

# LOCKING IN THE DOGE CUTS: ENDING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE FOR GOOD

---

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DELIVERING ON  
GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND  
GOVERNMENT REFORM

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

JUNE 24, 2025

---

**Serial No. 119-35**

---

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



Available on: [govinfo.gov](http://govinfo.gov), [oversight.house.gov](http://oversight.house.gov) or [docs.house.gov](http://docs.house.gov)

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

60-814 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2025

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, *Chairman*

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	ROBERT GARCIA, California, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI, Illinois
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RO KHANNA, California
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
GARY PALMER, Alabama	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	GREG CASAR, Texas
PAT FALLON, Texas	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	EMILY RANDALL, Washington
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	WESLEY BELL, Missouri
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	LATEEFAH SIMON, California
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	DAVE MIN, California
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	<i>Vacancy</i>
ELI CRANE, Arizona	
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

---

MARK MARIN, Staff Director

JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director

MITCH BENZINE, General Counsel

PETER WARREN, Senior Advisor

LISA PIRANEO, 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 DELIVERING ON GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia, *Chairwoman*

MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico, <i>Ranking Member</i>
PAT FALLON, Texas	ELANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	STEPHEN LYNCH, Massachusetts
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	GREG CASAR, Texas
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	<i>Vacancy</i>
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

# C O N T E N T S

---

## OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
Hon. Marjorie Taylor Greene, U.S. Representative, Chairwoman .....	1
Hon. Melanie Stansbury, U.S. Representative, Ranking Member .....	3

## WITNESSES

Mr. Matthew Dickerson, Director of Budget Policy, The Economic Policy Innovation Center (EPIC)	
Oral Statement .....	6
Mr. David Burton, Senior Fellow in Economic Policy, Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, The Heritage Foundation	
Oral Statement .....	8
Mr. Dan Lips, Senior Fellow, Foundation for American Innovation	
Oral Statement .....	9
Ms. Emily DiVito (Minority Witness), Senior Advisor for Economic Policy, Groundwork Collaborative	
Oral Statement .....	11

*Written opening statements and bios are available on the U.S. House of Representatives Document Repository at: docs.house.gov.*

#### INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- \* Article, “Donald Trump Approval Rating New polls show shakeup over Iran bombing”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *Newsweek*, “Donald Trump’s Approval Rating Plunges in Multiple Polls”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *CAP*, “How the Trump Administration’s DOGE Cuts Are Harming Women”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *CNN*, “How Trump’s DOGE Cuts Package Could put GOP in a Bind”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *Brookings*, “How will we know if DOGE is succeeding”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *CNN*, “Trump Admin Scrambles to Rehire Key Federal Workers”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *USA*, “Today Trump Pivots to Distractions as Polls Show Collapsing Support”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *CREW*, “DOGE’s Big Illusion”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *TipRanks*, “Trump’s Approval Rating Drops to Term-Low amid Israel-Iran War”; submitted by Rep. Crockett.
- \* Article, *ProPublica*, “Internal VA Emails Reveal How Trump Jeopardizes Veterans’ Care”; submitted by Rep. Lynch.

*The documents listed above are available at: [docs.house.gov](http://docs.house.gov).*

## **LOCKING IN THE DOGE CUTS: ENDING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE FOR GOOD**

---

**TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2025**

**U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM**  
**SUBCOMMITTEE ON DELIVERING ON GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY**  
*Washington, D.C.*

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., Room HVC-210, U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. Marjorie Taylor Greene, [Chairwoman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Greene, Cloud, Fallon, Timmons, Burchett, Burlison, Jack, Gill, Stansbury, Norton, Lynch, Casar, and Crockett.

Also present: Representative Subramanyam.

Ms. GREENE. This hearing of the Subcommittee on Delivering on Government Efficiency will come to order.

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

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

### **OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRWOMAN MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE REPRESENTATIVE FROM GEORGIA**

Ms. GREENE. Good morning, and welcome to today's hearing. I would like to begin by showing a video of what the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) is all about.

I certainly wish that my Democrat colleagues felt the same as their former Democrat leaders felt and worked to try to reduce our deficit and reduce the size of our government. Unfortunately, these former Democrat leaders failed at what they were saying they were trying to do, but today's DOGE and DOGE Subcommittee is actually delivering on those exact promises, and we are delivering the results.

It is too bad that my Democrat colleagues constantly mock DOGE, attack DOGE, criticize DOGE, and criticize the hard-working people in DOGE. They also attack this Committee and attack what we are all about, but that is today's Democrat Party. They are for big government, big spending, and doing nothing for the American people. They are America last.

This Subcommittee has highlighted where DOGE has staunched the flow of waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal spending. DOGE

drove the Administration to turn off the spending faucet that was pouring out billions of dollars to corrupt anti-American Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO)s; to illegal Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) programs; and to a vast array of wasteful, unnecessary Federal grants, contracts, leases, and personnel. President Trump drove this massive effort by creating DOGE via executive order on Inauguration Day. He then issued a series of White House directives empowering DOGE teams to work with agency leaders governmentwide in an unprecedented effort to root out wasteful spending using all means at their disposal.

And that effort has borne fruit. The DOGE website identifies \$180 billion in savings achieved in just a matter of months. We need to make sure we lock in those savings. It should be the first installment we pay on our Nation's \$37 trillion debt. We need to tackle that debt on behalf of our children and future generations. That is why Congress needs to act.

DOGE has shown how our government can cost less and deliver more. It has shown how we can turn off the faucet. It has shown we do not need to spend all the dollars that Congress appropriated for this year. Congress can reverse that unnecessary spending by rescinding dollars it has appropriated. That is why the Administration recently sent a \$9 billion rescission request to Congress.

By the way, you just saw Democrats on that video talking about saving \$9 billion. Republicans just delivered on that.

Our \$9 billion rescission would prevent dollars from going to corrupt international organizations, to woke NGOs, to National Public Radio (NPR), and to Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). The House adopted the legislation earlier this month, H.R. 4, the Rescission Act of 2025. But we need to do more, much more. Nine billion is just the tip of the iceberg of the waste that DOGE has identified and of the spending that the Administration has paused or shut off, so Congress needs to work with the Administration and DOGE to rescind billions more of dollars it has appropriated for agencies to spend.

DOGE is also creating savings that will lower the cost of government for years to come. For instance, the Administration is right-sizing the Federal bureaucracy by eliminating several hundred thousand staff positions. That reduces discretionary spending costs for the next year and every future year by tens of billions of dollars. So, we need to adjust those levels of new appropriations to align with the streamlined government DOGE is creating.

That is why the President proposed last month when he submitted to Congress a budget for next year that reduces nondiscretionary spending by \$163 billion. If we lower the spending baseline in that way, we can save \$2 trillion in that portion of the budget over the coming decade. We need to lock in DOGE savings for the taxpayers, and we should also be thinking about locking in the DOGE process that has produced these savings.

DOGE has attracted enemies because it has taken on Washington's culture of spending and the money laundering schemes that have been embedded in this institution. We should make that a permanent battle. We should institutionalize the battle against waste, fraud, and abuse in government. I hope that is something with which my Democrat colleagues can at least agree on.

DOGE is working with agencies to reduce the rampant fraud that Government Accountability Office (GAO) says costs taxpayers as much as a half trillion dollars annually. To enhance fraud detection, agencies are now providing the Treasury Department more information about financial awards, and they are making more use of Treasury's Do Not Pay data base to avoid funding fraudsters. DOGE is also lowering the barriers that prevent agencies from sharing data to identify duplicate awardees.

What is more, DOGE has pioneered what the President calls radical transparency concerning wasteful spending. The DOGE website and individual Federal agency sites continually update, for public view, the specific grants, contracts, leases, and other payments that they are flagging for termination. This is how you change the culture of spending.

And with that, I yield to Ranking Member Stansbury for her opening statement.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, good morning, everyone. Welcome to the DOGE Subcommittee.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER  
MELANIE STANSBURY  
REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW MEXICO**

Ms. STANSBURY. Notwithstanding the abject failure of the DOGE enterprise inside the Federal Government and the epic breakup of Elon Musk and Donald Trump, here we are again, once again, in this Committee.

I am grateful that the Chairwoman showed, again, one of my favorite videos, which she showed on the first day of this Subcommittee. I am grateful because it highlights the work that we have been doing for decades to root out waste, fraud, and abuse, including work that I was intimately involved in as a budget examiner in the Office of Management and Budget, in which we actually eliminated waste, fraud, and abuse.

But unfortunately, as my friends across the aisle in the GOP and their Heritage Foundation witnesses are still trying to make DOGE happen yet again, and the American people are over it. In fact, you do not have to take my word for it. A poll, from just two weeks ago, found that 67 percent of voters believe DOGE has done a bad job. That was just two weeks ago.

In fact, when I told one of my friends that we were having another DOGE Subcommittee hearing, they asked, really, is that still happening? Because literally the American people are over it. Except that it is not funny because DOGE has been used to wage a chaotic, destructive, and ideological war against the American people and the vital programs that they depend on. But I am going to turn to that in just a moment here.

Given everything that is happening in the world right now and with this Administration, I do not think we can sit here and pretend like everything is normal because just four days ago, the President launched an unauthorized military attack in Iran without the consent of Congress, putting our troops and our bases in harm's way, as we saw just last night with the retaliatory bombing of one of our largest bases.

And, Madam Chair, I have actually been extremely grateful and wholeheartedly agree with your outspoken advocacy against this war. But like so many in this Administration, so many days and weeks, this follows weeks of chaos here at home. As the President has deployed U.S. Marines and National Guard on our own soil against our own people, his Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary and Federal officials shoved a U.S. Senator to the ground, DOJ indicted a sitting Congresswoman in this House for doing her job, and tried to arrest a New York city official in a Federal courthouse. This is not only not normal, it is dangerous, it is anti-American, and it is anti-democratic.

And so, we are not going to sit here today and pretend like what this Administration is doing is normal. And we are not going to sit here and pretend like DOGE is just some normal government program. It is a scam in service of a political agenda.

While we came to the table at the beginning of this whole process in good faith, with real ideas, bipartisan ideas that folks have been working on for years, and a desire to actually fix and modernize the Federal Government, what we have seen from DOGE is the exact opposite. It has so failed in its stated mission of saving money that even the President asked if it was bullshit as Elon Musk was exiting the building.

And if they want to talk about fiscal responsibility, while we are sitting here, they are still trying to pass a reconciliation bill across the aisle that would saddle taxpayers with \$2.5 trillion in deficit spending. And in the last few weeks, reports have revealed that DOGE may actually have cost the Federal Government more than it actually saved because of the mass firings, dismantled agencies, stolen data, lawsuits, agencies in chaos, agencies that are not able to do their basic operational duties. This is not efficiency. This is a scam.

And that is not even to mention the completely reckless and needless suffering that DOGE has caused. We are talking about millions of children and people across the planet who no longer will have access to food and medicine because of the very \$9 billion rescission package that was just discussed. Thousands of veterans and public servants here at home whose lives have been shattered and millions of Americans who have been impacted by the gutting of vital programs, including staffing at Social Security. And now they are here today to try to make the case for making it permanent. Are you serious? Really? Are you serious? I cannot even believe my ears.

So, why are they actually trying to make DOGE permanent? Well, I think you have to look no further than the witnesses that they have called over the last several hearings, including today. We have got the Heritage Foundation and other authors and architects of Project 2025. And so, we have to be real about what this is actually about. It is not about efficiency. It is about a political agenda, an ideological agenda, about remaking the U.S. Government, about remaking our economy and our society in line with a hyper-conservative worldview that is so unpopular that even Donald Trump tried to distance himself from Project 2025 during the campaign, and now he has hired over 70 officials to try to enact it, and now they are trying to use this Committee to make the case.

Now, they like to try to claim that they are taking on cancel culture and a woke agenda, but let us be clear, DOGE and the folks who want to make it permanent are the actual cancel culture because they want to cancel anything that they do not like or they do not agree with, including your democratic rights and your freedoms; economic opportunity and education; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning (LGBTQ+) rights; rolling back the clock on civil rights; canceling the history of Black, Chicano, and indigenous communities; and stripping protections from our families and the healthcare, housing, and food people depend on so that they can give more tax breaks to their friends.

But this is all part of a wider agenda that is now seeking to apply political purity tests to government programs and services, including both Federal employment and, yes, veteran services. Let me repeat that again. Even veteran benefits. They want to apply political purity tests to your VA benefits.

Folks, this is not about efficiency. This is about eroding and privatizing our institutions, gutting programs that keep our people and our country safe. It is about rewriting history and remaking society to take us back decades, if not centuries. In short, it is about making this country less free, less democratic, less prosperous, and, frankly, consolidating power under Trump and his allies who are becoming increasingly dangerous, ideological, and, yes, autocratic.

So, we have to be clear-eyed about what is actually going on because this Administration and its allies, if they are willing to arrest and indict elected officials who are just doing their jobs, including a U.S. Senator and a U.S. Congresswoman, what will they do if we let them get away with it? We cannot and we will not remain silent. We have to continue to speak up, to speak out, and continue to stand together.

I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, Representative Subramanyam of Virginia is waived onto the Subcommittee for the purpose of questioning the witnesses at today's Subcommittee hearing.

I am pleased to introduce our witnesses today. Matthew Dickerson is the Director of Budget Policy at the Economic Policy Innovation Center. He is recognized as an expert on fiscal policy issues, including the budget, appropriations, and entitlement reform and served as a senior policy advisor on the House Budget Committee.

David Burton is a Senior Fellow in Economic Policy at the Heritage Foundation's Thomas A. Rowe Institute for Economic Policy Studies. He is widely regarded for his deep knowledge in issues such as entrepreneurship, financial privacy, tax matters, and regulatory and administrative law.

Dan Lips is a Senior Fellow at the Foundation for American Innovation. He has more than 20 years of experience in public policy, including with the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. His current work is focused on enhancing government efficiency.

Emily DiVito is the Senior Advisor for Economic Policy at Groundwork Collaborative.

Again, I want to thank you for being here to testify today.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise their 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?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Ms. GREENE. Let the record show that the witnesses answered in the affirmative.

Thank you, and you may take a seat.

We appreciate you being here today and look forward to your testimony. Let me remind the witnesses that we have read your written statement, and they will appear in full in the hearing record. Please limit your oral statement to 5 minutes. As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it is on and the Members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 minutes, the light will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your 5 minutes have expired, and we would ask that you please wrap it up.

I now recognize Mr. Dickerson for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF MATTHEW DICKERSON  
DIRECTOR OF BUDGET POLICY  
THE ECONOMIC POLICY INNOVATION CENTER (EPIC)**

Mr. DICKERSON. Chairwoman Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, and all the Members of the Committee, thank you so much for inviting me to testify today.

The fiscal state of our Nation is deteriorating, and unsustainable spending is the problem. Government spending that grows faster than the economy is inherently unsustainable. That is just basic math. Annual spending is now 50 percent higher than it was in 2019 before the pandemic. The national debt held by the public is now equal to the size of the entire economy.

For context, in 1944, the year of D-Day and the Battle of the Bulge, the debt as a percentage of GDP was 86 percent. After we went into debt to save the world, the Federal budget and the debt shrank while the economy grew in the post-World War II decades. But on our current trajectory, the debt is only projected to keep growing.

This growing debt risks evaporating the government's fiscal space, which is its capacity to borrow, without undermining debt sustainability or risking a loss of market confidence. This fiscal limit can be considered the government's true debt limit.

The fiscal situation was made much worse by four years of reckless spending under the Biden Administration. The policies of the Biden-Harris Administration increased Federal spending by \$4.7 trillion over just four years, compared to the projections made by The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) immediately prior. President Biden's executive actions added more than \$2 trillion in spending, without explicit approval from Congress. The Biden Administration spent hundreds of billions of dollars transferring student loan debt to the taxpayers from borrowers, they unilaterally increased food stamp benefits, they gutted Medicaid eligibility verification, and many other policies that increased spending.

The point of the American system of government, based on hundreds of years of experience under the British crown, was to restrict the ability of the unilateral expenditure of funds. By asserting the prerogative to spend the taxpayers' money unilaterally without authorization from Congress for this new spending, it can be said that Biden attempted to act as a king.

In contrast, President Trump has focused on reducing taxpayer costs and reducing the power of government. This is the whole point of DOGE. Trump's discretionary budget would multiply to about \$1.8 trillion of savings over the 10-year budget window, but that is only if Congress implements and continues these common-sense savings. And that is why it is so important that you are holding this hearing today, Madam Chairman, so thank you.

To paraphrase Madison in Federalist 58, the power to levy taxes and provide spending authority and the power to withhold funds from the executive, that is the most effective way for the elected representatives of the American people to provide for the vital and appropriate services of the Federal Government, as well as to prevent abuse by the government using the people's funds.

Congress has many tools at its disposal to carry out this vital responsibility. The most straightforward way to control waste, fraud, and abuse is by controlling agency budgets in the annual appropriations process. You can reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy. I estimate that reducing the Federal workforce by ten percent would allow discretionary appropriations for salaries and other benefits to be reduced by \$559 to \$608 billion over the next decade.

The scope of authorized agency activities should also be properly limited. You can work with the Administration, as you are currently doing, to rescind unneeded, unobligated funds. And of course, one of the most important tools at Congress' disposal to achieve budgetary savings is through the reconciliation process.

America's current fiscal trajectory is unsustainable, but it is not irreversible. DOGE has demonstrated that meaningful savings are, in fact, achievable. By exercising its constitutional power of the purse, controlling appropriations, implementing workforce reforms, rescissions, and reconciliation, Congress can lock in the DOGE cuts, safeguard taxpayers, and avert a fiscal crisis.

Thank you, and I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

I now recognize Mr. Burton for his opening statement. Mr. Burton?

Mr. BURTON. Oh, excuse me.

Ms. GREENE. Can you turn it on, thank you.

Mr. BURTON. I apologize.

Ms. GREENE. And make sure when you talk, your microphone is close to your mouth.

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Ms. GREENE. Yes, thank you.

**STATEMENT OF DAVID BURTON  
SENIOR FELLOW IN ECONOMIC POLICY  
THOMAS A. ROE INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC POLICY STUDIES  
THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION**

Mr. BURTON. President Trump deserves tremendous credit for establishing the Department of Government Efficiency, or DOGE. It is the first effort in a generation to provide comprehensive governmentwide oversight of Federal spending and management. There has been no similar effort since the 1990s during the Clinton Administration. President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich controlled Federal spending and improved government administration. Before that, you have to go back to President Reagan's Grace Commission to observe anything similar.

Currently, the Federal Government, most assuredly, is not a good steward of the tax dollars taken from hardworking Americans and is poorly managed. It is time for that to change, and DOGE is an important part of making that change. Under President Clinton in 2000, Federal spending fell to 17.7 percent of GDP, the lowest level since 1966. The Federal Government ran its last surplus in Fiscal Year 2001, which began during President Clinton's final term. In Fiscal Year 2025, Federal spending is expected to be about 23.3 percent of GDP. Thus, the share the government now consumes of the economy is 32 percent greater than it was under President Clinton.

The budget deficit is expected to be six percent of GDP this Fiscal Year and continue at that level for a decade. The Federal debt is now \$29 trillion and is expected to increase to \$52 trillion, or 119 percent of GDP, over the next decade. And it is projected to reach a crushing 156 percent of GDP by 2025. In context, at the final year of President Reagan, it was 39 percent, and the final year of President Clinton's term, it was 33 percent.

Federal Government is on an unsustainable path. The path will lead to sustained suffering among the American people, economic dislocation, and a declining standard of living unless Congress changes that path. No matter what, it is going to end. It can either end by making Congress make dramatic changes to the current fiscal path, or it can end in fiscal calamity.

DOGE represents an effort to return to fiscal sanity and meaningfully alter our fiscal path. But DOGE, by itself, is not enough, although it is a major step forward toward American renewal. Most of the personnel reductions, grant reductions, and other forms initiated by DOGE will not result in actual savings unless Congress takes action through appropriations bills and the accompanying explanatory statements. DOGE and the Administration can, within certain limits, reprogram spending, implement administrative efficiencies, and rely on statutes authorizing the withholding of expenditures. But ultimately, the Congress is going to have to address entitlements.

Let me talk for a second about improper payments. The GAO has estimated since Fiscal Year 2003 improper payments have been \$2.8 trillion, which is nearly 1/10 of the national debt. In Fiscal Year 2024, it was \$162 billion from at least 16 different agencies, and many commentators think these are gross underestimates. This is a massive amount of money, and seemingly no one in the

executive branch cares or is able to solve this problem. Certainly, that is a focus of what Congress and the Administration should be about, and ultimately, if the Federal executives in charge of these improper payments cannot change it, they need to be replaced.

Let me just talk for one second about the overall Federal situation and the need to address entitlement reforms. You could abolish the entire Federal Government and all appropriated spending, and it would not get rid of the Federal deficit, right? You could abolish the Pentagon and each agency, and it will not get rid of the Federal deficit. We need to address entitlement spending.

And there is a host of things that we can do. We can obviously address the improper payment problem. We can also adjust the entitlement program, so they reflect tremendous increases in life expectancy since they were created. We can adjust it so that they no longer are transferring hundreds of billions of dollars a year from working young Americans to relatively wealthy old seniors. Programs can be consolidated, and that includes Social Security, Medicare, Obamacare, and the literally dozens of programs designed to address poverty.

If these things are not done, then the United States will eventually suffer a Greek-style meltdown, inflation that will make our latest round of inflation look like child's play, or a gradual squeeze like what happened to Great Britain in the 1960s and 1970s or Japan.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Burton?

Mr. BURTON. Thank you.

Ms. GREENE. We have got to wrap. Thank you. Thank you.

I now recognize Mr. Lips for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF DAN LIPS  
SENIOR FELLOW, FOUNDATION FOR AMERICAN INNOVATION**

Mr. LIPS. Chairwoman Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Dan Lips, and I am a senior fellow with the Foundation for American Innovation. Our mission is to advance technology, talent, and policy ideas that support a freer and more prosperous future.

Earlier in my career, I served on the staff of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, where I worked on bipartisan government reform legislation and oversight.

In my testimony, I offer you three points. First, the United States is on an unsustainable fiscal path. The Treasury Department and the Government Accountability Office have both warned that our growing national debt poses serious economic, security, and societal challenges. Last year, the Federal Government spent \$882 billion just on interest payments. That is more than it spent on Medicare or national defense.

At the same time, the government is losing hundreds of billions of dollars each year to fraud and waste. GAO has estimated that the Federal Government annually loses between \$233 billion and \$521 billion due to fraud. That is up to \$4,000 per American household per year. And as we just heard, last year, the Federal Government reported making \$162 billion in improper payments. And over the last four years, improper payments totaled more than \$900 bil-

lion. Better oversight and financial controls could save hundreds of billions of dollars every year.

Second, the Trump Administration's focus on government efficiency builds on decades of bipartisan government reform efforts. From the Reagan Administration's Grace Commission to the Clinton-Gore National Performance Review to President Obama's fiscal responsibility initiatives, including a 2009 executive order that initiated Treasury's Do Not Pay system, there is a history and a bipartisan tradition of executive action to root out inefficiency in the Federal Government.

President Trump's new Department of Government Efficiency is working to reduce Federal spending, shrink the size of the Federal workforce, and streamline operations. DOGE has already identified \$180 billion in savings and reduced regulatory burdens by eliminating over 1.7 million words from the Federal code. The Administration has also issued several executive orders informed by DOGE's efforts, such as to reduce fraud and improper payments by centralizing payment systems under the Treasury Department and modernizing financial transactions. But the executive branch cannot do this work alone, which brings me to my final point.

Congress should use its legislative and appropriations powers to implement lasting reforms to increase government efficiency and reduce waste, fraud, and abuse. And this should be a bipartisan effort. Members of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, where I used to work, have a tradition of passing bipartisan government reform legislation.

For example, bipartisan legislation has been enacted and introduced in the past to reduce improper payments and prevent fraud. Key reforms to strengthen the Treasury Department's Do Not Pay system, consistent with President Trump's executive orders, have been included in recent bills sponsored by Democratic and Republican lawmakers. These reforms would serve as a good starting point for legislation aimed at improving government efficiency.

In my testimony, I discuss other opportunities for government reform legislation that could achieve substantial savings. For example, GAO has identified more than 200 open recommendations for Congress and more than 5,000 open recommendations for Federal agencies. These are nonpartisan good-government reforms. If addressed, the Federal Government could save hundreds of billions of dollars.

More broadly, Congress should consider creating an annual legislative vehicle, similar to the National Defense Authorization Act, which moves every year, focused specifically on government reform. This would ensure consistent legislative oversight and give the American people's Representatives greater input into ongoing reforms to government operations.

In closing, improving government efficiency should not be a partisan issue. It is a fiscal necessity. The 119th Congress has a historic opportunity to reduce waste, prevent fraud, end misspending, and begin addressing our long-term fiscal challenges.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to testify. I look forward to your questions.

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize Ms. DiVito for her opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF EMILY DIVITO (MINORITY WITNESS)**  
**SENIOR ADVISOR FOR ECONOMIC POLICY**  
**GROUNDWORK COLLABORATIVE**

Ms. DiVITO. Chairwoman Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Emily DiVito, and I am the Senior Advisor for Economic Policy at Groundwork Collaborative, an economic thinktank based in Washington, D.C. I have previously served as a policy advisor at the Treasury Department.

Americans deserve a government that works for them, a government that makes their lives easier. By that standard, DOGE has failed. It has led to higher costs and more confusion and complexity. It has undermined consumer protections for families, all while the ambitious savings Elon Musk promised failed to materialize.

Americans are not impressed with these results. Consistent polling shows strong disapproval of DOGE and deep concerns about the haphazard and reckless cuts DOGE is making across the Federal Government. Americans also believe, as do I, that the government can do more to deliver for workers and families. As the Subcommittee considers the future of DOGE and improving government efficiency and accountability, I would like to highlight several ways DOGE has done the opposite.

First, DOGE cuts make it harder and more expensive for families to access the basic needs programs for which they are eligible. DOGE's interventions at the Social Security Administration have disrupted access to critical monthly benefits for the nearly 74 million Americans, including 52 million retirees who rely on them. New policies, such as restrictions on updating bank account information by phone, will force seniors to collectively spend over one million hours annually on unnecessary travel just to receive benefits. Staff departures increase the risk of system outages, and beneficiaries face longer wait times and poorer service at understaffed field offices.

The Department of Veterans Affairs, which serves over nine million veterans annually, has also seen interrupted service. The impact of DOGE firings and buyout initiatives has been devastating. One rural Illinois hospital was forced to close its acute care unit due to nurse resignations. Orlando-area veterans faced a backlog of over 2,000 unread radiology exams, and over 1,000 veterans in Pennsylvania were denied treatment for life-threatening diseases like cancer.

Additionally, sweeping cuts are degrading consumer protection safeguards and empowering bad actors. DOGE has targeted the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which has put over \$21 billion back into the pockets of more than 200 million consumers since its founding. Eliminating this key consumer protection agency will enable exploitative companies and financial firms to profit at the expense of consumers.

DOGE has also gutted the IRS enforcement teams that ensure billionaires and corporations pay their fair share. As of early

March, the IRS has lost 11 percent of its total workforce and 31 percent of the revenue agents who conduct audits. This is projected to reduce U.S. revenue up to \$350 billion over ten years.

Further, the Federal science enterprise is being stripped of the tools and talent needed to develop and deliver the next generation of lifesaving treatments. Recent estimates suggest that DOGE's severe cuts to scientific research funding will reduce GDP and overall Federal revenues well into the future by inhibiting innovation. Permanently cutting non-defense research and development funding by 50 percent could decrease GDP in the long run by at least seven percent and Federal revenues by more than eight percent.

Finally, DOGE's funding disruptions to U.S. aid and global health programs have already caused widespread deaths. Estimates suggest that the abrupt termination of public health programs will be responsible for over 360,000 deaths, including 200,000 children.

DOGE did not generate the \$2 trillion in efficiencies that Elon Musk initially called for or even the \$180 billion figure that it now claims. Credible analysis shows that canceled contracts, service cuts, and layoffs may have saved as little as \$12 to \$15 billion while total Federal spending actually increased year over year. Now that Musk has made his exit, it is clear that DOGE did not deliver more efficiency, just poorer service.

Congress is at a crossroads. It can learn from DOGE's mistakes, redirect, and get back to the important work of ensuring government works for people and not special interests, or Congress can double down on DOGE, cementing the harms that it has caused to families, communities, and our economy. For me, the choice is clear. I encourage leaders in Congress to put this dark episode behind us and deliver a government that works for working families.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize myself for 5 minutes of questions.

The DOGE website details much of the wasteful spending it hits the brakes on, and it has an incredible list of top hits. Some of the spending is not just embarrassing, but it is funding actually the genital mutilation of our children, forcing the American taxpayers to pay for it. A \$620,000 Health and Human Services (HHS) grant for hashtag "transcendent health," adapting an LGBT+ inclusive teen prevention program for transgender boys. \$620,000 from HHS. It is absurd. This is disgusting, and it facilitates a lie.

Here is another one. A \$2,000 National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant for cross-sex steroid therapy and cardiovascular risk in transgender females. This is another absurd grant that was handed out. A \$120,000 NIH grant for personalized 3D avatar tool development for measurement of body perception across gender identities. Here is another absurd grant that, again, tells the lie that there is more than two genders. There are only two, male and female. That is it.

Something else that the American people should know about, these radical extremist judges that are playing politics from the bench, a judge ruled that this has to be protected. This is an HHS program for gender-affirming care in young people. Again, the only thing that affirms gender is the fact that there are only two sexes,

male and female, and the American people should never have to pay for that lie.

Ms. DiVito, in your testimony, you talk about so-called failures of DOGE, in your opinion, but do you support the Federal Government funding HHS and NIH studies that promote the genital mutilation of children? Do you support forcing Americans to pay for genital mutilation of children? Yes or no, Ms. DiVito.

Ms. DiVITO. Thank you for your question. I think we all agree that the government should work for people.

Ms. GREENE. No, I asked you do you support genital mutilation of children and the American people having to pay for it. That is a yes or no question.

Ms. DiVITO. I think government research is responsible for all sorts of innovations that we employ today.

Ms. GREENE. So, for the record, you do support the American people paying for top and bottom surgeries of children?

Ms. DiVITO. I think—

Ms. GREENE. Cutting off the breasts of young girls, teenage girls, and castrating teenage boys, you support the American people paying for that?

Ms. DiVITO. I think government research is incredibly important to our overall innovation.

Ms. GREENE. That is not research, Ms. DiVito. That is mutilating kids' bodies before they are old enough to vote, before they are old enough to join the military, before they are old enough to even be adults. That is what you are saying the American people should pay for.

Just so you know, Ms. DiVito—and I am very proud to announce that I have a bill called Protect Children's Innocence Act that will criminalize sex changes on children, and that bill will see a vote on the House floor, and I look forward to my Republican colleagues, and hopefully Democrats that come to their senses, voting yes for that bill because it is absolutely repulsive and disgusting, and America voted against that this past election. Sick.

Mr. Dickerson, how do we implement cuts and appropriations moving forward to prevent these agencies from ever being able to fund these studies that promote the mutilation of children's bodies ever again?

Mr. DICKERSON. I think what you need to do is ensure those riders are included in the appropriations bills that are passed to clarify to the agencies that even though they have never actually received authorization for these, so they should not have actually done it in the first place, but if they need that funding rider to restrict American taxpayer funds for going to those terribly divisive and harmful things.

Ms. GREENE. Yes, permanently, right?

Mr. DICKERSON. Exactly.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you. Other egregious abuses of funds, a \$10 million Department of Education grant to the Virginia Commonwealth University for faculty workshops on decolonizing the curriculum. A nearly \$700,000 National Science Foundation grant to the University of Tennessee for Black and Latinx parents leading reform and advancing racial justice in elementary mathematics, a project that can provide a model for other communities and schools

seeking to advance racial justice in mathematics and education. This is insane, absurd, and it is racist in itself. Math is math.

A \$500,000 EPA grant, green jobs, growing a new generation of environmental justice problem solvers. All of this stuff is far left ideology, and the American people should not be paying for it.

It looks like my time is up, so with that, I will yield to the Ranking Member Stansbury for 5 minutes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

As we get started here, we would like to show a brief video.

Ms. STANSBURY. Now, I want to start by describing what we just saw there. For any of the American people out there who have not seen this video yet, that is United States Senator Alex Padilla being handcuffed in a Federal building after self-identifying as a United States Senator at a Cabinet Secretary's DHS public press conference. This happened two weeks ago.

A few days later, they tried to arrest a New York city official in a Federal courthouse. A few days after that, there was a politically motivated assassination of a state legislator in Minnesota. This is not normal. This is the sign of an authoritarian approach to governance that is threatening our democracy and our people.

So, we can sit here today and debate government efficiency. We can sit here and listen to lies from both our colleagues and from witnesses about what has been done by former and current administrations. But what is happening in this country right now is not normal. What they are trying to do through the budget is not normal. The rescissions package that they are trying to shove down your throats right now, with \$9 billion in cuts, is not normal.

It is not the programs that they are describing. They want to dismantle the United Nations. They want to defund NATO. They want to defund programs that keep children fed across the world. They are trying to defund programs that have saved literally hundreds of thousands of lives of people in countries across the planet.

And we just heard witnesses here just a few moments ago say that they are not satisfied with what they have already done and the damages that they are already doing. They want to go after entitlement programs. That means your Social Security. That means Medicare. That means they are going to come for your programs, the programs that are lifesaving, that sustain people as they age, the lifesaving programs that make it possible for people with disabilities to live with dignity in this country. They are coming for those programs.

So, we are not going to sit here and pretend like what is happening in this hearing is normal at a time when this Administration is using DOGE to enact an ideological agenda against the American people while they are out there trying to arrest U.S. Senators and Members of Congress because this is not okay. This is not okay.

We all agree the government should be more efficient. We all agree that we should cut waste. We all agree that there should be bipartisan pathways forward to make the government operate in a modern manner. But that is not what this enterprise is all about. This enterprise is about consolidating power and endangering the lives of people that they disagree with, including people who ask questions, doing their jobs in public settings. And if they will do

that to a United States Senator, what will they do to the rest of us?

So, we are not going to sit here today and normalize this behavior. We are just not. We are just not going to do that.

And with that, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. I strongly support law enforcement for protecting the Secretary of Homeland. I would not recognize Senator Padilla if he walked in this room.

I now recognize Mr. Timmons from South Carolina for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

We have \$37 trillion in debt. We have a \$1.8 trillion annual deficit. The fact that this is a partisan issue and the fact that my colleagues across the aisle are not taking this seriously is really frustrating. It is really, really frustrating.

We have not even talked about Social Security, which goes into austerity measures. My constituents and your constituents all over this country will receive 21 percent less if we do not save Social Security. These are just facts. This is just math. So, we have to do our job here. We have to do our job here.

And some of the most important work DOGE has done in the last six months is just simply on increasing transparency. Their website shows the public how taxpayer funds are actually being distributed and justified on a daily basis. The DOGE initiative has shown that enhanced payment tracking and upfront verification can eliminate billions in waste. And we must make these practices standard, not exceptional.

Tens of billions of dollars are lost each year to improper payments across Medicaid, unemployment insurance, SNAP, housing assistance, and more. Most people do not realize that there are 17 means-tested social safety nets that total more than \$1.5 trillion in annual government spending. And a good portion of these are improper payments, and it is simply due to lax or outdated income verification processes.

So, all these different social safety nets that we appropriately provide to Americans, they require that you have an income threshold that you do not meet. And we tell the states that they have leeway in how to do that, but it is a patchwork framework, and it is all antiquated. Certain states require paystubs, W-2s, other income documents to the IRS. It is just simply not enough. This is 2025. Technology can solve this problem.

We should be leveraging all income sources, in real time and continuously, to verify eligibility for Federal benefit programs, no more pay-and-chase, no more hoping the paperwork matches up months later, and no more guesswork. Shockingly, in the Big Beautiful Bill, the House proposal to simply require states to confirm eligibility twice a year instead of only once resulted in \$11 billion in savings. What if we confirmed income eligibility in real time?

That is why I introduced H.R. 1755, the Timely and Accurate Benefits Act, or TABS Act, to require states to adopt enhanced income verification across their Federal benefits programs to get people the benefits they deserve faster and to stop payments to those who no longer qualify, immediately.

Now let us zoom out. Income verification is one example of a broader problem. Federal agencies are swimming in waste, fraud,

abuse, and redundancy, and thanks to DOGE, we now have a public-facing receipt book of over \$180 billion in identified savings. From unnecessary grants to absurd leases to Federal offices with no measurable output, DOGE is shining a light on the insane bloat of our frivolous spending. And again, this is critical work that must be done. We have \$37 trillion in debt and run a \$1.8 trillion annual deficit. Our social safety nets will fail if we do not make appropriate changes to save them.

Mr. Lips, DOGE is attempting to overcome barriers to data sharing among and within agencies to enhance fraud detection. Isn't the inability to cross-check data bases a problem historically in identifying fraudsters?

Mr. LIPS. Absolutely, and thank you for the question, Congressman. It is important to look at the history around improper payments. There was an executive order issued by President Obama establishing the Do Not Pay system that the Treasury Department has been using to try and increase verification and tighten controls over Federal payments. But that was more than 15 years ago, and we have seen hundreds of billions of dollars in improper payments reported annually over those past 15 years.

It is important to know that the Treasury Department has been asking for help, asking for the ability to share information. A long time ago, the Social Security Administration could not share information about deceased Americans with the Treasury Department. That stopped for a few years. They can now do that. There is a lot more that can be done to share information between agencies to stop fraud and prevent improper payments. There have been bills introduced both in the Senate and the House to do that, bills by Republican Members and Democratic Members.

Mr. TIMMONS. I am running out of time.

Mr. LIPS. Sorry.

Mr. TIMMONS. Let me finish. So, this is not a "maybe." This is a "must" piece of legislation. We cannot continue down this path. My bill came from a Missouri pilot program that resulted in 17 percent savings. Seventeen percent of just Medicaid is \$140 billion annually, annually. Seventeen percent across all social safety nets that are means-tested is \$250 billion. We are running out of time. We have got to pass these pieces of legislation. We have got to use technology to make sure that we are being efficient with our tax dollars.

With that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

I now recognize Ms. Norton of Washington, D.C., for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Federal workers are essential not just to the fabric of the District of Columbia but to the functioning of the Federal Government and, in turn, to the well-being of every American. Federal workers make sure that Social Security checks go out on time. They provide healthcare to our veterans. They make sure planes land safely. They make sure food and drinking water is safe. Their work is critical to the functioning of the government and making sure people, families, and communities get the services and resources they need.

The so-called Department of Government Efficiency's gutting of the workforce has meant the senseless, tragic, and irreparable loss

of more than 100,000 public servants so far, each of whom has had their own life upended. Ms. DiVito, what do we lose when we push qualified experts out of their roles serving the American people?

Ms. DiVITO. Thank you for the question, Congresswoman. DOGE's widespread staff cuts represent a huge loss of potential and talent from the Federal workforce. As you said, many of these workers are located in D.C., but most are not. They are the people who make sure food is safe to eat, that Medicaid applications are processed in a timely way, that Social Security benefit checks go out the door. So far, we have lost thousands of these workers, and their loss is devastating not just to the communities in which they live and serve, but to the American public as a whole.

Ms. NORTON. And Ms. DiVito, what are the effects of the Department of Government Efficiency driving early career employees from Federal service?

Ms. DiVITO. Young and probationary employees are people who, by definition, are just tending to start out in their careers in public service. Some of them might have had decades ahead of them dedicated to making sure that the government works for people, and DOGE firing probationary employees guts a generation of that talent from the workforce.

Ms. NORTON. President Trump is also working to steadily politicize the Federal workforce by attacking civil service protections, replacing nonpartisan Federal employees with partisan loyalists, by reclassifying Federal positions as political jobs, and introducing loyalty tests to the Federal hiring process. Ms. DiVito, how does the gutting and politicization of the Federal workforce hurt everyday people, reduce access to the services and protections they are entitled to, and generally harm committees?

Ms. DiVITO. For the government to work for people, it needs people, workers, behind the scenes making sure that all of the vital functions of the Federal Government are happening in a timely manner that best serves the population. When you gut the Federal workforce, you obviously lose that talent. You undermine the resources, programs, functions of the Federal Government, and politicizing certain agencies undermines the overall effect of those agencies, so you see a lot more politicization of things like apolitical regulators, people who are trained and focused on making sure that they are serving the interests of the public and not one particular person or administration.

Ms. NORTON. In April, Department of Government Efficiency officials, including a 25-year-old with no Federal Government experience, recklessly purged 15,000 employees of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. That is about 90 percent of the Agency's workforce, which had been dedicated to protecting Americans from deceptive and abusive financial practices like predatory lending. Ms. DiVito, what impact does the hollowing out of the civil service from Federal Government agencies and regulatory bodies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau have on consumers and the broader economy?

Ms. DiVITO. The CFPB and other financial regulators do not just make sure that consumer interests are protected, but they keep the economy stable. They keep our financial system safe and secure, and that benefits businesses and families across the country.

Ms. GREENE. The gentlelady's time has expired.

I now recognize Mr. Burlison from Missouri for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, everyone, for being here today. I, like everyone, my constituents, are fed up with watching Washington squander their money on frivolous programs and bloated bureaucracies, which is why the Department of Government Efficiency was the most exciting thing that when I went back home and talked to constituents about, it is the most exciting thing that was happening with this Administration.

And look, this is an example of what private sector can do when it is evaluating a bloated public sector system that seems to be resistant to everything. When I spoke with Mr. Musk, I warned him. I said, you know, this place is a swamp for a reason, and you cannot rely on the politicians and the people in this town to help you in evaluating or determining places to cut. They will only deliver what they want, right? There is a reason why Congress, it being in our hands, we are at \$37 trillion in debt, and we have all of these wasted expenditures.

So, Mr. Dickerson, I am going to ask you three the same question. If you had anything to say to the DOGE efforts, to the DOGE team, and to Mr. Musk, what would you say?

Mr. DICKERSON. I would say keep up the—it has been a good start so far, and keep up the good work.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Burton.

Mr. BURTON. Excuse me. I think there is a need for them to get beyond just canceling grants and starting to work with you to draft legislation to make these changes permanent. If Congress ultimately does not act, either through appropriations bills or rescissions, it is going to be ephemeral. There is also the need to make changes on the regulatory front. There is need to change various secretary directives. They need to take it to the next step to bring it home, and they have not done that.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you. Mr. Lips.

Mr. LIPS. I agree with that point. I think the most important thing they could do now would be to work with the Members of this Committee and the Congress on government efficiency reforms, many of which I think should have broad support among lawmakers.

Mr. BURLISON. Ms. DiVito, let me ask you this. You have seen a lot of the DOGE cuts in the programs. Is there a single one that you would have agreed with, a single one?

Ms. DIVITO. Part of the problem, I think, with DOGE—

Mr. BURLISON. The answer is yes or no. Do not eat up my time. Is there a single one that you would have agreed with?

Ms. DIVITO. I do not think there is a yes or no answer to that question.

Mr. BURLISON. Okay. Well, I am not going to waste my time. I want to dive into Mr. Burton and what you said. So, the question is what should happen to force Congress to actually make these cuts that have been identified?

Mr. BURTON. Congress needs to legislate, and it has not been. I mean, the GAO has made countless proposals. The improper payments have been around for decades and literally involve trillions of dollars. No one has fixed that. That is one of the few things,

though, that the Administration has the ability, through administrative changes, to do on their own because they are legally required not to spend that money, and yet it is going on. Congress needs to appropriate the appropriators. There needs to be changes in the authorizing committee. A lot of the grants that the Chairwoman was referencing could be prohibited through authorizing legislation. Congress needs to legislate, and at some level, it sort of has forgotten how to do so.

Mr. BURLISON. Do you think that we could?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. BURLISON. You do?

Mr. BURTON. In fact, I am old enough to remember when you guys did.

Mr. BURLISON. Well, I may be just above being black-pilled at this point, so you are giving me a little bit of hope here. But, Mr. Dickerson, if you could make one significant change, what would be the most significant change or policy change that we could do that would save taxpayers' dollars?

Mr. DICKERSON. I think one of the most important things you can do is exactly what you are doing in the One Big Beautiful Bill reconciliation package, which is reform our welfare programs that literally pay people to stay out of the workforce and have the entirely the wrong disincentives so that we can actually preserve benefits for people who are actually needy, right? Things like income verification that Mr. Timmons was talking about, that is so essential to do.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Lips, if you could change one thing, if we passed one thing, what would we do?

Mr. LIPS. I would recommend strengthening the Do Not Pay data that is available to the Treasury Department. This is a bipartisan measure that could be, I think, passed through the House and Senate. It would provide access to Treasury to stop improper payments and end fraud.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you. I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman's time has expired.

I now recognize Mr. Casar from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASAR. Good morning. Today, Republicans have called this DOGE hearing called "Locking in the DOGE Cuts: Ending Waste, Fraud and Abuse for Good," and I am deeply concerned about the cuts that DOGE has made to services for our veterans.

So, I want to ask our pro-DOGE witnesses today some questions about those cuts. So, Mr. Lips, *ProPublica* reported that DOGE cuts have stalled lifesaving clinical trials for our veterans with head and neck cancer, otherwise known as throat cancer. Can you tell me, are lifesaving clinical trials for our veterans waste or are they fraud or are they abuse?

Mr. LIPS. I think that is an area of government that is certainly vital and that there is many things that can be done to improve VA services. I do not know all that DOGE has done for the VA, and I think that if there is anywhere where you could repurpose funds from these wastes that we are talking about, hundreds of billions of dollars misspent—

Mr. CASAR. But if they cut the clinical trials that are helping our veterans with throat cancer, do you agree with those cuts?

Mr. LIPS. No.

Mr. CASAR. Thank you. Mr. Dickerson, leaked documents revealed that a VA hospital in rural Illinois was just forced to close its acute care unit to new patients due to the DOGE cuts. Can you tell me, is closing the doors of a VA acute care unit waste or is it fraud or is it abuse?

Mr. DICKERSON. I do not know all the details about that particular instance, but I think that—

Mr. CASAR. Would you say it is a big problem if DOGE cuts cause the closing of an acute care facility in a VA hospital?

Mr. DICKERSON. Like I said, I think if funding that facility is a priority, we are running a \$2 trillion annual deficit—

Mr. CASAR. I think it is a priority.

Mr. DICKERSON [continuing]. So, we can repurpose funds to something if it is a priority.

Mr. CASAR. So, you think that if it is not a priority, that it is waste?

Mr. DICKERSON. I think that is for Congress and the Administration to work together to determine.

Mr. CASAR. Exactly. It is for Congress to work on, and the Administration should not be calling our acute care veterans facilities waste and closing the doors of an acute care facility without Congress. And frankly, it is a priority, I believe, of the American people to care for our veterans.

Mr. BURTON. Trump recently eliminated the VA Services Purchasing [sic] program, which just last year helped more than 33,000 veterans make sure that they do not get behind on their mortgage and they do not get thrown out of their home. Can you tell me, is this program that DOGE cut, is it waste, is it fraud, or is it abuse?

Mr. BURTON. That is highly fact-dependent, and I am not that familiar with that program. I will tell you one thing about—

Mr. CASAR. And I will tell you, Mr. Burton—

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. CASAR [continuing]. I am familiar with it. It helped 33,000 of our veterans not lose their homes. And in my view, our veterans are not waste, fraud, or abuse, nor are they a piggybank for billionaires' tax cuts like Elon Musk. And so—

Mr. BURTON. I doubt anyone thinks that.

Mr. CASAR. This is my time, Mr. Burton.

Mr. BURTON. Yes, fine.

Mr. CASAR. I am deeply concerned that President Trump will take reckless action to risk sending more American troops into endless wars in the Middle East. But back at home, he is breaking the sacred promise to our veterans to care for them when and if they come back.

Donald Trump has already tried to fire thousands of people at the VA, and recent reporting shows that there are plans to try to fire 80,000 people at the VA. These reckless DOGE cuts have thrown VA hospitals into chaos, and in my own district, I have gotten reports of veterans waiting months for basic services like a wheelchair.

I represent San Antonio, Texas, military city USA, where we honor the service of our men and women in uniform. And if we

want to honor our veterans, we honor it with more than just words. We take actions to care for them when they come home. We do not needlessly send people into harm's way, and we do not cut their services for when they come home. This Committee should not be holding hearings on locking in DOGE cuts. We should be holding hearings about restoring services for our veterans.

And while DOGE is screwing over our veterans, the Administration is also stealing from seniors. We just learned about a huge new scandal that every senior in America needs to hear about. After Trump and Musk made massive cuts to the staff at the Social Security Administration, they have scrubbed government websites of information about how long it takes to get your phone call answered. They have erased from the websites the delays that it takes to process benefit claims. They have wiped away what used to be publicly available about how long it takes to respond to a 1-800 call at the Social Security Administration. This is a coverup. And why are they covering it up? Because wait times have exploded. A brave whistleblower just estimated that Trump's changes and Elon Musk's cuts have doubled the amount of time it takes to process a Social Security claim. Everybody needs to hear about it. Social Security is not Elon Musk's piggybank. I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Chair?

Ms. GREENE. No one loves veterans more than President Trump, and he is made that apparent. That is why he is working for peace.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Chair?

Ms. GREENE. Right now—

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Chairman, I mean, it is not your time right now.

Ms. GREENE. I am the Chair of this Committee.

Ms. STANSBURY. That is not how—

Ms. GREENE. I am the Chair.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Parliamentary procedure works, Madam Chairwoman.

Ms. GREENE. You are not recognized, Ms. Stanbury. You are not recognized.

Ms. STANSBURY. You are not recognized either. You cannot just speak any time you want. That is not how the—

Ms. GREENE. I am the Chair of this Committee.

Ms. STANSBURY. That is not how it works, Madam.

Ms. GREENE. Ms. Stansbury, you are not recognized.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Chairwoman, that is not how parliamentary—you can smash your gavel—

Ms. GREENE. Ms. Stansbury, you are not recognized.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. All day, but that is not how parliamentary inquiry works.

Ms. GREENE. Ms. Stansbury, you are not recognized.

Ms. STANSBURY. We are going to get you a Robert's Rules of Order and put it in—

Ms. GREENE. Ms. Stansbury, you are not recognized.

Ms. STANSBURY. [continuing]. The Committee so that you can—

Mr. LYNCH. Point of order.

Ms. GREENE. Ms. Stansbury, you are not recognized.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. So that you can understand—

Mr. LYNCH. Point of order.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Parliamentary procedure.

Ms. GREENE. Point of order.

Ms. STANSBURY. Okay.

Mr. LYNCH. Point of order.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Madam Chair, calm down. Let us move on.

Ms. GREENE. Ms. Stansbury, you are not recognized.

Point of order.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam—

Ms. CROCKETT. Madam Chair, I have got a—oh, I am sorry, you had a point of order.

Mr. LYNCH. So—

Ms. CROCKETT. Go ahead.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, can we decide who is going to speak first, and when we are going.

Ms. GREENE. Absolutely. I am the Chair of this committee, and Mr. Gill—

Mr. LYNCH. I know that, but—

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Gill from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. There you go.

Ms. CROCKETT. But, Madam Chair, I had unanimous consent I was trying to—

Ms. GREENE. Without objection.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much. This is from Citizens for Responsible Reporting [sic]. “DOGE’S big illusion, the heavy cost of Trump administration’s so-called cuts.”

I have another one. “Trump Administration scrambles to rehire key Federal workers after DOGE firing.” That is four hours ago.

I have another one. “How will we know if DOGE is succeeding?”

I have another one. “How the Trump Administration’s DOGE cuts are harming women.”

I have another one. “How Trump’s DOGE cuts package could put GOP in a bind.”

I have more, but I will do them later. Thank you.

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

I now recognize Mr. Gill from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Madam Chair. It never gets boring in here. I would like to say thank you to the witnesses for being here and for taking the time.

Ms. DiVITO, thank you for coming here. In your testimony, you said that Americans deserve a government that works for them, a government that makes their lives easier and more secure. Is that correct?

Ms. DiVITO. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILL. Great. I would like to read through a couple of the grants that DOGE has pulled back, and I would like to get your take on them. They pulled back a \$1.5 million NIH grant to Morehouse College. It was called “the center to advance reproductive justice and behavioral health among Black pregnant/postpartum women and birthing people.” Do you think that that makes Americans’ lives easier and more secure?

Ms. DiVITO. I think that medical and scientific research of all types—

Mr. GILL. Do you think that that constitutes critical research? According to your testimony, NIH grants are critical research.

Ms. DiVITO. I think that government research of all types in the medical—

Mr. GILL. Including birthing people?

Ms. DiVITO. I think bench research of all types plays a fundamental role—

Mr. GILL. What is a birthing person?

Ms. DiVITO. Sir, I am here to talk about the DOGE impacts to working families.

Mr. GILL. I am asking you about this grant, and you are defending it. So, I am asking you, who is birthing people?

Ms. DiVITO. I am not familiar with this grant. I take a position that all kinds of government research—medical, pharmaceutical—

Mr. GILL. Is a birthing person a woman?

Ms. DiVITO [continuing]. Biological—

Mr. GILL. Is that another word for female?

Ms. DiVITO. That is outside the scope of my expertise.

Mr. GILL. Seems like erasure language to me. I have been told that that type of vernacular constitutes erasure language.

How about another one? How about the conference, “Gender equity in the mathematical study of commutative algebra?” Do you think that that is a valid form of government spending?

Ms. DiVITO. I think mathematical research of all types is deserving of government—

Mr. GILL. What about studying—and this is directly from the National Science Foundation’s website—women and non-binary mathematicians?

Ms. DiVITO. Again, I think all kinds of government investment should be dedicated toward mathematical, scientific—

Mr. GILL. All kinds of government investment. You do not have any kind of limit on what we are spending our money on, just everything? Is that your testimony?

Ms. DiVITO. I am talking about DOGE. You brought up a grant.

Mr. GILL. So am I. This is a grant that DOGE cut.

Ms. DiVITO. I am not familiar with this particular grant, but I think government investment in mathematical, biological—

Mr. GILL. Okay. Let us do another one. This one is called “Hashtag: Transcendent Health, adapting an LGB+ inclusive teen pregnancy prevention program for transgender boys.” I cannot even say this without laughing. Do you think that that is a, you know, useful form of our tax spend?

Ms. DiVITO. I am not familiar with that grant, but I think bench research, government investment in scientific and pharmaceutical research—

Mr. GILL. Teen pregnancy for transgender boys, do you think that that is a useful spend of our tax dollars?

Ms. DiVITO. I think government investment in all kinds of scientific research is of the utmost importance.

Mr. GILL. Including pregnancy prevention for transgender boys. Okay. Let me ask you—we can come back to this later, maybe. Do you support abolishing the filibuster still?

Ms. DiVITO. I am here to talk about DOGE, respectfully.

Mr. GILL. Right. We could abolish the filibuster and get a lot of DOGE cuts through. And you have written at length on your Twitter about abolishing the filibuster. I am just curious if you think that we should do that still.

Ms. DiVITO. I did a lot of previous work on different topics because I am an economic policy expert, and respectfully, I am here to talk about DOGE cuts.

Mr. GILL. Okay. But we could abolish the filibuster and get DOGE cuts. This is totally germane here. Do you think we should?

Ms. DiVITO. I am here to talk about DOGE cuts, not strategies for achieving more of them, but the harms that they have produced for working families.

Mr. GILL. That is a convenient change of opinion. I notice that most of your comments about the filibuster were during the Biden Administration.

But we can move on. Let us go back to some more of these grants. Do you think that we should be spending money on “the racialized basis of trait judgments from faces”?

Ms. DiVITO. I am not at all familiar with that grant.

Mr. GILL. It is a \$500,000 NSF grant.

Ms. DiVITO. Okay. I am not familiar with the subject matter or the particular grant.

Mr. GILL. But you are defending these.

Ms. DiVITO. I am saying that I think the government has—

Mr. GILL. You are pretty adamant against DOGE cuts, and I am asking you if you support the cuts—

Ms. DiVITO. I think that there is—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. That DOGE has found.

Ms. DiVITO [continuing]. Economic and medical public health communal benefit to the government investing in—

Mr. GILL. What about cross-sex steroid therapy and cardiovascular risk in the transgender female?

Ms. DiVITO. Again, I think government investment in scientific research is important.

Mr. GILL. Great. Thank you for your testimony. I appreciate it.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman’s time has expired.

I now recognize Ms. Crockett from Texas for 5 minutes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes, Madam Chair. I would actually like to subpoena the former head of DOGE if we could subpoena Elon Musk. Can we take a vote on that?

Ms. GREENE. This hearing will suspend.

Ms. CROCKETT. Is the clerk in place? Do we have a clerk? Can I make a motion that we subpoena Elon Musk right now?

Ms. GREENE. The hearing has suspended.

[Pause.]

Ms. CROCKETT. Point of order, Madam Chair.

Ms. GREENE. We are suspended.

Ms. CROCKETT. Point of inquiry? I am trying to ask a question.

Ms. GREENE. The hearing is suspended. If you can have some patience, we are suspended.

The hearing will now resume.

Ms. Crockett, do you have a motion?

Ms. CROCKETT. I did not have a motion. I had a point of order. I was trying to determine how long it was going to take for us to call the roll. I can call it if need be.

Ms. GREENE. Well, if you are not making a motion—

Ms. CROCKETT. I already made the motion.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. Then you can continue with your 5 minutes of questioning.

Ms. CROCKETT. The motion was to subpoena Elon Musk, who was heading DOGE, who is the one that made the recommendations for these cuts, yet he has yet to come before this Committee. And last time I checked, none of the witnesses sitting here know anything about DOGE, except for what they read on the internet. I want to talk to the person—

Ms. GREENE. You have made your motion.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. Well, you were asking, so I wanted to make sure you understood.

Ms. GREENE. You made your motion.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Burchett.

Mr. BURCHETT. Chairlady, I would like to make a motion to table that motion.

Ms. GREENE. The motion is not debatable. As many as are in favor of tabling the motion, signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

Ms. GREENE. All those opposed, signify by saying no.

[Chorus of noes.]

Ms. GREENE. In the opinion of the Chair, the yeas have it, and the motion—

Ms. CROCKETT. Madam Chair, we would ask for a recorded vote.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. To table is agreed to.

A recorded vote is ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes, call it.

Ms. GREENE. Okay. The clerk will prepare for the vote, and then we will go from there.

The hearing is suspended.

[Pause.]

Ms. GREENE. The hearing will resume.

A recorded vote is ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk. Mr. Cloud.

Mr. CLOUD. No. Yes, yes, yes to table.

The Clerk. Mr. Cloud votes yes.

Mr. CLOUD. Yes to table.

The Clerk. Mr. Fallon.

[No response.]

The Clerk. Mr. Timmons.

Mr. TIMMONS. Yes.

The Clerk. Mr. Timmons votes yes.

Mr. Burchett.

Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.

The Clerk. Mr. Burchett votes aye.

Mr. Burlison.

[No response.]

The Clerk. Mr. Jack.

Mr. JACK. Aye.

The Clerk. Mr. Jack votes aye.  
 Mr. Gill.  
 Mr. GILL. Aye.  
 The Clerk. Mr. Gill votes aye.  
 Ms. Stansbury.  
 Ms. STANSBURY. No to table.  
 The Clerk. Ms. Norton.  
 [No response.]  
 The Clerk. Mr. Lynch.  
 Mr. LYNCH. No.  
 The Clerk. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
 Mr. Garcia.  
 [No response.]  
 The Clerk. Mr. Casar.  
 Mr. CASAR. No.  
 The Clerk. Ms. Crockett.  
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
 The Clerk. Ms. Greene.  
 Ms. GREENE. Yes to table.  
 The clerk will report the tally.

The Clerk. Madam Chair, the ayes are six, the noes are four.  
 Ms. GREENE. The yeas have it, and the motion to table is agreed to. The Committee will now resume.

I now recognize Ms. Crockett for 5 minutes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much. You know what? It is interesting because we sit here in the Department of Government Efficiency Subcommittee, and the most inefficient thing that we have done since we have had the invention of this nonsense was the fact that we have decided that we will not do accountability or oversight over DOGE because we have failed to bring in the person who actually runs DOGE.

In fact, we have decided, or actually you all decided, that we would not even debate why it is that we should or should not subpoena Elon Musk. In fact, you all are just trying to get rid of the musky smell because it was not working out very well for you, and now you want to pretend as if you are coming in here to do exactly what your constituents want you to do. But the last time I checked, you all did not want to go talk to your constituents because if there was one thing they were complaining about, it was Elon and it was DOGE. You did not want to hear those.

And listen, if I had time, I would run the tape, but I only got 5 minutes, because there is plenty of video footage of all of you all getting your butts handed to you when you went home and people told you how they felt about DOGE.

So, let us talk about it for a quick second. Americans are looking for help, but instead of offering it to them, the Republicans have unleashed the most aggressive attack on the working-class families in American history, and they have been excited to do so. In fact, they are here today arguing to make all the chaos, confusion, and destruction caused by DOGE permanent. They want hungry kids to be permanent. They want sicker Americans to be permanent. They want homeless veterans to be permanent, shuttered hospitals to be permanent, disrupted Social Security benefits to be permanent. They sold out their constituents to give permanent tax breaks to

billionaires, and they are doing it, and now they want to have a victory lap, celebrating the pain of their constituents.

So, Ms. DiVito, let us go through some of the things that the Republicans have done to see if they are helpful or harmful to Americans. Helpful or harmful? Stripping healthcare away from 16 million people?

Ms. DiVITO. I would say harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. Laying off hundreds of thousands of Federal workers?

Ms. DiVITO. Harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. Disrupting or delaying Federal services such as Social Security?

Ms. DiVITO. Harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. Medicaid?

Ms. DiVITO. Harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. SNAP benefits?

Ms. DiVITO. Harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. Cutting billions from agencies like NIH?

Ms. DiVITO. Harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. EPA?

Ms. DiVITO. Harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. HUD?

Ms. DiVITO. Harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. FDA?

Ms. DiVITO. Harmful.

Ms. CROCKETT. All right. Seems like you understand the assignment. There is an entire agenda that is attacking the working-class Americans from start to finish.

And then the thing is, they told us that they were going to do this, but, you know, they pretended as if they knew nothing about the playbook that was laid out by good old Heritage Foundation.

All of this talk about lowering costs and reducing waste is absolute BS. Their agenda is about one thing, making the Federal Government so weak that they can exploit it for their personal gain. They are stealing your data to help their companies. They are taking away your healthcare and food assistance to fund tax cuts for billionaires. Their agenda is pro-disinformation, pro-obstruction, pro-greed, and pro-exploitation. If you did not know, that is what DOGE actually spells out. D, disinformation; O, obstruction; G, greed; and E, exploitation.

And congressional Republicans have been complicit in this agenda. They have helped this Administration terrorize the public. They have allowed this Administration to launch the country into a war without congressional approval. And while we are talking about saving money, let me tell you, just dropping those few bombs in one day, that was the beginning of what is going to be a very long bill for us.

As they talk about being efficient, there was nothing efficient about doing it. And maybe if there was some consultation, maybe with those that, say, have constitutional authority, since we care about the Constitution, then maybe we could have saved the American people not only money, but the lives that are now at risk as we have to put out warnings for American citizens in this country and abroad. Maybe we need to start leading with the people at the

middle of what it is that is guiding us instead of following one person.

The reason that people like me say things like, you all are in a cult, is because somehow people are abdicating their duties and abdicating the very people that put them into office. But I got 30 seconds. They have allowed this Administration to steal congressionally approved money, money for cancer research and food delivery to vulnerable communities. They have allowed Elon Musk to infiltrate your medical records and banking data. They have allowed this Administration to ignore court rulings. And now Republicans are here patting themselves on the back, literally arguing to make this chaos permanent.

So, Americans are going to continue to live through chaos and destruction that has been occurring ever since he swore in, in January. And I hope you all remember who caused this because it was not just Trump this time.

Ms. GREENE. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Ms. CROCKETT. It was also the congressional Republicans—

Ms. GREENE. The gentlelady's—

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. Who do not have a spine—

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. Time has—

Ms. CROCKETT [continuing]. To do what is right.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. Expired.

I now recognize Mr. Burchett from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Chairlady. I would remind Members of both sides of the aisle that President Trump's approval rating is soaring. And last I checked, congressional approval is not, and I think that bears witness.

Mr. Dickerson and Mr. Burton, do you think Congress should withdraw additional funds other than the \$9 billion recently approved by the House?

Mr. BURTON. Absolutely. The Federal budget is entirely out of control. There are hundreds of billions of dollars in improper payments. There are tremendous numbers of agencies whose missions are not being fulfilled and are wasting money. There is the opportunity for many, many tens of billions of dollars of additional rescissions.

Mr. DICKERSON. Wholeheartedly agree.

Mr. BURCHETT. Just yesterday, we passed unanimously—it was like pulling teeth, though, and I give a lot of credit to the Chairlady for helping me get the bill across the finish line. We were sending millions of dollars every week to the Taliban, if you can imagine that, and the NGOs. And that money flows right back to Washington, dark money or possibly in members of this body's pockets or their families, I suspect.

Mr. BURTON. Huge amounts of the money flows to very wealthy beltway bandits that live around here.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, sir, and I would agree with that. What other programs and activities should be looked at for additional cuts?

Mr. DICKERSON. I think there is a whole host of things that you can look at to fix the Federal budget. For example, Congress has allowed the Biden Administration to spend billions of dollars to facilitate the illegal immigration, for example, in the Migration and Refugee Assistance account, in the DHS Shelter and Services ac-

count. That has helped facilitate open borders and transport illegal immigrants all throughout the country into your districts across the country.

We spend hundreds of millions of dollars on abortion providers to literally kill American citizens. I think that is a terrible thing. We spend billions of dollars subsidizing green energy research that makes our grid more inefficient. So, there is lots of great examples that we could go on about.

Mr. BURTON. The list is extraordinarily long, but the big money is two places, healthcare and entitlements. The United States spends twice as much as the percentage of GDP than the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) average on healthcare, which is well over \$1 trillion we might as well burn because we do not get better health outcomes than major European countries. And then the entitlements, of which there are three major ones—Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid, but also Obamacare and dozens of programs, some effective, some not—meant to alleviate poverty. But there is tremendous waste, duplication, and opportunities for savings there.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Lips, I see you itching to get on the mic, and I need to ask you a question, followup, but you go ahead.

Mr. LIPS. Thank you, sir. I think a great area to focus on would be implementing watchdog recommendations. The GAO has put together a list of more than 200 recommendations for Congress and 5,000 recommendations for Federal agencies. GAO says that this could save upwards of \$200 billion.

Mr. BURCHETT. What is GAO? We do not use initials in my office. What does that stand for?

Mr. LIPS. Sorry, the Government Accountability Office.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay. All right. Do you think Congress should codify the DOGE or certain aspects of its operations?

Mr. LIPS. I think it is a good question. I do not know if it is necessary. I think that I would recommend codifying and putting strength behind the executive orders trying to improve program integrity measures within Treasury. The Do Not Pay system needs help, it needs more information, and you could save hundreds of billions of dollars.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Burton, Mr. Dickerson, should we have a group of people at each agency who are focused on cost savings?

Mr. DICKERSON. Yes. I think everybody at every agency should be focused on that.

Mr. BURCHETT. You know, as fiscally responsible as the State of Tennessee is, low-tax state, no debt, I have seen that in the individual counties even, they are talking about this, so I think it is one thing—the residual of this will be hopefully some long-term savings in elimination of waste, abuse, and fraud.

DOGE is subjecting Federal spending to a higher level of scrutiny. What level of spending scrutiny do you think is important?

Mr. BURTON. I am not sure I entirely understand the question.

Mr. DICKERSON. Yes, I mean, I would say—

Mr. BURCHETT. How deep should we go? How about that?

Mr. BURTON. We should—I think a reasonable objective would be to get back to a level of Federal spending during President Clinton's term.

Mr. BURCHETT. And I am out of time.

Mr. BURTON. We would balance the budget at that point.

Mr. BURCHETT. I would just like to see us go back to pre-COVID-level spending.

Thank you, Chairlady.

Ms. GREENE. The—

Ms. CROCKETT. Madam Chair, I have a unanimous consent.

Ms. GREENE. Without objection.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much. This is just from a couple of hours ago. “Trump pivots to distractions as polls show collapsing support for his agenda.”

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. CROCKETT. The next one is “Donald Trump’s approval rating plunges in multiple polls.”

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. CROCKETT. The next one, “Donald Trump’s approval rating, new polls show shakeup over Iran bombing.”

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. CROCKETT. The next one, “Trump’s approval rating drops to term low amid Israel-Iran war.”

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

I hope you are not reading the same thing from your phone, which it looked like.

I now recognize—

Ms. CROCKETT. So, for clarification—

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize Mr. Lynch from Massachusetts for 5 minutes.

Ms. CROCKETT. I just want to clarify. I can give you the sources because—

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Lynch is recognized.

Ms. Crockett, you are rudely interrupting Mr. Lynch’s 5 minutes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Well, Ms.—

Ms. GREENE. I have already said without objection, so ordered.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. Then there we go.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Lynch is recognized, Ms. Crockett, for 5 minutes. Thank you.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, first of all, I want to be the first to congratulate my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. Garcia, on becoming our new Ranking Member on the full Committee, Oversight and Government Reform. I am sure he will enjoy not only my own support, but the full support of all of our Members, and we will all work to help him in his new role.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you. Ms. DiVito, in the past, veterans’ benefits in this country have been separate and apart from everything else we do. They are different because veterans’ benefits, for the time that I have been in Congress over the last 25 years, they are regarded as special because they are earned by courageous service to our Nation previously rendered by a very narrow segment of our society.

And we, as a Nation, both Democrat and Republican, through every President so far, made a promise that if a young man or woman puts on that uniform for our country, serves our Nation,

and they come home from war with the scars of that war, either invisible or visible, we make a promise that we will take care of them and their families. And that has happened for every—we have been proud that every administration has honored that promise until now.

On January 20, Trump laid off 6,000 employees at the VA. He even laid off the workers at the suicide helpline in the middle of a suicide crisis among our returning veterans. It is an epidemic. And after that, DOGE and Donald Trump have laid off—2,700 of those people that they laid off were veterans themselves. So, now we are looking at a 250,000 case backlog at the VA, so veterans are waiting longer and longer to get their care. You know, we still have World War II veterans, Korean War veterans, Vietnam veterans who are older, and the delay in care to those veterans is a denial, a denial of those benefits they are owed.

I have a UC, Madam Chair, request, unanimous consent request from *ProPublica* magazine, which the headline is, “Internal VA emails reveal how Trump cuts have jeopardized veterans’ care, including that of lifesaving cancer trials.”

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you. The email itself, these are VA internal emails, and it notes that this is between folks at the VA talking about the cuts. The email says that more than 1,000 veterans will lose access to treatment for diseases ranging from metastatic head and neck cancer to kidney disease to traumatic brain injuries. And it goes on further, and this is a quote from the internal emails, that “the enrollment in those clinical trials is stopping,” meaning that these veterans lose access to those therapies. Ms. DiVito, can you talk about that, the delivery of services to our veterans?

Ms. DiVITO. Thank you for the question. Unfortunately, what we are seeing across the country is that veterans’ healthcare is being held up and interrupted because of the DOGE cuts. I, and I think most of the panel, agreed that that should never be the case when dealing with our servicemen and women. They deserve, at the very least, quality and timely healthcare through the VA. But DOGE has announced the goal of firing over 80,000 VA staffers. They have already lost 200 doctors, 1,700 nurses, and almost 900 advanced medical support assistants, in addition to some of the cuts to grants that funded various programs, including the suicide prevention hotlines. Veterans are facing much longer backlogs and disrupted service. And in many instances, it can be life and death.

Mr. LYNCH. How important is it, you know, so we have got this hotline, and these veterans, in many cases, are isolated. They are isolated from their families, their communities. How important is that suicide hotline?

Ms. DiVITO. Oh, it is of critical importance. Veterans are a population that are at heightened risk for suicide, so making sure that they have all kinds of resources at their disposal is of the utmost importance.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you. Madam Chair, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman’s time has expired.

I now recognize Mr. Jack from Georgia for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACK. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And first, I would like to acknowledge our colleague, Mr. Lynch, for his hard-fought campaign.

And I would like to, at the same time, spend a little bit of my time today working with Mr. Dickerson and Mr. Burton. First, Mr. Dickerson, I want to congratulate you and EPIC for all that you have accomplished. I worked with both Paul and Zoe at the White House in the President's first term and commend you all for your work.

Mr. Burton, if you could, I was reading through your testimony, I would love for you just to walk this Committee through the history of impoundment and rescissions. It started, as I understand, in Thomas Jefferson's Administration. I would love for you to walk us through the history.

Mr. BURTON. The earliest impoundment that I know of was by Thomas Jefferson. The Congress appropriated money to build some gunboats. Peace broke out, and he chose not to build the gunboats. So, he, in effect, impounded the money and sent it back to Congress. That has been going on for a very long time. In older appropriations bills, particularly in the 19th century, it generally read not to exceed X dollars, so Presidents often did not because they did not think you needed to spend that much money. And President Roosevelt impounded money, and so did President Nixon. And at that point, there was serious objection by the Congress, and the Impoundment Control Act was enacted, which establishes an expedited procedure for rescissions but has very broad prohibitions on impoundment. There is certain reprogramming permitted and things of that sort. Obviously, if the, as with improper payments, if you cannot spend the money, that is fine. The President should do that.

So, the rescissions process, however, is somewhat cumbersome, as you probably just discovered. It could be streamlined and made better, but nonetheless, that is the general requirement today.

Mr. JACK. And, you know, one thing that stood out to me in your opening testimony and your testimony throughout this hearing is you mentioned the work that Speaker Gingrich and President Clinton undertook.

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. JACK. So, in your estimation, is our Committee's work an extension of what was successfully done in the 1990s to rein in spending?

Mr. BURTON. Yes and no. I mean, the effort in the 1990s was very broad. The Clinton Administration was serious about improving government administration. They resisted some of what the Gingrich Congress wanted to do, but ultimately, there were serious, very hard negotiations, and they reached an agreement. President Clinton signed legislation that substantially reduced Federal spending.

And there was a tremendous amount of legislating going on throughout the Congress, not just in one committee, but committee by committee by committee by committee. There was a lot of legislating done, a lot of markups, a lot of investigations, a lot of hearings. It was not just one hearing like here. There was systematic throughout the Congress and in government and the executive branch.

Mr. JACK. Thank you. Mr. Dickerson, if we could spend a little bit of time in the remaining time we have left talking about improper payments. The first hearing our Chairwoman convened was on the troublesome improper payments we discovered over the last four years of the Biden Administration. I would love for you to touch on some of the challenges we face with respect to verifying identity, with respect to payments that are going out the door, would love for you to comment on that.

Mr. DICKERSON. Absolutely. Improper payments is a huge issue. In one program alone, Medicaid, for example, spent \$1.1 trillion over the last decade on improper payments. And that is incredibly harmful because it is a waste of taxpayer money, but it is also funds that are not going to people who are truly vulnerable and truly needy. And so, this waste, fraud, and abuse is rampant throughout the Federal Government.

And so, one of the major sources of that is the lack of ability to identify the people who are claiming money, and checks are going out the door to, are actually eligible. For example, the Do Not Pay registry is supposed to be a data base of accounts that the Federal Government is not supposed to write checks to. But in many cases, those checks go out the door and then they ping the registry. And in many cases, that registry does not have access to all the data bases that it is supposed to, so it is a huge problem, and we really should be fixing it.

Mr. JACK. And I recall in our first hearing, we talked about the amount of payments going out the door that are still done by hand, not by computer or electronically. Is that something you all have uncovered in your work?

Mr. DICKERSON. Yes, I think it is something that we should be using new technology, using AI, to actually look at what we have across the government to ensure that only people who are actually eligible for benefits are receiving it, nobody else.

Mr. JACK. Thank you. Madam Chair, in my closing, just a point of clarification. The poll behind you, behind our Ranking Member, it adds up to 110 percent. Just wanted to clarify, is it meant to add up to 110 percent or is that an error?

Ms. STANSBURY. Do you yield?

Mr. JACK. Yes, I do.

Ms. STANSBURY. This is from a Quinnipiac poll that was held two weeks ago, and this is the data that was provided. There is a wealth of information, including information about Donald Trump's falling poll numbers, so you should take a look. Thanks.

Mr. JACK. I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields. And it still adds up to 110 percent. That is a fake poll right there.

I now recognize Mr. Subramanyam from Virginia for 5 minutes.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Before I get started on DOGE, Mr. Burton, you are one of the coauthors of Project 2025. Is that correct?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. And is this Administration trying to implement Project 2025, yes or no?

Mr. BURTON. In some respects, yes.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Okay. Because last year, we kept hearing about how they wanted nothing to do with Project 2025. That must have hurt your feelings, I bet. But are you saying that they are trying to implement all parts of Project 2025?

Mr. BURTON. I just said in some respects, yes.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Okay. Thanks. I just wanted to get that out of the way. I am glad there is someone being honest these days.

But let us talk about DOGE. So, DOGE promised us \$2 trillion in cuts back in January. And so far, we have a report card now out, and it has actually cost us billions of dollars, maybe over \$100 billion by one estimate. It is actually costing taxpayers money. And it seems like, you know, they are cutting a lot of things, how is this possible? Well, the reason it is possible is because they are cutting the very people who are actually there to help get rid of waste, fraud, and abuse. And they are cutting people who do essential research and run really important programs that save taxpayer money long term.

And so, the dashboard that we are talking about, the so-called transparency, was riddled with errors. There has been article after article about this. And so, we know now that that dashboard cannot be trusted.

What can be trusted is that we are not anywhere close to \$2 trillion. In fact, there is another bill that this House just passed that adds \$3 trillion to the debt. And so, even if we did all these cuts, even if you cut every single Federal employee in the entire government, you still end up with a situation where you are adding to the debt in this Administration because of the \$3 trillion in the bill that was passed a couple weeks ago that is being added to our debt.

And, you know, the examples that I have heard are things like cutting meteorologists at the Weather Service, cutting essential researchers at NIH. People who are doing groundbreaking research that will spur entire industries are being cut. Sometimes the government does research and funds research because the money just is not there in the private sector. The private sector mandate is not there. And so that actually, you talk about the internet, for instance. That was a DoD project at one point. And DoD funded ARPANET, which became the internet. And so, we are basically—we will never know all of the things that we missed out on because of some of these cuts.

And I have heard a lot about, you know, we heard earlier about these cuts to veterans' benefits. There is PFAS inspectors, nuclear scientists fired although they tried to rehire them. There has been a lot of firings where they tried to roll them back.

But, you know, I think I, you know, Ms. DiVito, I just want to know if you were to do this—is DOGE doing what they are trying to do here? And why is DOGE so unsuccessful right now? Why has it been such a failure?

Ms. DiVITO. Thank you. I believe that DOGE has been a lose-lose. It has failed to find the sizable savings, as you mentioned, and has only made life harder and more expensive for working families.

You mentioned a lot of the mistakes. Those do not just cost—there is not just an opportunity cost to loss potential and loss impact from those mistakes, but there is also a cost to correct for

them, so rehiring and retraining all of the Federal workers that are—

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. So, is DOGE on track to save us money? Is it going to save taxpayers money long term?

Ms. DiVITO. No.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. And why is that?

Ms. DiVITO. I think DOGE has been making incredibly hasty cuts, and these have consequences. There are already a lot of protections baked into our Federal workforce—

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Yes.

Ms. DiVITO [continuing]. Our system of regulations. We can always add more that protect people in even better and stronger ways, but we cannot take them back without costs.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. So, I would ask Mr. Burton or Mr. Dickerson, you know, I had one idea for cuts, which is the President actually, his last term, spent \$150 million plus on golf trips. Do you think that is waste, fraud, and abuse? Yes or no?

Mr. BURTON. I certainly would think there are more high-priority spending things, yes.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. But do you think that is wasteful spending? Do you think that is less or more wasteful than cutting veterans benefits, his golf trips?

Mr. BURTON. I would rather spend money on veterans.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. What about \$50 million for the Department of Homeland Security's private plane? That is what they requested in the appropriations bill. Do you think they should get a new plane for DHS, a private plane?

Mr. BURTON. That is a factual question on whether or not this—

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. No, so I am going to reclaim my time.

In the end, what is happening is there is more waste, fraud, and abuse since DOGE has come into effect. It has led to poor services, a brain drain on our Federal Government, and it is going to cost taxpayers money long term.

I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman's time has expired.

In closing, I want to thank our witnesses once again for their testimony today.

I now yield to Ranking Member Stansbury for closing remarks.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, that is another DOGE Subcommittee in the books, and another morning and a number of hours of our lives that we will never reclaim spent here doing more political theater with our friends across the aisle.

As the President is starting wars in the Middle East, and by the way, news just broke, canceled the classified briefing that had been scheduled for Congress without a rescheduling. He is deploying United States troops against our people here in the homeland, and this Congress, controlled by these folks right over here, is trying to gut your healthcare, food programs, and steal your public lands while saddling the American people with trillions of dollars in debt to pay for tax breaks for billionaires.

This is one of the most unpopular domestic and global policy agendas in modern history, and they are here trying to convince you all that we should make DOGE permanent. But here is the

thing. The GOP may continue to try to make DOGE a thing, but no matter how hard they keep trying, GOP will never make DOGE happen. Even with their Regina George out of the picture—that is Mr. Elon Musk in this scenario—Americans just are not buying tickets to this show, and just like the movie business, House Republicans' DOGE reboot is not hitting like they thought it would. And in fact, a majority of Americans actually oppose DOGE cuts, a number that will only grow as the devastating and real-life impacts continue to sink into everyday life for all of us. And I think we have all seen this film before, and we do not like it.

The fact is DOGE is costing taxpayers more than it is saving, and Donald Trump has spent more of your hard-earned taxpayer dollars in his first six months in office than any other President in modern history. That is right, he spent more money than the last President just in the last six months, going golfing and doing other random things while the Republicans are actually trying to increase Federal spending in reconciliation with trillions of dollars in tax breaks and kickbacks to their donors.

But despite this box office bomb—that is DOGE—here in this Subcommittee we are stuck on repeat, watching the rerun over and over again as the GOP continues to roll out the same tired talking points that got Elon Musk fired in the first place. And not only that, we are seeing the same kinds of witnesses, backed by the Heritage Foundation and their allied organizations, coming to testify again and again, attempting to back up a flailing Administration and its flailing policies.

So, where are we? In case you forgot, the Heritage Foundation is the same organization that brought you Project 2025, which is what this is actually all about, a show that was so unpopular that even the President and members of this Committee tried to distance themselves from during the campaign season and even lied to the American people about.

But the American people are smart, and they are watching, and they know what a scam is when they see it. You cannot run away from Project 2025 because it is right here, and we will not let you destroy our government, our democracy, our institutions, and our freedoms. And we will hold you accountable.

Medical trials ended, veterans' benefits cut, Social Security decimated, thousands of children without food and medicine, thousands dead across the world, American lives upended, that is DOGE's legacy. But it is clear, however, no matter the impact, the Trump Administration and the GOP does not seem to care. Because DOGE is not actually about waste, fraud, and abuse. It is not even about cost-cutting or making the government more efficient. It is a means for pushing their political agenda on the American people.

And if you could not tell already by their obsession with the culture wars, from attacking education to slashing global food aid to stripping healthcare, this is about remaking American society. They want to remake our country in a hyper-conservative image, just as they laid out in Project 2025. The American people know what is going on, and this is not the sequel we asked for.

So, I want to just take a note from America's real anti-hero and to say to Mr. Elon Musk, as far as we are concerned, you are just another picture to burn. And to DOGE, now we got problems, and

I do not think we can solve them. You made really deep cuts, and baby, now we are bad blood. I think we are out.

I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize myself for closing remarks.

The American people gave President Trump a mandate to drain the swamp, and they expect us to deliver on that promise. Our massively growing debt and interest threaten every single American, their children, and every generation to come. The United States is now \$37 trillion in debt. In Fiscal Year 2024, the government spent over \$1.8 trillion more than it took in. And in Fiscal Year 2025, the interest on our debt is expected to exceed \$1 trillion, more than our military budget.

We need to be brutally honest about how this massive debt came to be in the first place. It originated from Congress and elected Presidential administrations for decades. We are grateful that President Trump's DOGE team has already identified at least \$180 billion in Federal savings. However, without legislative action, these hard-won cuts could be reversed by the stroke of a pen with a future administration. After all, we listen to Democrats every single day make fun of, attack, and criticize the efforts of DOGE. They do not take it seriously. They want government to be bigger and bigger and bigger until we completely collapse.

Congress must use every tool at our disposal to make the hard work of the Trump Administration permanent. Two weeks ago, House Republicans took the first step in codifying the DOGE cuts by passing the White House's \$9.4 billion rescissions package. This is only the first step. The Senate must immediately pass these cuts and send them to President Trump's desk. We must continue to codify every penny of DOGE cuts through rescissions and the appropriations process. This is our mandate. This is our duty.

The legislative branch cannot sit on the sidelines. In this Subcommittee, we will fight the war on waste shoulder to shoulder with President Trump. We have held hearings exposing billions in improper payments, corrupt NGOs pushing destructive policies, and taxpayer-funded media like NPR and PBS that serve elite interests over the public good. We have uncovered shocking examples like United States Agency for International Development (USAID) funneling money to undermine United States interests abroad, lavish spending on empty Federal buildings, and so-called nonprofits bankrolling illegal immigration.

Today, we heard more egregious examples of Americans' hard-earned tax dollars being abused to promote genital mutilation of children, fund the Green New Deal scam, fund terrorists overseas, and fund hundreds of billions of improper payments. The American people overwhelmingly support the cuts, and I do not know what faulty polls my Democrat colleagues are using to back their claims saying otherwise, but I have never heard of any legitimate poll that adds up to 110 percent like the one on their poster that was displayed here today. What a joke. What a pathetic example. My god. Maybe they should support spending a little more on teaching actual mathematics in the classrooms and a little less on seeking to advance racial justice in mathematics, like the National Science Foundation grant. Regardless, we know the American people are

behind the DOGE efforts, and we know the American people do not believe stupid, fake polls that have math that make no sense.

Exposing this waste and abuse is only half the battle. To win this war, we need to make sure these cuts are not just temporary. That means passing laws to streamline agencies, eliminate redundant programs, and give the President the authority to fire bureaucrats who do not do their jobs, the same bureaucrats that go ahead and give out these grants that mutilate children, gives money to USAID to do regime change in foreign countries, and so many more stupid, horrible things that the American people do not want to spend their money on.

Slashing waste, fraud, and abuse from the Federal Government provides real savings for the American people. We, as lawmakers, should pass new DOGE cuts every single day and make cutting waste, fraud, and abuse our top priority. Instead of growing the government, we should be slashing the government. The government is far too big. It is like an overgrown, out-of-control animal, and the American people are beginning to hate it.

With that, and without objection, all Members have five legislative days within which to submit materials and additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses.

If there is no further business, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

