

this. I would certainly urge the incoming administration to rethink the whole process because Mr. VARGAS is right: It is an important thing to do, to try to capture illicit finance, but it is another thing in the world to sweep up every American trying to live the American Dream with their own small business.

We want people who want \$5 million in revenue and have 20 employees. What a joy.

We are united on this today, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is good for the American people to see, too, that we care about what is happening. Occasionally, we get it wrong in government, and we work hard to try to rectify it. That is what ZACH NUNN of Iowa is fighting for small businesses to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HARIDOPOLOS), the committee whip.

Mr. HARIDOPOLOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this to the floor and my colleagues across the aisle for working together on this important bill. It is great that common sense is making a comeback in America.

I applaud the sponsor of the bill, Mr. NUNN of Iowa. He has done a remarkable job of bringing this to the forefront as people recognize the impact that burdensome paperwork can have on our American economy.

In recent years, the previous administration imposed complex and costly beneficial ownership requirements, backed by the threat of civil and criminal penalties. Compliance could cost up to \$8,000 per year, and little was done by the Treasury Department to communicate those requirements to businessowners.

As a result, with little clarity and even less time to comply, over 30 million small businesses are now facing the risk of thousands of dollars in fines and potentially years behind bars if egregious.

Why are we making criminal suspects out of businessowners? American businesses already file a considerable amount of paperwork to ensure that money launderers and bad actors are unable to operate through shell corporations, as the chairman highlighted.

Why are millions of American small businesses now forced to file these regulations when they have already been burdened by so much extra paperwork?

This extension will also give our new Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Bessent, the time to apply common sense in helping small businesses meet these reporting requirements.

This bill is a strong start to reduce the immense regulatory burden that America's small businesses face each day, and it protects businessowners from unjust criminal liability.

Let's pass this bill and get back to common sense.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the Corporate Transparency Act has been called the most

important improvement to the U.S. anti-money laundering framework in a generation. To both effectively enact the law and to assist companies whose reporting is essential to fight against oligarchs and criminal cartels, we need the extension provided by this bill.

As my good friend from Arkansas said, we, too, see and hear small businesses and businessowners. In fact, California has the largest number of small businesses in the United States. We don't want them to get swept up in the Corporate Transparency Act, but at the same time, we also need the ability to identify, investigate, and prosecute the bad actors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to stand up and speak out against what we are seeing today, unfortunately, which is President Trump's vengeful and self-interested destruction of our American national security, and to demand that we get information on how Elon Musk and his young marauders are using Americans' personal information.

We want to know: What are they doing with all of this information that they are gathering about all of these Americans? What is he doing with it? We have no idea, and no one is asking questions on the other side.

Again, it is important that my colleagues listen to their constituents right now, on both sides of the aisle. I know in my district, Republicans and Democrats want to know: What is going on with all of this information that Elon Musk is drawing out of the Federal Government? What is he doing with it? We have no idea. There is no investigation of this. We demand answers, and we think our friends on the other side should demand answers to this also.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a good, robust debate on the importance of the right tools for the Treasury, for our States, and for our law enforcement to root out illicit finance.

Today, the Corporate Transparency Act, I think, has been exposed for what it is, which is a tremendous overreach in that effort that has added complexity, financial burden, and confusion for our small businesses.

There is a better way to go about this, and I hope we can work together on both sides of the aisle and with the Treasury Department in the coming months to find that better solution, that least-costly solution, that solution that protects people's privacy, that protects personally identifiable information contained in these filings, and that does it in a way that is less intrusive and less costly.

The concern I have about these big databases, Mr. Speaker, is intrusion

from China, Iran, Russia, and North Korea, our adversaries that every day are trying to break into the systems of the Federal Government and our private sector of this country to gather this personally identifiable information.

We have talked about it on this House floor, Mr. Speaker: IRS, hacked; Office of Personnel Management, hacked; the CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau databases, hacked; others, hacked; private sector, hacked. This is just another giant database that puts people's data at risk.

Not only do I think there is a better way to do it, a less costly way to do it, and a more effective way to do it, but also a way to do it that protects people's privacy.

I thank Mr. NUNN for working on both sides of the aisle to craft a way. Let's take a new look, and let's do that by approving this bill overwhelmingly, encouraging the Senate to do the same so that we protect these small businesses in the interim, over the next year, from this horrendous cost and confusion by rising in strong support today on both sides of the aisle and passing H.R. 736.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 736.

The question was taken.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CREDIT UNION BOARD MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 975) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 975

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Credit Union Board Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. FREQUENCY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS.

Section 113 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1761b) is amended—

(1) by striking "monthly" each place such term appears;

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "The board of directors" and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The board of directors";

(3) in subsection (a) (as so designated), by striking "shall meet at least once a month and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) MEETINGS.—The board of directors of a Federal credit union shall meet as follows:

"(1) With respect to a de novo Federal credit union, not less frequently than monthly during each of the first five years of the existence of such Federal credit union.

"(2) Not less than six times annually, with at least one meeting held during each fiscal quarter, with respect to a Federal credit union—

"(A) with composite rating of either 1 or 2 under the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System (or an equivalent rating under a comparable rating system); and

"(B) with a capability of management rating under such composite rating of either 1 or 2.

"(3) Not less frequently than once a month, with respect to a Federal credit union—

"(A) with composite rating of either 3, 4, or 5 under the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System (or an equivalent rating under a comparable rating system); or

"(B) with a capability of management rating under such composite rating of either 3, 4, or 5."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1715

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 975, the Credit Union Board Modernization Act.

I applaud my Committee on Financial Services colleagues, Representatives VARGAS and HUIZENGA, for introducing it. This bipartisan bill will help focus credit unions' time and resources where it really matters, which is serving their members.

Federal credit unions are governed by boards of directors who are currently required by law, Mr. Speaker, to meet at least once a month. This outdated requirement prevents credit unions from attracting talented volunteers and professionals to a credit union's board due to the time commitment of a monthly board meeting.

Under H.R. 975, certain well-functioning credit unions are provided with the option to meet at least six times annually with at least one meeting held during each fiscal quarter of the year.

This crucial change frees up the time and resources used for meetings to put toward the critical mission of providing financial services to their credit union members. Importantly, this bill has guardrails to ensure the safety and soundness of our financial system. Only credit unions with a CAMELS composite rating of a one or two will be permitted to meet at this less frequent rate.

All credit unions, just like commercial banks, are subject to a supervisory rating scale. It is called the CAMELS rating. A credit union is assessed at each of the six categories under that acronym, and they are assigned a composite rating on a scale of one, the best, to five, the worst, based on: capital adequacy, asset quality, management, earnings, liquidity, and sensitivity to market risk, hence the acronym CAMELS.

Therefore, this bill provides an incentive to achieve the strongest supervisory rating so that a credit union might access the flexibility offered by this bill.

Furthermore, by reducing the mandated number of board meetings for federally chartered credit unions, this legislation would promote parity between Federal and State-chartered credit unions as 17 States currently allow for meetings less frequently than monthly.

As I say, fewer mandated board meetings are especially helpful for rural credit unions who struggle to attract talent to their boards and also operate with significant regulatory burden and sometimes long travel. Of course, nothing in this legislation prevents credit union boards from meeting more frequently if they determine that is necessary.

Credit unions play an essential role in our communities across this country, and H.R. 975 will ensure that they are able to operate more efficiently. I thank the gentleman from California's 52nd District, Mr. VARGAS, for introducing this important bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HILL and Ranking Member WATERS for their support throughout this process.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 975, the Credit Union Board Modernization Act. Credit unions are a vital part of our country's economic stability and success. These not-for-profit, member-owned institutions serve over 140 million Americans. Yet for over 40 years, volunteer-led Federal credit union boards have been burdened by an unnecessary requirement on meeting frequency.

This bill gives financially sound and well-managed Federal credit unions the flexibility they deserve. It will adjust the board meeting requirement by allowing qualifying Federal credit unions to move from the current

monthly meeting to meeting a minimum of six times annually with at least one meeting each fiscal quarter.

This is a commonsense fix that allows Federal credit unions with a proven record of stability to dedicate more time and resources to the local communities they serve, like in San Diego, my hometown, and across the country.

This fix also makes it easier for more Americans who currently are not able to serve on these boards, due to the time commitment, to have an opportunity to bring their perspectives to the table. This bill contains key safeguards to ensure stability and mitigate risk.

Newly formed credit unions and those with poor ratings, as Mr. HILL stated, will still be held to the current monthly meeting requirements. Under this bill, only Federal credit unions with strong ratings from our Federal regulators and proven management capacities and capabilities will be eligible for the new meeting requirements. This reasonable bipartisan bill passed the House twice in both the 117th and 118th Congresses.

Again, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for working with me on advancing this legislation and his deep knowledge of the issues. It was actually a pleasure working with him again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HILL for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 975, the Credit Union Board Modernization Act. I also want to stand up and echo and reiterate the points that I already addressed because this legislation is so important.

This bill would amend the Federal Credit Union Act to revise the frequency of the board meetings a federally chartered credit union must hold. Under current law, credit union boards must meet once per month, but this bill, H.R. 975, would allow credit unions to lower that threshold of required meetings to six per year.

This bipartisan bill is needed to increase flexibility and unlock more resources for credit unions to better serve their members and our communities.

Additionally, H.R. 975 creates an incentive for credit unions to improve their management ratings by decreasing the number of board meetings for those that have the best management ratings. On the other hand, credit unions that are poorly managed or are new Federal credit unions will still be required to meet on a monthly basis.

I commend my colleagues, Representatives HUIZENGA and VARGAS, for reintroducing this commonsense piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 975 and eliminate burdensome regulations to let credit

unions do what they do best, which is to service their communities.

As you heard, this has been passed in the 117th and 118th Congresses. I think it is time to bring this home, and let's get this done this Congress.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, credit unions are vital to our economy and to our communities. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and the consumers and small businesses that they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 975. I appreciate Mr. VARGAS sponsoring this good bill and Mrs. KIM speaking on it. They represent the State of California, and the State of California has some of the largest Federal credit unions active and headquartered in their State.

This will be a great service to those credit unions particularly and their home State of California to be able to focus on their members and have a few less meetings. I thank the gentleman from California for his sponsorship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 975.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING UNHOUSED DISABLED VETERANS ACT

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 965) to amend section 3(b)(4) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to exclude certain disability benefits from income for the purposes of determining eligibility for the supported housing program under section 8(o)(19), and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 965

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Housing Unhoused Disabled Veterans Act".

SEC. 2. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN DISABILITY BENEFITS.

Section 3(b)(4)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (vi) and (vii), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

"(iv) with respect to the supported housing program under section 8(o)(19), any disability benefits received under chapter 11 or chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, received by a veteran, except that this exclusion may

not apply to the definition of adjusted income;

"(v) with respect to any household receiving rental assistance under the supported housing program under section 8(o)(19) as it relates to eligibility for other types of housing assistance, any disability benefits received under chapter 11 or chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, received by a veteran, except that this exclusion may not apply to the definition of adjusted income;"

SEC. 3. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISABILITY BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—When determining the eligibility of a veteran to rent a residential dwelling unit constructed on Department property on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, for which assistance is provided as part of a housing assistance program administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and not yet in existence at the time of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall exclude from income any disability benefits received under chapter 11 or chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code by such person.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(2) DEPARTMENT PROPERTY.—The term "Department property" has the meaning given the term in section 901 of title 38, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 965, the Housing Unhoused Disabled Veterans Act introduced by my colleague on the Financial Services Committee, Congressman BRAD SHERMAN of California.

Much like the bill that we just considered a few minutes ago from our friend from Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ), I want to start out by commending our colleague from California for his work on this related issue that once again speaks to the fairness in HUD programs on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

The Housing and Urban Development-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing, or HUD-VASH, program was created back in 1992. The purpose was to assist homeless veterans with psychiatric and substance abuse disorders.

The VASH program is an important Federal tool that provides housing assistance and supportive services for low-income veterans experiencing homelessness. Of course, it might seem

redundant to some that a program to help homeless veterans would be geared towards those who are low-income, but sometimes with HUD nothing is ever simple.

Much like how HUD treats service-connected disability compensation of veterans as income in its CDBG program, HUD treats any disability benefits a veteran receives under chapter 11 or chapter 15 of title 38 of the U.S. Code as income under HUD-VASH.

A predictable result is some disabled homeless veterans are blocked from using a program to help all homeless veterans because HUD has decided that those low-income veterans that are disabled are too wealthy to qualify. Sound familiar? This is exactly the debate we had a few minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker, someone always has to explain these government bureaucratic messes to me because they never make any common sense.

The reform we are talking about today offered by Mr. SHERMAN fixes this problem. It reforms the HUD income calculation used in the HUD-VASH program to ensure that the disability payments of a low-income veteran do not exclude them from accessing this housing support.

The bill goes on to say that HUD needs to adopt the same income calculation standard for any future veteran housing program it might create using HUD-owned property. I applaud my colleague for calling attention to this problem and for his bipartisan work to find a solution.

While this may seem like an easy fix, this is Washington. There are no easy fixes, and HUD has consistently placed bureaucratic obstacles in the way of program efficiency time and time again.

In fact, when Representative SHERMAN brought this up last year to the Secretary of HUD, he got the same answer that Representative DE LA CRUZ got on her veterans CDBG income question: Hey, that is Congress' job to fix it, not HUD's.

Fix it, indeed we will. The approach the gentleman has taken in crafting this bill is a good one. It is one that will make a big difference in the HUD-VASH program, as well as: How about making a difference for the veterans who are eligible to use it? That is why we are on this House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SHERMAN for his hard work to honor the promises that we have made to our veterans. I urge bipartisan support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 965, the Housing Unhoused Disabled Veterans Act sponsored by Representative SHERMAN. I thank Mr. SHERMAN for his work on this bipartisan bill which ensure homeless veterans, including those who may have higher incomes due to their disability benefits, can access supportive housing through the HUD-VASH program.