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. Welcome, everyone. We are pleased to have you this afternoon.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses, if you will please stand and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[A chorus of ayes.]

Ms. MACE. Let the record show that the witnesses all answered in the affirmative. We appreciate you for being here today and look forward to your testimony. You may be seated.

Let me remind the witnesses that we have read your written statements, and they will appear in full in the hearing record. Please limit your oral statements to 5 minutes. As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it is on when you speak and the members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 our minutes, the light will turn yellow, and when the red light comes on, your 5 minutes is up, and we would ask that you please wrap it up.

I would like to recognize Mr. Goodman to please begin your opening statement.

STATEMENT OF JUSTIN GOODMAN
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
WHITE COAT WASTE PROJECT

Mr. GOODMAN. Thank you. Chairwoman Mace, Ranking Member Brown, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. As the Chairwoman mentioned, it is my birthday, and this is the greatest gift I could possibly ask for. My name is Justin Goodman, and I am the Senior Vice President of Advocacy and Public Policy at the nonprofit, nonpartisan government watchdog White Coat Waste Project. White Coat Waste has one mission: to stop taxpayers from being forced to pay for cruel, wasteful, inefficient, and dangerous animal experiments in labs around the world. Lab survivors Nellie, Beasley, and Oliver, sitting behind me, are three of the many reasons why.

Many people do not realize that the U.S. Government is not only the single largest funder of animal testing in the country, but in the world. Uncle Sam outspends the private sector on animal testing 2 to 1. This is not something to be proud of. Over 20 years ago, the NIH budget doubled and animal testing skyrocketed, but, overall, people are not healthier or living longer. It is estimated that over $20 million a year of taxpayers' money is still wasted annually on ineffective and inhumane tests on tens of millions of puppies, kittens, and other animals.

Am I being flippant when I use the word "waste?" Absolutely not. The NIH itself has said, "Animal models fail to mimic disease or predict how drugs will work in humans, resulting in much wasted time and money," yet agencies continue to dump billions of tax dollars into animal tests, despite the horrible return on investment.

Experiments we have uncovered range from the savage to the stupid: injecting puppies with cocaine, staging hamster fight clubs, putting dead turtles on treadmills. One of the reasons this problem has gotten so out of control is the stunning lack of innovation, transparency, and accountability. Agencies do not report, or even track, in some cases, how much money is being spent, how many animals are used, what is being done to them, where, and what taxpayers are getting out of it. We file hundreds of FOIA requests every year to glean just basic information. When we can find out how tax dollars are being spent, it becomes apparent why Federal agencies fight against disclosing details.

For example, Senator Rand Paul's December 2024 Festivus Report highlighted cruel taxpayer-funded cat experiments exposed by my organization. In one $10 million DARPA grant, cats have marbles shoved up their rectums and are electroshocked to make them defecate in constipation experiments. We have also recently identified over $240 million in NIH grants for transgender animal experiments, including $26 million in active funding. Some of these tests, as the Chairwoman mentioned, examine the effects of party drugs on animals injected with testosterone and how hormones used for human gender transitions impact the size and shape of animals' genitals. How does this translate to helping the average American?

Shockingly, 95 percent of this funding came from Dr. Fauci's NIAID. Speaking of Dr. Fauci, our group is perhaps best known for

exposing his and USAID's funding for dangerous gain-of-function animal experiments at the Wuhan lab. We also uncovered his support for cruel Beagle tests around the world. Taxpayer-funded animal tests may have caused COVID.

Unfortunately, the government has not learned its lesson from what happened in Wuhan. Today, there are still 26 animal labs in China, including labs controlled by the Chinese Communist Party and tied to the military, approved to receive NIH funding. This is not just a misuse of taxpayer dollars but presents a national security threat.

White Coat Waste recently obtained a contract funded by the NIH and DOD that is paying for 300 Beagles a week to be restrained and injected with or force-fed experimental drugs in a Chinese lab. The reason they chose Beagles like Nellie, Oliver, and Beasley, the contract states, "Beagle dogs are docile, cute, and easy to domesticate, so it has been the best choice," not because it is effective, but because it is easy.

This issue extends beyond China. Three hundred and forty-four animal labs in 52 foreign countries are approved currently to receive NIH funding. GAO audits prompted by White Coat Waste have found that NIH shipped billions to foreign animal labs with essentially no oversight, that the NIH has never visited a foreign animal lab in over 40 years of overseeing research, and that some foreign spending is not even tracked. This is how some spending in Wuhan went undisclosed, and no surprise, Dr. Fauci's division of NIH is responsible for 95 percent of the foreign aid. Continuing to send tax dollars to an authoritarian adversary's animal labs is a recipe for disaster.

With Chairwoman Mace's leadership, we have been able to halt plans for wasteful and cruel testing on dogs and cats in other Fauci-funded labs. These tests never should have been approved in the first place and were only deemed unnecessary after we exposed them. Our campaigns and legislative work with the Chairwoman, Reps Boebert, Khanna, Luna, and many others exposed and shuttered waste, like the government's largest cat lab that was feeding kittens kitten meat from Chinese wet markets—yes, that is true; that was a cannibalism experiment—eliminating VA testing on dogs and cats, and ending nicotine tests on monkeys at FDA, but there is much more work to be done. Taxpayers should not be forced to pay billions of dollars every year for outdated, cruel, and potentially dangerous animal experiments, especially when most people oppose them.

We are excited to work with you, DOGE, the Administration, and others to continue cutting wasteful spending on animal experiments. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, on my birthday. I look forward to your questions.

Ms. MACE. Thank you. I recognize Dr. Locke to please begin your opening statement.

STATEMENT OF DR. PAUL A. LOCKE
PROFESSOR
JOHNS HOPKINS BLOOMBERG SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. LOCKE. Chairwoman Mace, Ranking Member Brown, and members of the Committee and Subcommittee, thank you for invit-

ing me to offer comments at today's hearing. My name is Paul Locke. I am a professor in the Department of Environmental Health and Engineering at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. I am an attorney and an environmental health scientist, and a substantial portion of my work has concentrated on the uses of nonanimal methodologies in research and regulatory decision-making, with an emphasis on the promise that these methods have for both reducing animal use and improving evidence-based decision-making.

I want to state for the record that the opinions here that I offer are my own, and they do not necessarily reflect the views or positions of the Johns Hopkins University or the Johns Hopkins Health System.

Today, I want to cover three major points. First, the scientific questions facing us increasingly call into question our reliance on animal models and demand that we move forward with more human-centric science. Second, Federal agencies must play a leadership role in this transition to these new human-centric models. And third, the development and deployment of these models represent innovation in places where U.S. businesses and scientists are and must continue to be at the cutting edge. Let us start with a discussion about scientific methods and needs.

The complex scientific challenges that we now face require that we move away from traditional animal models and embrace new technologies that do not involve animals but instead incorporate human biology. These technologies include small, engineered systems, such as organs on a chip and microphysiological systems, or three-dimensional groups of cells, such as organoids, that mimic many of the important functions of human organs. I would also include AI in this group. Now, while there is considerable enthusiasm around the promise of these new methodologies, unless Federal agencies and departments support their development and recognize their promise, they will never be able to reach their full potential. We are not going to be able to replace animals in biomedical research with the meagre investments that Federal agencies are now making.

EPA, FDA, and NIH all have important roles to play in unlocking the potential that these technologies have for designing better drugs, protecting the environment, and improving health. Based on our research, there are currently major gaps in the frameworks needed to support new methodologies, and it is imperative that the Federal Government step forward. The Federal approach has been passive and reactive. What we need is for Federal agencies and departments to lead efforts to development, implement, and use these methods, and my written testimony goes into greater information about what Federal agencies can be doing, and I hope we will have some questions on that, as well.

Finally, the U.S. must continue to lead the way in these technologies so that we are setting the global standards in these fields rather than following other nations. Regulatory agencies worldwide look to us for leadership, and if the U.S. leads in alternatives, methods, development, and validation, our standards will shape international regulations, assist in the creation of U.S. high-tech jobs, and strengthen our national economic growth.

So, to summarize, scientific advancements have created multiple opportunities for us to develop and deploy more human-centric techniques in toxicology and biomedical research and transition away from animals in biomedical research. Championing these nonanimal models is a win-win situation because we can reduce the number of animals used, as well as produce data that is more relevant to human health. Federal agencies and departments must play a central role, and they have already begun to do so. However, to realize the full potential that this transition holds, our agencies and departments must do more, including dedicating additional resources and leading in efforts to validate these innovative new technologies. We cannot be world leaders given the meagre resources that are now available. These markets are expanding rapidly, and several American companies are well positioned for success in this market space once the regulatory environment and framework is open for them.

In closing, I urge the Subcommittee to work with Federal agencies to further develop the criteria for validation and acceptance of these new technologies within each department and in a coordinated way across multiple agencies, as well as dedicate additional resources to them. Doing so will allow us to reduce the number of animals in research, better inform decision-making, and advance American entrepreneurial science. Thank you very much.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Dr. Locke. I now recognize Ms. Baker to please begin your opening statement.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH BAKER
DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH POLICY
PHYSICIANS COMMITTEE FOR RESPONSIBLE MEDICINE

Ms. BAKER. Chair Mace and Ranking Member Brown and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you so much for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Elizabeth Baker at the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. I work with a team of scientists, physicians, lawyers, and other professionals to move medical research, product testing, and advanced medical training away from using animals. I appreciate the Subcommittee's attention to this critical subject.

Ending federally funded animal experiments is long overdue. For generations, tax dollars have paid scientists to conduct acts that would shock the conscience of most Americans. Dogs, cats, monkeys, rabbits, pigs, and other animals are used in experiments that are painful, stressful, and often lethal for the animals that are subjected to them. Increasingly, it is recognized across research and testing sectors that animals are not good surrogates for humans. Over 85 percent of Americans that were recently polled agreed that animal-based research should be phased out. Both Congress and the Administration must take action to ensure that government funding and requests for animal experiments are stopped, and that instead, a portion of that funding is reinvested into more effective human-based approaches.

Our first recommendation is to end Federal support for wasteful and ineffective animal research. Animal research does not translate to humans because there are insurmountable species differences in our anatomy, physiology, lifespan, disease characteristics, and

more. It is known that, for new drugs, 9 out of 10 are going to fail in humans after they appeared successful in animals, and paying for those failures is partially why drugs can take so long, over a decade, to develop and cost so much to develop, over $1 billion. Worse, relying on animal data is partially why many human diseases have no treatments and even fewer have cures. Despite this knowledge, the Federal Government continues to promote animal research. The National Institutes of Health fund seven National Primate Research Centers that house, breed, and experiment on nonhuman primates with little regard to actual human translation.

While there are countless examples of cruel research, consider this. Since 1991, the NIH has given $15 million to a single heart failure project where dogs are subjected to multiple major surgeries, they have devices that are stabbed into their hearts, and then they are forced to run on treadmills until they die or that device malfunctions. Despite 34 years of this work and hundreds of dead dogs, there has been no benefit to patients.

Agencies across the Federal Government continue to fund animal experiments, even when the objectives of the research have already been shown in humans or could be studied using human-based approaches, like animal experiments for human nutrition. Regulatory agencies continue to require animal testing. Congress and the administration can end these wasteful experiments by cutting egregious research, ensuring that research is not funded if these objectives can be studied without using animals, and ending the Federal animal testing requirements in regulation and policy.

Our second recommendation is to reinvest some of these savings from animal research and testing toward evaluation, acceptance, and use of innovative and more effective human-based approaches. Methods like organs on chips, reconstructed human tissues, sophisticated computer models have existed for some time, but they are only supported at a fraction of the funding that goes to the animal experiments.

Some Federal efforts have already begun accelerating innovative human-based methods. The NIH has a national center, NICEATM, that works to evaluate and advance nonanimal approaches across Federal agencies through a congressionally mandated committee, ICCVAM. With more investment and an expanded purview, NICEATM can accelerate this work and even address the reproducibility crisis in research. A center at the NIH, NCATS, is already working to bridge the gap between medical research and product development by prioritizing innovative human-based approaches. Recently, the NIH adopted important recommendations on nonanimal approaches and launched the complementary program to speed development and use of these methods.

Each of these are great examples of steps in the right direction, but the current resource investments just pale in comparison to the stronghold that animal experiments have held for decades. Greater support for these efforts will more quickly advance better science that leads to improved outcomes for people, while avoiding animal use. There has been so much recent attention on getting Americans healthier. If we truly want to make America healthy again, we have to make science human again.

Thank you so much for this opportunity to testify, and I look forward to answering your questions.

Ms. MACE. Thank you all for being here today. I will now recognize myself for 5 minutes of questioning.

Mr. Goodman, in your written, you state the White Coat Waste Project identified at least $10 million in NIH grants for transgender animal experiments. You state that 95 percent of the funding came from Dr. Fauci's NIAID. Why is the Federal Government spending taxpayer dollars to create transgender animals?

Mr. GOODMAN. It is a great question. I——

Ms. MACE. Your microphone.

Mr. GOODMAN. Thank you. It is a great question. I mean, I wonder why they are making cats constipated also. It is a question that rings around in my head at night when I am going to bed, why we are funding these things. A lot of the programs that are funded do latch on to some type of social trend, and then animal experimenters use it as a money grab, as an excuse to get NIH tax funds. In this case, DEI grants were used to fund a lot of this stuff.

Ms. MACE. Uh-huh.

Mr. GOODMAN. So, people who abuse animals find some kind of excuse to bring in new money, and They will switch their research program over to something that is trendy to bring tax dollars into a university. I mean, that is part of the big problem here is that colleges and universities are taking 25 to 40 percent off the top of every single one of these grants for indirect costs that go into a slush fund that has nothing to do with the research, so they are willing to let experimenters do whatever they want to animals to keep the money flowing in.

Ms. MACE. Some people might describe that as money laundering. All right. Are sex change experiments that forcibly transition mice, rats, and monkeys necessary for science?

Mr. GOODMAN. Absolutely not.

Ms. MACE. Why do these experiments at all—if they are not producing useful human-relevant research, again, do you think it is a money issue, follow the money?

Mr. GOODMAN. Animal testing is big business.

Ms. MACE. As you know, I have been long vocal about animal experiments and Federal-funded animal testing and worked with you to prevent Fauci's plan to waste almost $2 million in taxpayer dollars to maim and murder Beagle puppies, for example. Why was Dr. Fauci so insistent on poisoning these puppies, even though, as you state in your written statement, the FDA does not mandate that human drugs be studied on dogs?

Mr. GOODMAN. So much of the problem with all of this is institutional inertia. It is that people just continue doing the same thing because that is what They have done before. There was a report the National Academy of Sciences put out a few years ago about the VA's testing on dogs that Congressman Khanna actually helped us——

Ms. MACE. Uh-huh.

Mr. GOODMAN [continuing]. Get the NAS to conduct. And they found that most of the VA's testing on dogs was unnecessary, and not only that it was unnecessary, but one of the reasons why is that there is just circular reasoning that they use to defend it when

they propose a new project. They say, well, we used dogs previously, so we are just going to use dogs again, and there is no one to break that cycle. There is not enough oversight to say, hey, maybe we do not need to do this anymore, maybe there is a better way to do it. It is like, if you only have a hammer, everything looks like a nail, and that is kind of the problem.

Ms. MACE. Right, and what would have happened to these Beagle puppies if your organization had not rescued them?

Mr. GOODMAN. In the case of those experiments?

Ms. MACE. Uh-huh.

Mr. GOODMAN. Those dogs were going to be force-fed and injected with massive doses of experimental drugs to poison them to see at what point they got sick or died, and those tests will have no relevance for the safety and efficacy of that drug in human beings.

Ms. MACE. Thank you. Dr. Locke, I had a few questions for you. Can the scientific challenges we face today be saved by relying on animal testing?

Dr. LOCKE. No, not all of them.

Ms. MACE. Can you briefly describe how new technologies can allow us to transition away from animal testing without hindering scientific research?

Dr. LOCKE. Certainly. I also want to point out that in my written testimony, I do try to lay out a roadmap for how that could happen. But basically, what we need to do is we need to spend a lot more resources supporting these nonanimal technologies, such as organs on a chip and organoids, so we can use those to study many of the phenomena that we are now studying in animals.

Ms. MACE. OK. Thank you, and, Ms. Baker, what are your thoughts today—reading your testimony "for the opportunity to testify, that it is long overdue"—where do we go from here? How do we fix the problem?

Ms. BAKER. I think we fix the problem by investing in what is going right. First, we have got to cut a lot of this terrible animal research. We need to cut the National Primate Research Centers.

Ms. MACE. Uh-huh.

Ms. BAKER. We are funding these centers to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars every year. We have got to stop. We have got to stop funding animal experiments outside the United States, as Mr. Goodman said, that have no oversight. If you can meet your objectives without using animals, there is absolutely no reason that you should, and so——

Ms. MACE. Thank you for bringing that up, the amount of money, the hundreds of millions. I recently found out in the state of South Carolina, in my district, there is a primate breeding center and testing site, Alpha Genesis. They have made, to my understanding, over $100 million from NIH over the last 20 or so years. This is a boondoggle. It is a racket, and hundreds of millions of dollars—billions of dollars, in fact—have been wasted on it. So, I want to thank you all for your testimony today. Thank you for being here. I would now like to recognize my colleague, Ms. Brown, for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN. Again, thank you to our witnesses for being here. I think it is clear that we all agree that we do not want to see animals harmed and that there is work to be done to reduce our reli-

ance on animals for medical and scientific research. So, I would like to start with you, Ms. Baker. Can you talk about where you think some of the current gaps, the oversight, are in the animal experimentation?

Ms. BAKER. Yes. I think we have some major issues with oversight. We do not know, really, how much spending is going to animal experiments. The public is largely in the dark. We try so hard to understand this information, and we have to come up with some of it on our own. It would be great if the Federal Government would be more transparent in this way. We do know that, in 2016, the NIH said that for Fiscal Year 2015, 47 percent of extramural grants used mice. Seven-point-four billion dollars is what that would be in 2024. In 2021, NIH issued a figure that said about 8 percent of grants go to non-clinical, nonanimal approaches. Well, non-clinical approaches really mean the animal tests or the alternatives, and so a ton of money is going into this.

We wanted to understand for cancer; cancer is one disease area where it is well known that animals are just really poor predictors of human outcomes. We get cancer differently. It behaves differently in our bodies. The failure rate for cancer drugs is 94 percent. We have cures for cancer in mice. We do not in humans. And so, we wanted to look at what is the National Cancer Institute doing. How are they funding? What does their funding look like? And so, our analysis is not perfect because it is based on, unfortunately, just the publicly available information, which is not totally transparent, but we found that 45 percent of their grants seem to be animal related. And so, the NIH can really, I think, help by ensuring that there is transparency around this.

Ms. BROWN. I am just going to reclaim——

Ms. BAKER. There is also an oversight issue when——

Ms. BROWN [continuing]. Because I would like to get to Dr. Locke, too, but thank you. Dr. Locke, you talked in your testimony about several different technologies that you have worked with that are direct alternatives to animal testing. Can you speak to the success of these technologies and what Congress can do to be more supportive of the efforts to expand other innovative technologies in this space?

Dr. LOCKE. Yes. Thank you for your question. I think there are at least two things that Congress can do. The first thing Congress can do is to really get a handle, as my colleagues have said, on how much money we are spending on these technologies. The transparency issue is severe. So, since this is a committee on accountability, I would say the first thing we need to do is we need to count. We do not have that information. You do not have that information.

The second thing that needs to be done is that these technologies need to be what I would call validated, and by that, I mean they need to be shown that they are relevant and reliable for a particular purpose. One of my frustrations now is that the Federal agencies are not doing that. They seem to be very reactive, and they seem to want folks who are in the field to bring the data to them. And then they are going to make the decision, well, we accept this data or do not accept this data, and that is a really bad situation to be in. These folks who are developing the methods are

entrepreneurs. They are innovators. They have to know what kind of target they are shooting at.

The third thing I would say is that we really do need to get a handle on the animal research we are doing. Again, that is an area of transparency, and we need to develop metrics so we can figure out what part of that research is actually working and what part is not working. And then, as my colleagues have suggested, I think we should be sunsetting the stuff that is not working and reinvesting that in these new methodologies.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you very much, Dr. Locke. And as we move to decrease our reliance on animal experimentation, it is important to acknowledge that, unfortunately, there are still companies and organizations that still utilize animal testing. So, what can be done to move these places toward alternative models like the ones you have mentioned?

Dr. LOCKE. Thank you for that question. I think there are several things that can be done. The first thing that we can do—and I have some bias here as an academic—is we can train our students in these new methods. We have to move away from animal tests and animal research as always the gold standard. The second thing we can do is we can energize the whole Federal grant system to make it much more friendly so that folks who want to use these alternatives can actually go out and get research money to study them.

Ms. BROWN. All right. Thank you, and with that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

Ms. MACE. Thank you. I will now yield to Ms. Boebert.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I appreciate your advocacy on this and protecting so many animals against this, as we have heard, savage research that has been taking place, not only in the United States, but all throughout the world. And I want to thank our witnesses today for your boldness to come out because it seems like any time we expose millions and billions, even, of dollars that are spent toward ridiculous research programs or just organizations themselves, we are lashed out at. We are called crazy and conspiracist, and I want to thank you so much for taking a bold step.

I want to thank you for the White Coat Waste Project because this is not only saving precious Beagles' lives but really exposing to the American taxpayer where their money is going, and I think we all want to be good stewards of our tax money. We are responsible for those tax dollars here in Congress, and it is our responsibility to be stewards and overseers of that. So, I am grateful for DOGE to come in alongside of us to help expose some of this and kind of get those wheels turning.

But just for the folks back home real quick, before I get into my questions, I want to just highlight, a million seconds is 11-and-a-half days. A billion seconds is 31 years and 7 months. It is, like, this is a huge difference. When we are talking about billions of dollars going toward the cruelty of animals, it is much larger than what it sounds because it has been so watered down to hear that Congress is spending millions or billions or even trillions of dollars. God forbid if we find out what comes after a trillion. We will start spending that, too. But Mr. Goodman, since 1998, how much do you

believe that the Federal Government has spent on animal cruelty testing?

Mr. GOODMAN. Thank you for the question. As we have been discussing, it is tough because there is not a lot of transparency behind actually how much tax dollars are being spent. I would say we are probably looking at a trillion in spending by NIH since 1998, and about 47 percent of that is used for experiments on animals. Half a trillion dollars——

Ms. BOEBERT. Wow.

Mr. GOODMAN [continuing]. Could have potentially been spent on animal testing since 1998.

Ms. BOEBERT. That is an extreme number. Thank you for that, and, Mr. Goodman, how much money do you think that NIAID wasted on unethical and useless and abusive testing? I would imagine it is about the same because none of this has been very useful or effective.

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. So, Dr. Fauci ran NIAID from 1984 to 2022, and when he left at the end of 2022, it had a $6.5 billion budget. Again, we do not know what percentage that was for animal testing but probably higher than the average across NIH. And I just want to make a note here that Dr. Fauci—and I do not have any issue with him outside of his abuse of animals—he was not just a paper pusher. He was personally involved in animal experimentation, experimenting on monkeys, giving them HIV-like viruses, until the day he left NIH. He was a lead investigator on grants that were funded by taxpayers to do that. And he started his career by infecting chimpanzees with HIV and promising we were going to have an AIDS vaccine back in the 1980's, which we never got because, as you mentioned, they do not get HIV. They do not get AIDS. They do not get sick. So, there has been an enormous amount of waste and abuse, and, unfortunately, he is gone from government, but his legacy at NIAID lives on.

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes. Fortunately, he is gone from government, but that does not prevent us from holding him accountable for not only the wasteful spending, but the cruel tests that have taken place over the years, so maybe you answered my next question. How many of these treatments have found cures in humans that come from this cruel kind of testing?

Mr. GOODMAN. Virtually none. We have heard the statistics today, and any that have come, it is out of pure dumb luck, and they are the exception, not the rule because animal experiments are a dead end. It is pure chance if something good comes out of it.

Ms. BOEBERT. And so, I am seeing here, with NIAID, the budget of spending $6.5 billion in taxpayer money, it has been used to pay EcoHealth Alliance to import hundreds of Asian bats into the U.S. for new viruses in labs in Colorado run by the Wuhan-linked researchers. That is $6.7 for the Colorado State University in Fort Collins to research bats here in America. And we have also sent billions of taxpayer dollars to unaccountable labs in China and other foreign countries. Implanted aborted baby parts into lab animals, have you heard of that sort of research?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. We did an analysis a few years ago showing that over 90 percent of experiments using human fetal tissue and involving animals were funded by Fauci's NIAID.

Ms. BOEBERT. Do you know where they are getting the aborted human fetal tissue?

Mr. GOODMAN. A lot of it is happening at colleges and universities that have affiliated hospitals that perform that procedure.

Ms. BOEBERT. Madam Chair, I think we need to look into that as well. My time has expired. I apologize to our other witnesses. I did have questions for you, but I will submit those in writing. Thank you.

Ms. MACE. That is wild. I would now like to recognize Mr. Subramanyam for 5 minutes of questioning.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you. I am glad we are having this hearing today. I actually had the chance to talk to an animal care program manager at a research facility, and he said something really interesting. He said, the day we no longer need animals for research is the day we have succeeded as an industry. So, I think what you are finding is that even the people who are employed to run these programs are starting to realize that we would like to see a path to where we no longer need animals, and so I think that is really interesting.

One of the things I would like to know, though, is how far away are we until the technologies can completely replace animals and we can still be on the cutting edge of science. I am an animal lover. I am a vegan, even. I very much support getting rid of animals in all testing, but I want to make sure that we also do the cutting-edge research that we need to do. I would ask all three, really—Ms. Baker, Dr. Locke, Mr. Goodman—if you could address how far away are we, and I also would love to know what kind of investment do we need. Does it have to be from the public sector? Is there private-sector companies going after this, getting venture funding for it, for instance? I would love to know what we can do and what the path looks like.

Ms. BAKER. Thank you for the question. There are so many incredible technologies that we have today that we should be using to be on the cutting edge. So, using animals is not cutting edge. Using animals is something that has been done for so long. The innovative approaches, they do not use animals. They are human-biology-based because we need to understand human outcomes. If we want to talk about innovation, just take a look at any other industry. Look at the phone industry. What was a phone in the 1950's versus what it is today? What was a car back then versus what it is today? What was science doing back then versus what is happening today? A lot of the regulatory tests that are done are the same exact tests that have been done since the 1950's, so if we are talking about really being on the cutting edge, we absolutely have to be embracing and supporting and investing in these approaches.

It is not just our Federal Government. There are many companies that exist today that have already developed these approaches. I think they will do much better once we do things like remove requirements for testing products on animals. Because there still is so much favoritism in science for using the animal-based approaches, because people think that you have to do it if you want

to get an NIH grant, you have to do it if you want to get through the FDA. And so, once those things really start to change, I think we will see a lot more investment in the government and outside.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. And, Dr. Locke, the same question.

Dr. LOCKE. Yes, thank you for the question. The good news is that, at least in one area, cosmetics testing, we are pretty much out of the animal testing business. If you look at other areas—for example, testing of environmental chemicals, drugs, and discovery—we are not there yet. How long is it going to take? I always like to say it is not a matter of if, but it is a matter of when, but no one has ever asked me to put a time on that, and I am afraid I cannot do that.

I know what steps we need to take to get there, which are to really start to fund these technologies, to make sure that these technologies are valid, to get the Federal Government to really be very, very much of a leader in these. I do believe that we have an incredibly entrepreneurial private sector that is well positioned to be leaders in these in the world market. You are seeing all sorts of continuous funding of these from venture capitalists. You are seeing all sorts of use of these technologies in medical settings. There is a lot of personalized medicine that is being used, so the future is very bright. I think it is just really a matter of getting us on the right pathway to do that.

It is not going to be something, unfortunately, I think it is going to happen in 5 years or 10 years, but it could happen in 20, 30, 40, maybe not even within my lifetime, but to be honest with you, I do not really care as long as we get on that pathway.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Goodman?

Mr. GOODMAN. I think I am a little more optimistic. I mean, we could stop animal testing today. It is useless. It is misleading us. It is causing us to waste billions of dollars every year, decades of time and energy and very smart people. These are some of the smartest people in the world. You cutoff their funding for animal testing, they are going to figure out something else to do. The private sector is going to innovate. Stop forcing companies to test on animals. Stop doling out billions of dollars to animal experimenters who have no incentive to innovate and actually solve problems because that is what keeps the grants coming. They will figure out another way to do it, and we are going to get solutions that way.

The EPA is a great example. I know my time is up, but the EPA set a timeline in 2019. The Trump Administration said, by 2035, we are going to phaseout all animal testing, which was great. It was lauded by Republicans, Democrats. Everyone across the spectrum thought it was a great idea. Within months of that, within months of the Biden Administration taking over, they killed that timeline to phaseout animal testing at the EPA because environmental groups pushed them to do it, saying that it was an environmental justice issue, that we needed to do more animal testing, not less, which is ridiculous. So, I think that if you take the politics out, and if we are concerned with science and we are concerned about being good stewards of taxpayer dollars and the public's interest, we can end animal testing tomorrow. We are going to be fine, and we are actually going to be better off. Thank you.

Ms. MACE. Thank you. I would now like to recognize Mr. Crane for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, Ms. Chairwoman, for holding this hearing today. Thank you guys for showing up. It was just yesterday in an Oversight hearing that I asked Chairman Comer if we could get some therapy dogs up here because of some of the meltdowns that were going on. I had no idea I would walk into this hearing today and see three beautiful Beagle puppies. And I have noticed that my mood has already improved, so thank you guys for bringing them there. I think we should make it mandatory.

We also talked about, in the Oversight Committee hearing yesterday, some of the ridiculous initiatives and programs that need to be cut from our bloated government. And it seems like a lot of these studies are just another example of our senseless, out-of-control spending by bureaucrats who never really get held accountable. I want to start with you, Mr. Goodman. You said you have estimated over $20 billion in taxpayer money wasted on ineffective animal research. Is that correct, sir?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRANE. Wow. Mr. Goodman, did you also say that it was your estimation that $241 million was spent for transgender animal testing?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes, and that, I would say, is the floor, not the ceiling, because the information on Federal data bases is pretty incomplete.

Mr. CRANE. So, you think we are going to find out that it was much more money than that for——

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRANE [continuing]. Transgender animal testing?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRANE. Can you describe what exactly the American people's taxpayer dollars were spent on regarding transgender animal testing?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. In a lot of these cases, they involve mice, rats, monkeys who are being surgically mutilated and subjected to hormone therapies to mimic female-to-male or male-to-female gender transitions, gender-affirming hormone therapies, and then looking at the biological, psychological, and physiological effects of the gender transitions, looking at the effects of taking vaccines after you have transitioned these animals from male to female or female to male, looking at the size of their genitals changing after you have put them on estrogen or testosterone therapies to transition them. In the example the Chairwoman gave, there was a $1.1 million grant to give female lab rats testosterone to mimic transgender male humans and then overdose them with this party drug to see if female animals taking testosterone were more likely to overdose on this sex-party drug than animals who were not taking testosterone.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Goodman, are many of these taxpayer-funded animal studies shared with the public, or is there a significant oversight of this research?

Mr. GOODMAN. You essentially needed a degree in information technology to navigate the Federal spending data bases to find any of this stuff.

Mr. CRANE. So, what you have found is we are not being very transparent with what we are spending these funds on?

Mr. GOODMAN. Not at all, and it is by design.

Mr. CRANE. Did you say that Dr. Fauci, in your estimation, had funded close to 95 percent of these animal research projects?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. In our analysis, Dr. Fauci funded about 95 percent of the transgender animal experiments.

Mr. CRANE. OK. I found in some research that the EPA, under President Trump, is planning to reduce the Agency's animal testing by 30 percent by 2025 and completely by 2035. Mr. Goodman, can you explain why that is a win for the American taxpayer?

Mr. GOODMAN. Absolutely. Animal testing is incredibly time-intensive, inaccurate, and expensive, and it is not very good at predicting the human health effects or environmental effects of chemicals and pesticides. And right now, what we are doing to test human effects is poisoning the lab animals, forcing them to breathe wildfire smoke simulated in a laboratory by burning different types of foliage and pumping it into animals' cages, making them obese to simulate what it would be like for obese people to be exposed to wildfire smoke, shooting off handguns and rifles and forcing animals to breathe the emissions in gun control experiments, and the list goes on and on. And that is what is happening currently at the EPA after the Biden Administration overturned the Trump plan to phaseout animal testing.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Goodman, one more question. You have also been outspoken about the COVID–19 outbreak stemming from Dr. Fauci's U.S.-funded research at China's Wuhan lab. What are the public health risks if we continue some of these outrageous animal studies?

Mr. GOODMAN. We are flirting with disaster if we continue to fund dangerous virus research, both abroad, like in Colorado, where Fauci greenlit this bat lab. They are trying to import hundreds of bats from Asia to build a new lab in Colorado to do virus experiments with Ebola, Nipah, Lassa, deadly viruses for which there is no cure. It is just a matter of time before we have another pandemic on our hands if we let mad scientists run amok with our money.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you. I yield back.

Ms. MACE. All right. I will now yield 5 minutes to Mr. Burlison.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for this hearing. I have to admit, whenever I saw the subject line of this, I was surprised that this was a thing. I am shocked. I think the American people should be even more shocked and disgusted to find out what is happening with their dollars. I think it is actually embarrassing. People from other countries look at this country as a beacon and as an example, and here we are spending money, taxpayer dollars, to try to study transgender animals, like transing animals and testing them on party drugs? I mean, it is insane.

My question to you, Mr. Goodman, is, I understand that your organization, White Coat Waste, helped expose the taxpayer-funded experiments on bats that led to the COVID pandemic. How did you come about that? What was your investigation? How did you get the information?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. Thanks for the question. Again, it is an honor to be here. In 2018, we uncovered a lab at the USDA here, right outside of the Beltway, where they were breeding hundreds of kittens every year and then flying to China and other foreign countries to these disgusting wet markets, and buying dog and cat meat—Federal employees. They were then putting it in their carry-on luggage, flying it back to the United States, and then force-feeding dog and cat meat to kittens in this government laboratory in Maryland. They had spent $22 million on this project.

Mr. BURLISON. For what purpose?

Mr. GOODMAN. They wanted to know if people eating dog and cat meat in China might be exposed to a particular parasite that could be carried in dog and cat meat.

Mr. BURLISON. Wow. That was your first——

Mr. GOODMAN. So, that was when we first got a sense that taxpayer dollars——

Mr. BURLISON. That was the first clue——

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. So——

Mr. BURLISON [continuing]. And then you continued to follow that.

Mr. GOODMAN. And fortunately, the Trump Administration shut that project down. They adopted out the cats who were left in the lab. Two of them went to live with my boss, the president and founder of White Coat Waste Project. Delilah and Petite lived happily ever after with him, but that set us on the scent of foreign aid for animal research. In late 2019, we discovered a list on the NIH website of all the labs in China receiving taxpayer dollars, and in January 2020, we went——

Mr. BURLISON. There are, like, still 26?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes.

Mr. BURLISON. Or how many were there at that time?

Mr. GOODMAN. There were more than 30 at the time, and there were actually labs in Russia receiving taxpayer money at the time. In January 2020, we met with the White House to flag for them that these labs in China, including the Wuhan lab, were receiving taxpayer funding, and then in April 2020, we finally went public. Working with Congressman Matt Gaetz and Joni Ernst, we went public, exposing the grant that Fauci sent to the Wuhan lab through EcoHealth Alliance to fund the gain-of-function experiments. And then since then, we have been working to defund EcoHealth, defund the Wuhan lab, and cut funding for all animal laboratories in adversarial nations as a matter of animal welfare, government waste, and national security.

Mr. BURLISON. What kind of sick and twisted individual comes up with a plan to have an experiment where you are going to turn these animals into cannibals and see what the outcome is? Where does that come from? Like, what was the thought process? How did the Ph.D. student who was doing the research or whatever, how did they make that pitch to get that grant?

Mr. GOODMAN. If it tells you anything about the government's thinking, the person responsible for this experiment is in the USDA's Hall of Fame.

Mr. BURLISON. Do you have the name?

Mr. GOODMAN. Dr. Dubey.

Mr. BURLISON. Dr. Dubey. Wow. Let me ask this question, I just have a little bit more time left. Given the fact that we have got quantum computing, we now have AI, if they truly are trying to do research and determine something, could they not run a lot of this research through advanced technology using quantum computers, data centers?

Mr. GOODMAN. Absolutely, and there are studies that have come out of Johns Hopkins and elsewhere showing that things like screening drugs and chemicals for human safety are actually much more accurate and efficient using computer modeling and AI than testing on lab animals.

Mr. BURLISON. On a completely different species, right?

Mr. GOODMAN. Correct.

Mr. BURLISON. With completely different DNA. It would make sense. Thank you. I appreciate what you do. Thank you for exposing all of this. It is shameful that we are still sending money to these, but I will do everything we can to try to stop this.

Mr. GOODMAN. Thank you so much.

Ms. MACE. All right. Thank you, Mr. Burlison. With agreement from the Ranking Member, the Chair and Ranking Member will each get an additional 5 minutes to ask questions, so I am going to yield to the Ranking Member first.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. So, I want to circle back to you, Ms. Baker, with regards to potential legislative solutions that Congress can do to support and increase oversight of animal experimentation.

Ms. BAKER. Yes. Thank you for this question. You know, one of the things that was mentioned is the numbers of animals. It is unbelievable that in 2025, in the United States, we still do not know how many animals are used in research. The estimate is up to 100 million, but we need to know that number, and one of the reasons we do not know that number is that a lot of the animals that are used in research are not even recognized as animals under the law. Mice, rats, birds bred for research, invertebrates, they are not animals under the law, and so they are not counted. We can amend the Animal Welfare Act to count those animals by including them in the definition of "animals." If there is no appetite for amending the Animal Welfare Act, there are other solutions, and especially focused on Federal Government spending.

So, the NIH does require recipients of NIH funding to do some reporting, but it is not transparent, and it is not accurate. If you receive NIH grants, every 4 years you need to provide some assurances that you are complying with NIH policies, and in that is an average daily inventory of animals. It is just an estimate. It is not transparent. To get that information, you would have to do FOIA requests. And so, there is actually some proposed legislation—the Federal Animal Research Accountability Act—that could change this. Simply put, if you receive NIH grants, then once a year you need to report on how many animals have been housed, bred, used in research, and that should be made transparent.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you for that. I appreciate you giving your testimony today. Mr. Goodman, I do have a question. We keep hearing about the gender-affirming care, and I do find that concerning. Just

for clarification purposes, can you let me know, what is that dollar figure and where is the source from?

Mr. GOODMAN. For those experiments?

Ms. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. GOODMAN. The source of that is *NIH RePORTER* website and the *USAspending.gov* website.

Ms. BROWN. OK. And what was the dollar figure?

Mr. GOODMAN. Let me get it for you, and I have a spreadsheet with all those projects.

Ms. BROWN. OK.

Mr. GOODMAN. I would be happy to share it. The dollar figure was $240 million in recent grants; $26 million of those are active grants.

Ms. BROWN. OK. And the——

Mr. GOODMAN. And those——

Ms. BROWN [continuing]. Two-hundred-forty-one million is for?

Mr. GOODMAN. So, that is grants that are available in the *NIH RePORTER* data base, and again, I have this actual search saved. If you use search terms "transgender" and "animal models," those were the hits that came up.

Ms. BROWN. OK, because I think the article that you cited in your statement indicated there was $10 million.

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. That was——

Ms. BROWN. I was just trying to get clarity.

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. That was just a sub-selection of the projects. It was not everything.

Ms. BROWN. OK.

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes.

Ms. BROWN. All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. GOODMAN. You are welcome.

Ms. BROWN. All right, and I will yield back.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, and I am going to yield to myself for 5 minutes, and, Congresswoman Boebert, I am going to yield to you for a minute or two. I think you had a couple extra questions you want to ask. My first question, Mr. Goodman, what is the worst animal testing experiment you have ever heard of and uncovered? There are some really bad ones out there, but what is the absolute worst one you have ever heard of and uncovered?

Mr. GOODMAN. The kitten cannibalism was pretty horrendous: breeding kittens just to force them to eat cat meat, and then killing them, even though they were perfectly healthy, after they collected their feces out of a litter box. I mean, that is literally what was happening. They were doing that to thousands and thousands of kittens. The DOJ, until recently, was stabbing, shooting, and blowing up live animals for training exercises. We were able to cut that and defund that. The experiments that the NIH funded and Fauci funded in Tunisia, where they were putting the dogs' heads in mesh cages and filling them with biting flies. Yes, there is a lot of nightmarish stuff that we are being forced to fund, and taxpayers do not like it, and they do not even know how bad the situation is. If they did, they would be marching in the streets.

Ms. MACE. Yes, and Dr. Locke, a question for you. What are the prospects of a drug therapy that fails animal testing? Is it likely to receive regulatory approval?

Dr. LOCKE. Thank you for your question. I am not an expert on the drug development process, but the way you have described things, I think if the drug would not make it through the tests that are required, it would not be able to be in the market. If I could just add, though, that Congress has really looked closely at this issue about developing drugs and passed a law, the FDA Modernization Act——

Ms. MACE. Uh-huh.

Dr. LOCKE [continuing]. That removed the requirements for testing drugs. And my understanding is that there is bipartisan support for another law, because Congress feels that the FDA is not moving more quickly in this area. That is the FDA Modernization Act 3.0 that would force the Agency to really pay a lot more attention to using alternatives.

Ms. MACE. OK. And then, Ms. Baker, before I hand it over to Ms. Boebert, I love your idea of revisiting the Animal Welfare Act. I would be open to working with you in finding that language and doing a bill that would insert that language, to define what an animal is. I think that is very important. I am all about small parts, big difference. Of course, I would like to eradicate animal testing altogether, but that seems like an easy win that we could work on together in a nonpartisan manner. So, I would love to talk to you about that, and I will yield the last 2-and-a-half minutes to Ms. Boebert.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Madam Chair. I think the NIH probably should change their acronym to FOD—Faces of Death. This very much sounds like a show that my mother would not let me watch as a child and just hearing how egregious this is. There are many more things that I have listed here. Of course, we have heard of the beagles who were in the mesh cages. I do not know if their vocal cords were paralyzed or if they were removed, but they were prevented from barking, correct?

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. There was a project that Dr. Fauci funded, actually we worked with Chairwoman Mace to expose, that they were doing drug testing where they were poisoning puppies with massive doses of drugs. There was actually a line item in the contract for a cordectomy——

Ms. BOEBERT. Wow.

Mr. GOODMAN [continuing]. To cut the vocal cords so the dogs would not bark in the lab.

Ms. BOEBERT. Wow. And so, we have heard that. We have heard electroshock therapy, even to the point where cats had their spinal cords exposed, their backs sliced open, and that electroshock therapy was given to test for erectile dysfunction and cognitive issues, and so many other things. And so, I ended my last round of questioning talking about the implantation of aborted fetal tissues, and you said that universities partner with clinics who are performing these abortions. Now, how does that process work and who funds that? Are the mothers of these aborted babies giving permission? Do they know it is taking place? Is there taxpayer funding in the crosshairs of that, other than the actual testing itself?

Mr. GOODMAN. That is outside of my wheelhouse.

Ms. BOEBERT. OK. Again, Madam Chair, I think this is something we should look into. I would love to see just what permissions

are granted and given for that. I know that we have some regulatory framework within the Department of Health and Human Services and the Public Health Service Act, and regulations include prohibitions on buying or selling the tissue of valuable consideration, but they allow for compensation for costs associated with the tissue handling. And so, I would love to look into that, so not only can we prevent the cruelty in the animals like these beautiful beagles we see here today, but also even our children who are being harmed in this process as well, for whatever reason it may be. But, Madam Chair, I would love to continue to work with you on this and hold Dr. Fauci, the NIH, NIAID, and everyone else accountable for this wasteful spending, and I yield.

Ms. MACE. Thank you. I would now like to yield 5 minutes to Mr. McGuire.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Thanks for bringing this egregious and evil issue to our attention. It is not working? All right. The new guy is learning. All right. Thank you, Chairwoman for bringing——

Ms. MACE. You are doing great.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Thank you for bringing this egregious and evil issue to my attention. I do not think anyone in my district or our country would approve. I want to thank you for our witnesses for coming in. As a veteran, as a Navy Seal, we use dogs, and they save many lives. We call them furry missiles. And my wife and I have a Great Pyrenees, and our dog is part of the family, and I was not aware of what you have brought to our attention. And after listening to what the Chairwoman talked about, this being a bipartisan issue, it should be. It is definitely evidence that evil does exist. We spend more in our country per day than we bring in per day, which is going to sink this country if we do not get it under control. I cannot believe the amount of money that we are spending to do these crazy things.

I want to start with Dr. Locke. Approximately how many drugs on the market today rely on safety and efficacy data from multiple animal models before being allowed to move to human clinical trials?

Dr. LOCKE. Thank you for your question. I do not have a good figure for you other than to say that, as you correctly stated, the law requires safety and efficacy. And before the FDA Modernization Act was passed and probably even after it was passed, most of those drugs almost certainly had to go through some sort of animal testing, but I cannot put a number on it. I am sorry.

Mr. MCGUIRE. No worries. I strongly advocate for the welfare of animals. Dr. Locke, would you agree that eliminating animal testing entirely from the research and development of drugs and vaccines could significantly hinder our ability to assess safety and efficacy, potentially delaying lifesaving treatments?

Dr. LOCKE. At the present time, we would need to transition away from animals. Yes, I do agree with that statement.

Mr. MCGUIRE. That is what I think. All right. Dr. Locke, given your knowledge in alternative testing models, can you briefly list and describe different examples of technological alternatives?

Dr. LOCKE. Yes. Thank you for your question. One of the ones I mentioned in my testimony are these things called organs on a

chip, which are just like what they sound like. They are small, engineered devices, and they mimic the organs that we have in our body. So, there is a lung on a chip, there is a heart on a chip, there is a liver on a chip, and those do not have the same functions that our organs do, but they have enough so that you can make good decisions based on the biology that you learn from those. In many cases, you can actually put human cells in there. You are putting human cells in there to study chemicals, and you can also begin to link these together to get a whole body on a chip.

Another area where we have had a lot of advances in developing these things is called organoids. So, organoids are groups of cells from, let us say, a brain or a liver or a heart, and you put them in a dish, and they actually organize themselves into something that looks like a human organ, but it is not exactly the same. But again, it has enough function so you can study it, and you can expose it to chemicals, and you can expose it to other things so that you might know what is going to impact it. The important thing to remember about these, too, is that, in terms of cost effectiveness, you can put these in a well plate, and you can do many, many studies at the same time. Unlike with animals, where you have a very, very slow throughput, these, you have either a medium or a high throughput. So, those are two examples that I am most familiar with.

Our other witnesses have mentioned AI computational models. That is another very, very powerful one, but we have all these unbelievable techniques now where we can actually use these for personalized medicine. So, I think everyone here has a medical school in their district or a university in their district that does this. But for example, if I was suffering from a disease and there were two options for treatment for that disease, and one was, let us say, a chemical and the other was a radiation treatment, you could actually take cells from my body and you could regress those cells to stem cells, then make them organ cells——

Mr. MCGUIRE. I apologize. I am running out of time——

Dr. LOCKE. Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. MCGUIRE [continuing]. And I have another question.

Dr. LOCKE. OK.

Mr. MCGUIRE. I wish I had a list of the egregious things that my colleague Lauren Boebert listed—I could not believe half of them, or any of them—but I heard them mention kitten cannibalism, which is unbelievable. Is that true, and if so, where did it happen? When did it happen? What did they think they were going to achieve?

Dr. LOCKE. I do not have any information on that question. I am sorry.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Does any of the witnesses have——

Mr. GOODMAN. Yes. My organization exposed that in 2018. The USDA's Agricultural Research Service, ARS, in Beltsville, had a lab where they were breeding hundreds of kittens every year and doing feeding experiments with them, including going to wet markets in China and Brazil and other places, buying dog and cat meat, bringing it back to the United States, and force-feeding that meat to kittens for studies looking at the prevalence of toxoplasmosis in dog and cat meat in wet markets abroad.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Proof that evil does exist. Thank you, Chairwoman, for bringing this to our attention, and hopefully we can stop this evil. Thank you.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. McGuire. I would now like to yield to Ranking Member Brown for any brief closing remarks she may have.

Ms. BROWN. I just want to thank the witnesses for being here, and I look forward to doing some good work on this Subcommittee.

Ms. MACE. And I want to thank the Ranking Member, and I look forward to working with you. While we were just talking offline here, I was saying I want to get on her bill about cosmetics and animal testing, so all good things today. Today's conversation builds upon the work that I and many of us on Oversight and throughout Congress have been working on for years to end animal testing. There are many of us up here, and we are not working fast enough. We are trying as hard as we can, so we appreciate the witnesses being here today.

Last Congress, I introduced the Preventing Animal Abuse and Waste Act to prohibit the NIH from conducting or funding research that causes significant pain or distress to cats or dogs. As an animal lover, I have been disturbed to learn about these barbaric and unnecessary experiments to create transgender mice, rats, and monkeys. I, like many, most humans, have a deep adoration and love for all of God's creatures, including our animals, and one of my earliest memories as a child was being in Hampton, South Carolina. I was, like, 4 years old, and my grandmother had just made some great biscuits and breakfast, and she gave me this bright pink album, and it was just full of pictures of animals from the newspaper from Hampton, and ever since then, I have just loved them so much, and I grew up with seven pets. We had three dogs, three cats, and a parrot named Julio.

And so, it is just important for the work that we are doing that all of God's creatures, all animals, are treated with respect and dignity and love, and that they are not murdered and maimed and killed on these horrific experiments. So, this Congress, I will continue to fight to end all animal testing, including by introducing legislation that prohibits use of Federal funds for these cruel animal sex-change experiments. Thank you, again, to our panelists. The issue of taxpayer-funded animal cruelty deserves our time and attention. I am thankful for your expert testimony today.

And with that, without objection, all Members will have 5 legislative days within which to submit materials and to submit additional written questions for the witnesses, which will then be forwarded to the witnesses for their response.

Ms. MACE. And we are now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:20 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]