PUBLIC FUNDS, PRIVATE AGENDAS: NGOs GONE WILD

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 4, 2025

Serial No. 119–30

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

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE
60–681 PDF WASHINGTON : 2025

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

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

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

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director
MITCH BENZINE, General Counsel
PETER WARREN, Senior Advisor
BILLY GRANT, Professional Staff Member
LISA PIRANEO, Senior Professional Staff Member
MARGARET HARKER, Senior Advisor
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
PAT FALLON, Texas
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri
BRIAN JACK, Georgia
BRANDON GILL, Texas

MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico, *Ranking Minority Member*
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
STEPHEN LYNCH, Massachusetts
ROBERT GARCIA, California
GREG CASAR, Texas
JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas

C O N T E N T S

WITNESSES

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

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

Documents are available at: docs.house.gov.

PUBLIC FUNDS, PRIVATE AGENDAS: NGOs GONE WILD

Wednesday, June 4, 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 2:09 p.m., Room HVC–210, U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. Marjorie Taylor Greene, [Chairwoman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

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

Also present: Representatives Gosar, Pressley, and Moskowitz.

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.

Good morning, and welcome to another DOGE Subcommittee hearing where we will highlight more abuses of your tax dollars. The left has funneled hundreds of billions of Federal tax dollars through nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, to push destructive policies and line the pockets of their friends and allies. This NGO scheme demonstrates massive waste and abuse of Federal resources.

Today's hearing will bring transparency for the American people. We will expose the corrupt ties that bind left-wing NGOs, Democrat elected officials, Democrat political appointees, and the deep state bureaucrats who write grants and contracts.

Corrupt backdoor deal-making has exploited the taxpayer purse to achieve policy ends opposed by the very Americans forced to fund them. Whether by pushing green energy scams or facilitating the resettlement of millions of illegal aliens into American towns and cities, the alliance between big government and allied NGOs has been highly effective and has been flying under the public's radar for far too long. But today, we are going to draw back the curtain.

The scheme works in a cycle, as shown here. Democrat administration officials work with leftist NGOs to implement programs in a manner that ensures those NGOs receive massive grants and

contracts. The leaders of those recipient groups then turn around and donate to Democrat political campaigns. This intricate web of connections is how elected and appointed Democrat officials and allied NGOs work together. Federal agencies fund the NGOs, and the NGOs shape the agency's behavior. It can be hard to tell where the government ends and the NGO begins. The nonprofits essentially serve as an arm of the government. To put it another way, if the permanent bureaucracy is the de facto fourth branch of the government, then these leftist NGOs are the fifth.

Our witnesses today will describe how the left has funneled hundreds of billions of U.S. tax dollars through NGOs, discuss the destructive policies this has enabled, and detail the damage done to our country. So-called green energy NGOs are among the worst offenders. They have used Federal dollars to destabilize the U.S. power grid and energy dominance while raising energy costs on Americans. The Biden EPA steered billions in U.S. tax dollars to leftist climate NGOs via a $20 billion slush fund known as the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, GGRF. Like-minded nonprofits were enlisted to implement President Biden's Green New Deal scam.

While we are grateful to the Trump Administration and EPA Administrator Lee Zeldin for shutting it down and quickly terminating these grants, further accountability is necessary. The full Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is investigating Biden's GGRF. We know that all the awardees are connected to both the Biden Administration and Democratic donors and that they sit on each other's boards in an incestuous circle. Today, we will shine light on this dynamic.

Take, for example, who the Democrats choose to bring in as their witnesses, someone so entrenched into the system that she was a Director at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, a leader of a housing organization that lobbied for more Federal spending and now a nationally renowned nonprofit leader who donates to Democrat campaigns.

Other examples include many green NGOs that employ former Biden Administration officials. These people wrote the rules for this climate grift in which they now partake. As government officials, they were paid by taxpayers to conduct the grift. Now, taxpayers are funding the grant awards that pay their salaries. This cash grab was so large that some nonprofits were birthed solely to get in on the game. One newly created nonprofit, Power Forward, received an astonishing $2 billion from Biden's EPA, despite having just been formed.

Power Forward is now part of a network tied to Rewiring America which employs Stacey Abrams, the twice-failed Democrat candidate for Governor in Georgia and voting rights activist. After all, however, she would have been a good hire given her history of running her own nonprofit, which spent $3.2 million on campaign resources instructing voters to support her campaign, all of which are prohibited actions for nonprofits. Consequently, her nonprofit was levied the largest penalty ever imposed in Georgia's history for violating state campaign finance laws. This is the circle of life.

Climate and energy is just one area where the entrenched bureaucrats and political appointees have partnered with NGOs to do

the left's bidding. Illegal immigration is another. federally funded NGOs have egregiously abused tax dollars to fund the invasion at our southern border by providing housing, transportation, legal services, and more to shepherd illegal aliens across our border and settle them in our country. These NGOs support the cartels in their mission to invade our country. Under the guise of assisting migrants, these groups have placed criminal networks, dangerous gangs, and human traffickers into American towns and cities.

Think about this. The American people's hard-earned taxpayer dollars have been used to literally import rapists, murderers, and terrorists from around the world straight into our communities. Where were these NGOs when 22-year-old Laken Riley was violently murdered by an illegal? Where were these NGOs when 12-year-old Jocelyn Nungaray was brutally raped and murdered by one of these illegals? And where were these NGOs when 20-year-old Kayla Hamilton was raped and strangled to death by an illegal? Where were these NGOs over the weekend when an illegal alien launched Molotov cocktails into a crowd in Boulder, Colorado, intentionally injuring a dozen Americans in an antisemitic attack? I will tell you. They were continuing to receive taxpayer dollars to import more of these illegal alien monsters to commit more heinous crimes against our people.

Many Americans are familiar with the more egregious offenders. These include Catholic Charities, which raked in over $2 billion during Biden's 4 years, and the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, which received over $221 million in government grants in Fiscal Year 2023 alone. But many American taxpayers are still unwittingly funding this sort of illegal activity through the United Nations, which is the conduit for much of the funding NGOs use to resettle in our country.

Americans are likely unaware that their tax dollars are funding U.N. efforts such as the Cash and Voucher program involving 624,000 illegal aliens crossing the border just last year. This $372 million program provides prepaid debit cards and cash in envelopes to illegal aliens to facilitate their movement to and through the U.S. border. The American taxpayer is funding groups that start the migration, the groups that show people how to cross the border by evading U.S. immigration laws. These groups that have been bussed and flown, illegal aliens, many of them dangerous, into America.

Whether exploiting taxpayers to push illegal immigration or fake environmental justice, the left's NGO scheme seeks to destroy our country and fundamentally alter the American way of life. This ongoing waste and abuse of taxpayer resources must end. The Trump Administration is turning the tide, and today's hearing is intended to expedite the effort to drain these slush funds dry. If we do not, Democrats can't wait to return to power and continue funding their NGO friends through slush funds and stop deportations, keep these illegal alien criminals in our country, and, of course, fund the Green New Deal scam again.

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

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, good afternoon everyone. Welcome, indeed, to the DOGE Subcommittee. It is always an interesting journey here.

Madam Chairwoman, before we get started, I want to take a moment to observe that this very Subcommittee was created in January to act as the congressional tip of the spear for DOGE and Elon Musk's efforts inside the Federal Government, which our GOP colleagues were falling all over themselves to get in on the action. And in fact, I do not know if you know this, Madam Chairwoman, but one of your own GOP Members who could not get on the Committee actually contacted me to see if I could help because they were so desperate to participate in this activity.

But here we are. I feel like we should play a breakup song in the midst of the breakup of the GOP with Elon Musk and DOGE, and yet still the zombie lurches on. And you know, I think it is interesting that people are barely saying his name in these halls and this Subcommittee barely has any credibility at this point. And Elon Musk still has not appeared under oath in front of this Committee or anybody here in Congress.

And in fact, Donald Trump himself apparently asked his own aides this week if DOGE was—and I quote the President—bullshit. Donald Trump asked if DOGE was bullshit. Meanwhile, our friend, Mr. Musk, is going crazy on Twitter. We just checked. He is still going at it. And he literally has been tweet-storming the GOP for the last 24 hours. And he says, "I'm sorry, but I just can't stand it anymore. This massive, outrageous, pork-filled congressional spending bill is a disgusting abomination. Shame on those who voted for it. You know you did wrong. You know it." And you know what I find interesting about his tweet is that he says, "I'm sorry, I just can't stand it anymore."

And I think, you know, the American people have been there for the last 3 1/2 months as they have dismantled the Federal Government, as Musk and Trump and his friends here have helped lay wake to the Federal Government, dismantling Federal agencies, firing thousands of Federal workers, stealing your private data, costing the Federal Government millions of dollars. And in fact, it appears that they may have actually cost more money than they apparently saved. So, it is hard to take any of this seriously or with any credibility.

Musk lied about DOGE and its savings. The President and the Speaker just this morning, once again, lied about the big abomination of the bill and the deficit spending in it. There was a misrepresentation of a witness in this hearing last time. There were lies about the budget reconciliation and, yes, the DOGE package, which was transmitted to Congress yesterday. And I do not think I even need to comment on the wild journey of baseless conspiracy theories that we just heard.

So, it is very clear that DOGE has made America less safe, less secure, undermined our global and national security, compromised our data privacy, impacted our ability to serve our vulnerable communities, and left the government in total chaos. And yet, many of these DOGE brothers have implanted themselves inside of Federal agencies and are now answering directly to the West Wing and to the Director of Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Russell

Vought, who, by the way, is testifying just across this campus on his bill for the Fiscal Year 2026 budget, which would eviscerate these programs.

So, I want to say, first they came for our Federal agencies. Then they came for our judges and law firms and the rule of law. Then they came for the free press and your freedom of speech. Then they came for higher education and our children. Then they came for congressional offices. And now, here they are, coming for civil society and nonprofit organizations.

What are nonprofit organizations? Food banks, legal aid clinics, homeless shelters, organizations that are the glue of our communities. In fact, right now, they are withholding a half trillion dollars illegally from nonprofit organizations that provide services for our communities: public safety, health services, housing, the Big Brothers and Big Sisters of America, Boys and Girls Club, and Habitat for Humanity. Is this the dark money scare that we are hearing across the aisle? I think all of us understand what these organizations do in our communities.

But let us be clear. The actions that are happening here in this Committee and which the Administration are trying to execute through executive actions, through letters, and yes, sending DOGE employees baselessly and illegally into nonprofit organizations, are illegal. They lack moral authority, and they lack legal authority.

The truth is simple. Neither the President nor any other executive branch official has the power to unilaterally revoke an organization's tax-exempt status or to use these authoritarian tactics to try to intimidate our nonprofit and civil society organizations. And we will dive deeper into that topic and your rights during this hearing.

But if my colleagues across the aisle want to talk about dark money networks, we can look no further than this very hearing room. Because if we actually want to understand the dark money-funded networks that are making the government run right now, let us talk about Project 2025. The witnesses who are here today as part of the organizations that helped to craft it. Mr. Vought, who was at the helm as the architect of that document, and the folks who are inside the Federal Government right now dismantling our agencies and attacking every aspect of our democracy. We will not stand for it.

And with that, Madam Chairwoman, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, Representatives Gosar of Arizona, Moskowitz of Florida, and Pressley of Massachusetts are waived on to the Subcommittee for the purpose of questioning the witnesses at today's committee hearing.

I am pleased to introduce our witnesses today. Scott Walter is the President of Capital Research Center and an expert in investigating how nonprofits spend money and get involved in politics and advocacy.

Mark Krikorian is the Executive Director of the Center of Immigration Studies and is an expert on the issues of immigration and border security.

Daniel Turner is the Founder and Executive Director of Power the Future and an expert in energy and environmental issues.

Diane Yentel is the President and Chief Executive Officer of the National Council of Nonprofits.

Again, I want to thank all of 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. 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 statements, 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 has expired, and we would ask that you please wrap it up quickly.

I now recognize Mr. Walter for his opening statement.

STATEMENT OF SCOTT WALTER
PRESIDENT
CAPITAL RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. WALTER. Thank you, Chairwoman Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, distinguished Members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the honor of testifying. I am president of the Capital Research Center, where we study nonprofits every day.

Americans are proud of our nonprofit sector, which has long led the world because they love real charities that actually help people here and abroad. They do not think of the nonprofit sector as the plaything of billionaires and politicians. Yet, all too often, that is the reality of our nongovernmental organizations, or NGOs.

Far too many NGOs are really BGOs, basically government organizations, for two reasons. First, they get most of their money from government, not citizens. Second, they serve the big government political agenda that fights to centralize power in Washington for the benefit of the left's preferred political party.

From countless egregious examples, consider the Solidarity Center. This nonprofit child of the country's largest union federation, the AFL–CIO, is chaired by the AFL–CIO's president. The Solidarity Center does not just boost unions. It also champions DEI and climate justice. It is suing the current administration because DOGE recommended its Federal gravy train end. It has received over $86 million from the Federal Government since 2008. Sixty-one of that $86 million was given under President Biden, doubtless encouraged by the three Solidarity employees who went into the Labor Department.

Solidarity receives 99 percent of its revenue from American taxpayers. It serves the AFL–CIO, which gave 86 percent of its 2024 political donations to Democrats.

Today's Democratic witness, Diane Yentel, is yet another powerful example of nonprofits serving big government. One of her typical tweets attacked DOGE and defended the Vera Institute of Justice, which in 2023 received 79 percent of its revenues from government. It is a hard left, Soros-backed group whose priorities oppose the views of America's Democratic majority by advocating soft-on-crime policies and defending illegal aliens. Its biggest vendor in its last IRS filing was Blue State Digital, which began life as Barack Obama's digital campaign team and now serves the entire left.

Ms. Yentel was hired by Obama at HUD, and President Biden considered her for a Cabinet post. Her previous job was leading the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, an NGO that advocates for evermore Federal spending by HUD and uses identity politics to justify its agenda.

In her current job, leading the National Council of Nonprofits, Ms. Yentel quickly sued the Trump Administration over budget cuts. What lawyers did she turn to? The Democracy Forward Foundation, whose board includes President Biden's notorious Chief of Staff, Ron Klain, and is chaired by Marc Elias, the Democratic super-lawyer.

Ms. Yentel claims the Republican tax bill would have handed "unchecked power to the Trump Administration to punish nonprofit orgs that do not fall in line with its ideology by labeling them as terrorist-supporting groups." Nonsense. As an honest left-leaning law professor explained in The Chronicle of Philanthropy, "A despot seeking to silence nonprofits would be weakened, not empowered by the legislation."

No wonder nonprofit expert Bill Schambra warned that Yentel's partisanship at a major nonprofit membership group may erode public support for nonprofits by suggesting "nonprofits are just like any other major institution of American society, fighting fiercely to maintain the status quo against necessary reforms."

It is understandable, though not admirable, that status quo nonprofit leaders are scared by DOGE examining their government funding. They will use an Urban Institute study designed to scare you, Members of Congress, with statistics like "government grants support nonprofits in every congressional district." No one explains why it is wonderful that so many nonprofits are as dependent on government cash as a meth addict is on methamphetamine.

The same study stresses how larger nonprofits especially hoover up tax dollars, but while big nonprofits are often less effective at helping people compared to smaller neighborhood groups, they certainly are more powerful at lobbying government in the service of bigger government and the left. They are also great at suing government.

This politicized pseudo-charity aimed at bloating government and seizing political power goes back decades as when the Obama Administration took money from Catholic Charities and gave it to Planned Parenthood. This is a simple ugly story of tax dollars, cronyism, and political scheming camouflaged by invoking the moving stories of the real heroes of America's charitable sector. Please do not fall for the sob stories.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Walter.

I now recognize Mr. Krikorian for his opening statement.

STATEMENT OF MARK KRIKORIAN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CENTER FOR IMMIGRATION STUDIES

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Thank you. During the 4 years of the Biden Administration, the United States devoted significant taxpayer funds to facilitating illegal immigration. There has been much reporting about the role of NGOs in this process after the illegal immigrants crossed into the United States, but what the center has examined is what happened before the migrants got to the Rio Grande, in other words, how NGOs and U.N. agencies were paid by U.S. taxpayers to facilitate the illegal movement of migrants through South and Central America and Mexico.

We have documented a large U.N. NGO support network from field reporting and annual reports from this group called the Regional Refugee and Migrant Response Plan. This network consisted of waystations all along Latin American illegal migration routes that made it possible for millions of foreign nationals from as many as 180 countries to illegally get to the U.S. border, in part funded by U.S. taxpayers. Some of these funds were provided directly to NGOs by the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, or USAID. Other funding was sent indirectly through our funding of U.N. agencies, which then in turn funded NGOs.

This often was described as merely humanitarian assistance to people who would travel anyway, but in reality this amounted to a coordinated, well-funded assistance to designed to undermine U.S. immigration laws. Starting in South America and Central America, NGOs handed out millions of dollars' worth of supplies designed to assist recipients in their plans to illegally breach the borders, not just of the United States, but of half a dozen countries along the way.

Just a couple of examples, in Colombia, in northwestern Colombia, the Center found NGOs working in coordination with a paramilitary drug smuggling group called Clan del Golfo, also known as the Gaitanistas, which controlled the smuggling routes in those areas. To get an idea of how this worked, there is a town in northwest Colombia called Necocli, which is a major staging area for migrants trying to cross the Gulf of Uraba to get to the jumping-off point for trips through the Darien Gap. Well, our researcher went to Necocli and found what amounted to kind of a swap meet or farmer's market of NGO groups with booths of U.N. and NGO organizations there to provide assistance.

Just a couple of examples, the Florida-based NGO Cadena was set up in a booth next to the Silver Spring-based Adventist Development and Relief Agency, and there were many other U.S.-based and overseas-based groups there. And they provided a variety of services, assistance on how to make it through the Darien Gap, food, dry socks, backpacks, et cetera.

When they crossed that Gulf of Uraba, they are still in Colombia, and they get to the village of Acandi, which is where you jump off to go to the Darien Gap. And there, the NGO U.N. group, the camp, was in a camp where the security for the camp was provided by this drug-smuggling gang. In other words—and it is not clear to us, we do not have evidence of this, but it seems likely to me

that NGOs and the U.N. paid for the security by paying this drug-smuggling gang for security for this jumping-off point.

After they pass through Central America, they get to southern Mexico, cross from Guatemala into southern Mexico. And there, Tapachula is the town that is the first place you get to. And what we found there was a large, kind of a one-stop shop illegal immigration mall where the U.N. agencies and the NGOs were supposed to be housing them. This was under construction when we went last fall. And it was only one of many similar camps. There are several in northern Mexico as well.

Especially curious in Tapachula was an NGO that is funded by the United Nations, which means funded by the U.S., which provided repressed memory therapy for illegal immigrants who had been rejected for asylum by Mexico, which they do in order to be able to make it through Mexico without hassles. They had been rejected. They went to the repressed memory therapy and got a certificate that they had forgotten about the persecution they had suffered, and now they remembered it, and so they went to their appeal, and they got their asylum status.

So, throughout Latin America, these networks, funded in part by U.S. taxpayers, have made this flow of illegal immigrants possible, and yet oversight has remained absent, and Congress has not cracked down and insisted that recipients of funding not engage in promoting illegal immigration.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Krikorian.

I now recognize Mr. Turner for his opening statement.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL TURNER
FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
POWER THE FUTURE

Mr. TURNER. Madam Chairman Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Committee today.

Three words often heard in tandem with DOGE are waste, fraud, and abuse, and I hope my testimony can shed light on the third word, abuse.

I started my organization, Power the Future, to advocate for energy workers in rural America, and it has come to light that on the other side of that fight, the climate movement received billions from taxpayers, and that is the abuse I wish to highlight.

The 2022 Inflation Reduction Act set aside hundreds of billions of dollars for the green agenda. The Environmental Protection Agency received tens of billions. As reported by the *Washington Free Beacon*, a staffer from an environmental group called the Coalition for Green Capital named Jahai Weiss joined the Biden EPA to direct $27 billion in green funding. For context, $27 billion is larger than the budgets of the Departments of Treasury, Interior, and Commerce, yet Mr. Jahai went through no confirmation process, and his decision to direct tens of billions to organizations of his choosing had no congressional oversight. And conveniently, under his tenure in this new EPA role, $5 billion was granted to his former organization, the Coalition for Green Capital.

The abundance of green dollars created a new pernicious mechanism, create a group for the sole purpose of getting government

grants. For example, Power Forward Communities was only a few months old when it applied for and received nearly $9 billion to distribute at its own discretion, and one lucky recipient was an organization affiliated with two-time Georgia gubernatorial candidate Stacey Abrams. With only $100 in the bank, this group received $2 billion.

Yes, it is legal to create a nonprofit to get IRS accreditation, apply for and receive government grants, but it is fair to question the process and demand transparency. What does the application for a $9 billion grant look like, particularly when an organization has no staff, no history in this space, no office, and is only a few months old? A Department of Defense grant of this size would have layers of transparency. A Department of Transportation grant that size would require a bond to guarantee deliverables, yet it seems that in the name of climate change, unvetted, unelected, unconfirmed bureaucrats require no safeguards, and this is the precedent of pernicious funding.

Any future President can announce a slush fund, appoint loyalists to dole it out, and anyone can create a group to get government billions if they know the right people, bypassing that pesky thing called Congress.

In his recent Senate hearing, Secretary of State Rubio said DOGE uncovered for every $1 spent at USAID, only 12 cents was actually received in aid. The rest was spent on overhead, high salaries, dinners, events, travel, raising awareness. You can call it overhead. A better term is grift.

But this funding scandal is far worse in context, for at the same time the Biden Administration was generously rewarding climate groups with billions, they enacted the most radical energy agenda in history, which punished the American people. Making energy expensive made life expensive, and we saw under the Biden Administration record high inflation, skyrocketing price of energy, gas, utilities, food, and consumer goods. It was bad enough to dole out billions, but to do it to the very groups making America unaffordable was a new low even for Washington, DC. And unless this Congress changes the laws, the mechanisms are still in place to appropriate new funds using a new crisis, forming new groups, skirting Congress, and ripping off the taxpayers.

Last week, my organization sent letters to this Committee and Attorney General Bondi calling for an investigation into the Biden Administration use of autopen on green executive orders, asking if Biden himself directed them, or if the staff took leniencies, a very severe accusation, but made even more plausible in the light of this hearing. Abuse. Abuse of the purse, abuse of the pen, also that climate groups and their political allies could benefit. This is the very worst of Washington and why the American people have such little trust in government.

For our Nation to survive, Congress must restore trust in government, end the slush fund abuse, stop the grift, and it is my sincere hope that my appearance here today can help begin the process.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Turner.

I now recognize Ms. Yentel for her opening statement.

STATEMENT OF DIANE YENTEL
PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NONPROFITS

Ms. YENTEL. Chairwoman Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to share how America's charitable nonprofits serve communities across the country. From small towns to big cities, in every congressional district and state, nonprofits feed, heal, shelter, and nurture people of all walks of life and every political persuasion. From hospitals to libraries, churches to food banks, from veterans to school children, artists to researchers, charitable nonprofits touch and benefit all Americans, all our lives.

Nonprofits are local, accountable, transparent, and are nonpartisan by law and in practice. The vast majority of nonprofits are small to mid-sized. Ninety-two percent have budgets of less than $1 million.

Nonprofits step in to fill gaps not met by government or other entities alone. They show up in times of crisis, providing disaster relief, hotlines, and safety from danger, and they meet everyday needs in local communities, from providing childcare and eldercare, job training, or essential food and shelter. Simply put, the work of charitable nonprofits improves lives and strengthens communities and the country.

Nonprofits represent the best of America, neighbors helping neighbors. Despite this essential work, nonprofits are at risk and under attack by this Administration and by some in Congress. Across the country, nonprofits are having Federal funding slashed or eliminated due to arbitrary cuts of congressionally approved spending and through reckless and unlawful Federal funding freezes by the Trump Administration.

These actions are causing real harm. Food banks across the country, already struggling with high levels of need, are serving fewer meals due to spending cuts. Nonprofit health clinics have closed, leaving neighbors without access to potentially life-saving care. Nonprofits focused on preventing violence and crime have seen their budgets disappear, putting a stop to critical work. Afterschool programs have been canceled, and school lunch programs are squeezed. Nonprofits that serve young mothers, respond to disasters, help address mental health or substance use, or operate child enrichment programs face funding shortfalls.

And the threats to nonprofits are broader than Federal funding. Senior members of this Administration and some witnesses here today give egregious mischaracterizations of the work of nonprofits, even using dangerous rhetoric to vilify nonprofits. There are repeated threats against nonprofits that hold views that do not align with this Administration, from statements calling for the illegal unilateral revoking of their tax-exempt status to attempted takeovers, audits, and even threats of civil or criminal investigations by the Federal Government, not for any wrongdoing, but for doing work at odds with the Administration's ideology.

The Administration's targeting of organizations and institutions with which it disagrees is a fundamentally un-American action and something that should concern us all. These actions are not about government efficiency or about reform. They are attempted censor-

ship disguised as accountability. This is weaponization of the Federal Government to chill dissent, and it is wrong, whatever party is in control.

In a functioning and healthy democracy, nonprofits must be free to identify and meet local needs without political interference, fear of retribution, or facing punishment for holding a different point of view from those in political power. Nonprofits are the backbone of our country, providing critical support to communities and saving lives. Defending and supporting their essential work should not divide us along political lines. It should unite us as Americans.

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

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

The American people definitely support nonprofits, but what they do not support is corruption, waste, fraud, and abuse. In 2024, right as the Biden Administration was leaving office, the Democrats finalized the awards that amounted to $20 billion under its greenhouse gas reduction slush fund to launder government funding to eight politically aligned nonprofits, several of which were newly created solely to join in on the massive grift. One of these awardees is Power Forward.

Mr. Turner, you have spent a lot of time diving into leftist green NGOs. Was the NGO Power Forward just created a couple of years ago, yes or no?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Ms. GREENE. In Fiscal Year 2023, did Power Forward report only $100 in revenue on their 990 financial disclosure form?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Ms. GREENE. Was Power Forward slated to receive $2 billion in Federal funding?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, that is 20 million times revenue.

Ms. GREENE. Is it commonplace for completely new nonprofits with zero track record to receive a multi-billion dollar grant from the Federal Government?

Mr. TURNER. There is no private entity that would give an organization 20 million times revenue after a few months of creation. Only government is stupid enough to do that.

Ms. GREENE. That is right. There is no business in America that could get that loan from a bank.

Is Rewiring America part of the same NGO coalition as Power Forward?

Mr. TURNER. Part of the same coalition, yes.

Ms. GREENE. Did Rewiring America hire Stacey Abrams?

Mr. TURNER. She is affiliated with the organization. It is unclear in what capacity, but yes.

Ms. GREENE. Is she an energy expert?

Mr. TURNER. No.

Ms. GREENE. So, it is pretty eye-opening that a brand new politically connected group got such a massive Federal grant. Rewiring America hired Stacey Abrams, as far as we know, a twice-failed candidate for Georgia Governor and well-known Democrat activist, even though she has little to no knowledge of energy policy, but the leader of Power Forward praised Abrams for playing a pivotal role in securing these billions. Notably, Abrams' PAC spent over $126

million on Democrat campaigns over the last 5 years. This recirculation of taxpayer funds literally is the Democrats' circle of life.

Mr. Krikorian, we witnessed the worst border immigration catastrophe under the Biden Administration. It seems to me that many immigration-oriented NGOs have double-dipped their hands in taxpayer money. My first question is how influential were the American taxpayer-funded NGOs at facilitating the movement of illegal aliens to and through our country's borders?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Extremely influential. Now, some of this would have happened anyway because of the Biden Administration's invitation to mass illegal immigration, but the invitation required some means of this happening, some means of doing it. And so, what it did is the taxpayer money essentially turned the illegal immigration crisis up to 11. It would have existed otherwise, but it was significantly magnified by this government funding.

Ms. GREENE. By the Biden's Administration policies.

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Right.

Ms. GREENE. You have mentioned that the United Nations pay psychologists to help illegal aliens reverse asylum denials on appeal. Specifically, tax dollars go to the United Nations, which directs and pays psychologists to help illegal aliens unearth repressed memories of torture, persecution, and human rights violation so that they can legally claim asylum. Is this an intentional effort to subvert our immigration laws by creating fake narratives for asylum seekers?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. I cannot put myself into someone else's head, but I cannot imagine any other plausible way to describe it. And initially, just to be clear, they use this to get Mexican asylum, which they use as a kind of trampoline to get to the United States, and then present those repressed memory documents as part of their evidence when they are in removal proceedings as part of their asylum claims.

Ms. GREENE. And do they provide legal help to apply for asylum claims?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. That is inside the United States, so that is beyond the scope of my testimony here.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you. Mr. Walter, you have been investigating NGO funding sources for a long time. Do you know of other examples of former elected or appointed officials in the NGO sector securing significant Federal tax dollars through grants or contracts?

Mr. WALTER. Well, we have had mentioned here the $2 billion slush fund, and of course, the OMB and HUD Director, Shaun Donovan, has been mixed up in that. And then, of course, there have been public reports as well about the millions of dollars that the wife of Senator Sheldon Whitehouse has received from NGOs whose legislation he has helped push.

Ms. GREENE. Yes. Thank you. My time has expired, and thank you all for being here.

I now recognize Ranking Member Stansbury for 5 minutes of questions.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you so much, Madam Chairwoman.

And I want to welcome back some of our guests here today. Mr. Krikorian, I recognize you from last summer when you came to testify. Welcome back.

Just want to clarify, you served on the board for Project 2025, is that correct?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. I do not think I was on a board. We were one of the advisors for it, but yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. So, yes, you served in an advisory role on Project 2025. I appreciate that. And Mr. Walter, I just want to clarify a few things about Capital Research Center. This is the organization that acted as a fiscal sponsor for Ginni Thomas' nonprofit, correct?

Mr. WALTER. For a project that she was one of many people involved with, yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes. And this is Ginni Thomas, Justice Clarence Thomas' wife. And my understanding is that there was a donor-advised fund that was the primary donor to that funding under fiscal sponsorship. In fact, it looks like about $400,000 was channeled through your organization. And if I am correct, based on what I see here, the primary donors are the Koch brothers, the Searles, the Mercers, oh, and Leonard Leo. And some of you may recall Leonard Leo because, of course, he is at the center of many of the big issues around Supreme Court ethics. But also, you all may recognize him because last week Donald Trump called him a sleazebag who probably hates America for his interference in the judiciary and his efforts to try to undermine what Donald Trump is trying to do. So, a very interesting cast of characters indeed.

And Mr. Turner, as I understand it, you are a former employee of the Koch Institute, correct?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. So, I think, you know, these are always very interesting hearings we have in the Oversight Committee. We have some retreads of some witnesses who have been here before, all of which are participants in organizations that were involved in Project 2025 that are funded through the same dark money networks and organizations of the Koch brothers and Leonard Leo and the Searles and the Mercers who fund all this stuff. Project 2025, the stuff that is happening in front of the Supreme Court, rolling back our rights, that helped to get, you know, over 70 Project 2025 authors placed in the Administration acting in high-level roles right now that are bringing cases in front of the Supreme Court, undermining our democracy, and which are attacking organizations who are working on civil society programs.

So, I think I already said this, but I think it is very clear what is going on here. And I want to point out that the project that Ms. Ginni Thomas was fundraising for through Capital Research Center, let us see, what was the direct quote, literally was formed with the mission to attack the left, a culture war, to wage a culture war against the left, so I think we can see what is going on here.

But this is not a joke, right? Ms. Yentel, you are here in your role of helping to advise nonprofit organizations and provide institutional infrastructure. I know there has been a number of untrue things said here today, both about your own professional background, as well as the affiliated organizations that help to support

our small nonprofits across the country. But I think it is really important—and this is a message we want to drive home today—that the attacks on nonprofit organizations that the Trump Administration is undertaking, including trying to find executive authority to take away tax-exempt status, are both illegal and immoral. Would you agree?

Ms. YENTEL. Excuse me. Thank you for the question. Yes, it is illegal for the President or any member of the executive office to direct the IRS to make any changes to the tax status of an individual or an organization. And in fact, the law makes clear that if the President threatens to revoke tax-exempt status from an individual organization, they can be convicted up to 5 years in prison.

Ms. STANSBURY. And, so, could you please tell us, you know, we want to make sure that for any nonprofit watching, because I know there are probably hundreds if not thousands across the country because they are deeply concerned of what might be coming, what should nonprofits be doing to prepare if DOGE or the Administration tries to either infiltrate or take away their status?

Ms. YENTEL. Well, nonprofits should know that that is illegal, and they do. That is part of what we have been working to educate nonprofits. But mostly what nonprofits should continue to do is the incredibly important, vital work that they do in communities and to try not to be distracted by threats and unlawful actions by the President.

Nonprofit organizations are local, they are transparent, accountable, they are non-partisan, and they do vital work in communities with communities, identifying and prioritizing local needs, and then working with the communities to meet those needs in ways that the government and other private entities do not.

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

I now recognize the Chairman of Oversight, Mr. Comer from Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Turner, I have launched an investigation, or the Committee has, we all have, into the role of former senior White House officials in possibly abusing the authority of former President Joe Biden while the former President was rapidly deteriorating mentally and physically. We will be conducting transcribed interviews of a number of former White House officials to understand who was really making the decisions for President Biden.

Your group, Power the Future, has expressed concerns that over half a dozen of the Biden Administration executive actions, which were signed by the autopen, related to climate policy should be deemed null and void, again, due to the fact that they were signed by the autopen without any public comment from President Biden confirming his knowledge of them. Now, why is it important that the American people know the truth about whether President Biden knowingly signed these orders making significant and drastic shifts in our energy policy?

Mr. TURNER. Thank you for the question, sir. We are looking at this from the sense of deceit of the American people. This is impersonation of the President. Staffers, of course, have a lot of leniency in what they do working on behalf of the President, but these exec-

utive orders that we identified, there is no evidence of Joe Biden in first person in his voice as President talking about them.

And I see some Pennsylvanians on the panel. When you ban the export of liquid natural gas and you never get asked about it in person, one has to wonder if Joe Biden did it or if a staffer did it on his behalf.

Chairman COMER. You specifically expressed concern that President Biden was not aware of that specific action to implement the executive order pausing liquefied natural gas permits. Now, why are you specifically concerned the President was unaware of that specific order?

Mr. TURNER. Well, there is an anecdote from earlier this year where Speaker of the House Johnson mentioned he was in conversation with President Biden and brought it up, and the President said, I do not know what you are talking about. At the time, that was understood as, wow, maybe the President's a little worse off than we realized, but maybe two things can be true. Maybe he really did not know what Speaker Johnson was talking about. Maybe he had no idea he passed this executive order. And if the President has never asked about it and he hides from the press and there is no opportunity for him to get asked in public about it, how do we know he actually did it? And these are serious executive orders. This is not——

Chairman COMER. It is bizarre. You know, when President Trump signed his executive orders, we saw him sign the executive orders. He had a big event. You know, they were talking about the executive orders. They said, this is what this specific executive order is.

Mr. TURNER. Correct.

Chairman COMER. We never saw any of that.

Mr. TURNER. No, and lives were destroyed, sir. And when you ban the export of liquid natural gas, there are hundreds of thousands of men and women who work in the natural gas industry.

Chairman COMER. Right.

Mr. TURNER. Lives are destroyed. People went bankrupt——

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. Because of that, and we have no evidence that Joe Biden himself actually ordered it.

Chairman COMER. We have not found any evidence either that—and ironically, unlike some of the investigations we have done in the past with respect to the former President, not many of the colleagues on the other side of the aisle are disputing many of the things that have come out in the Tapper book, the things that have come out with statements like former Transportation Secretary Buttigieg and others have said that they were shielded from the President.

So, we look forward to having these staffers come in. Our Committee will be conducting transcribed interviews, possibly depositions, depending on how quickly they come in, and hopefully, we will get the truth to the American people.

I want to switch gears and talk about the NGOs. The full Committee has another investigation into, you know, the green energy scam—I do not know how else to put it—known as the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, and the NGOs that receive significant

amounts of money through it. Can you tell us a little bit about this?

And the NGOs and the left, obviously, they advocate for initiatives as an excuse to spend billions in local communities but enrich themselves too. Who else benefits from these handouts? You know, every Democrat, I know Ms. Stansbury loves government programs, they love to spend money and create bureaucracies, but who really benefits from programs like this specific scam that I talked about?

Mr. TURNER. The operatives aligned to these organizations, consultancy groups, PR firms, lawyers, and it is all just an enormous cabal. They hire each other.

Chairman COMER. That sounds like a base for one of the two political parties.

Mr. TURNER. A hundred percent.

Chairman COMER. Well, thank you very much. We look forward to this Committee working to get the truth to the American people and try to get spending under control. And, you know, we are going to see if these executive orders were really authorized by the President or if this was being done unilaterally by some unnamed bureaucrats.

Madam Chair, thank you for this Subcommittee hearing. I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you. The gentleman yields.

And I now recognize Ms. Norton from Washington, DC.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Today's hearing is yet another attempt to rationalize the repeated attempts by the Trump Administration to destroy the ability of the Federal Government to address the needs of the American people. Spending months denigrating Federal employees and gutting the civil service is not enough for the Administration. The President is also attacking universities, law firms, nonprofit groups, and charities in a desperate attempt to control civil society, silence dissent, and seize absolute power.

Ms. Yentel, we have heard Committee Republicans and their witnesses attempt to villainize DGOs [sic] today because they do not want to say what they are really attacking, charitable nonprofits. What are nonprofit organizations, and what kinds of work do they do in local communities?

Ms. YENTEL. Thank you for the question, Congresswoman. Nonprofit organizations are local, transparent, accountable. They are predominantly small or mid-sized. About 92 percent of nonprofit organizations have budgets of less than $1 million, so they are experts at stretching every dollar for the biggest impact in communities. And they are predominantly in local communities, working with communities to identify and prioritize needs, and then working to meet those needs with the communities.

Nonprofits step in to fill gaps that the Federal Government and private entities on their own cannot meet, so often, they partner with government to do the work that they are doing. And they show up in times of crisis. They provide vital disaster relief assistance. They staff mental health hotlines. They provide safety from danger. They also show up in communities to meet our everyday needs, from childcare to eldercare, from libraries to food banks to

providing essential shelter. So, nonprofits really meet the needs of all Americans throughout our lives, and virtually all of us are touched by and benefit from nonprofit in our local community.

Ms. NORTON. Ms. Yentel, are nonprofits partisan organizations, as the Majority has tried to claim today?

Ms. YENTEL. No. Nonprofit organizations are nonpartisan, both by law and in practice.

Ms. NORTON. These attempts by the Administration to make it clear that they do not want nonprofits to provide expert services that protect the local needs and goals of our communities, just as they do not want a government with a qualified nonpartisan merit-based Federal workforce. Instead, the Administration wants a patronized system with services provided only by and for those who share their political views. Trump's attacks on nonprofits come while his allies in Congress cut government services that support the most vulnerable in our society.

Ms. Yentel, you have referred to nonprofits as America's backbone.

Ms. YENTEL. Yes.

Ms. NORTON. How do nonprofit organizations fill gaps in government services to meet local needs?

Ms. YENTEL. Well, nonprofit organizations show up to meet local needs in many ways. And the Federal Government, of course Congress, appropriates funding, and some, not all, but some nonprofit organizations apply for, through very rigorous processes, to receive Federal funding, and if they are found to be eligible, and if they are found to be able to meet the rigorous oversight and accountability requirements to receive those funds, they do. And then they put those dollars to good work in local communities, meeting a whole spectrum of needs that are identified by the community.

But it is important to know, too, that nonprofits earn these funds from the Federal Government through the work that they do and also have a diversified revenue source. So, about 27 percent of nonprofits receive Federal funding, earn Federal funding for the work that they do. Those nonprofits and the nonprofits that do not, receive their funding from a variety of sources, all of them dedicated to meeting local needs and working with the community to do so.

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

I now recognize Mr. Cloud from Texas.

Mr. CLOUD. Thank you, Chairwoman.

And I think it is important at the outset to kind of level set on the language being used because there seems to be an intentional attempt at creating a smokescreen about what we are talking about today in order to confuse people. Indeed, the Ranking Member tried to equate private donations going to conservative organizations with taxpayer dollars going to leftist organizations, as if that was the same thing. And even as you talk about charitable NGOs, we are all for charitable NGOs, and a lot of what you are saying is true about the vast majority of NGOs. But there are 120,000 of them, as you mentioned, and not all of them are that wonderful.

And to the point, Republicans historically, decades over decades, have far outpaced Democrats in their charitable giving. As a matter of fact, scripture gives a definition of what charity is. Each of

you should give exactly what you have decided in your heart to give, not reluctantly or under compulsion. God loves a cheerful giver. We are all about charity, but charity is not given at the strong-arm mandate of the Federal Government requiring taxpayers. That is not charity. That is taxes. That is a completely different thing.

And, so, what we are going after today is taxpayer dollars going to NGOs that are doing bad work. Indeed, so many of these organizations do have a high percentage—I appreciate what you said, Mr. Walter. You call them basically government organizations. I have thought of them, in a sense, as quasi-government organizations. Many of these have been stood up in a sense because it adds one more layer away from accountability on the taxpayer dollars.

For example, we had Secretary Mayorkas coming here claiming plausible deniability on much of the stuff that was happening at our border. Why? Because the dollars go to an NGO who is doing the work, and so if they are giving out Sodexo cards to illegal immigrants to incentivize them coming into the United States, you know, "I do not know anything about that. It is an NGO doing that." And then when we send that through the U.N. as another kind of filter away from accountability, it muddies the waters even more. And so, as the Department of Government Efficiency and the DOGE Subcommittee here, we are working to bring transparency to this process.

One of the things I wanted to mention was Endeavors. Endeavors was stood up as part of this illegal immigration scheme and this entire industry that was created. Endeavors, I think, approximately had maybe a $40 million operating budget. And you had a gentleman by the name of Lorenzen-Strait, who was on the Biden transition committee, who suddenly found himself on the Endeavors board. And normally, when a government puts out—you know, so they put out a request for proposal, and then you are supposed to get multiple sources. Here, the government did not even put out a request for proposal. He came and presented a proposal and got a $530 million contract from the Federal Government, followed by an $87 million contract, so 90 percent or more of the income was coming from the Federal Government. To me, this ceases to be an NGO. Mr. Walter, you spoke to that. Could you narrow down what we are talking about here when we talk about these NGOs? How many are there that are like this, you know, where much of their income is from taxpayer dollars?

Mr. WALTER. Shockingly, there are at least 35,000 NGOs that receive most of their money from government. And thank you, by the way, for mentioning that, yes, the Ranking Member attacked a charity that supports my organization. So, I do not understand why Ms. Yentel did not upbraid her for that.

Mr. CLOUD. Well, one of the things that DOGE is uncovering, it is shocking that this is—you would think that this would be an issue across the line, that you have a lack of transparency on taxpayer dollars, but it would seem that many on the left are content with the fact that this is a feature of the system, not a bug of the system. We are working to get that out.

Mr. Krikorian, I wanted to see if you could bring light as to how this NGO apparatus helped enable cartels to profit and also helped to incentivize illegal immigration into our country.

Mr. KRIKORIAN. What the nonprofits did, and the United Nations, again, funded in part by the U.S. Government, was make it possible for people to move through because these are people without—do not have a lot of money anyway. And so, by providing them cash, literally envelopes of cash sometimes, as well as cash cards, food, supplies, et cetera, they made it possible for people to move. And who were the smugglers making money off of this? Many of them were actually drug smuggling organizations who either just collected a toll or, in some cases, as we saw in Colombia, were integrally part of the smuggling operation.

So, this was—they were clearly working with these cartel and smuggling organizations, which were enriched by this flow of illegal immigration.

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

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

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Madam Chair and the Ranking Member. I would also like to thank the witnesses for their willingness to come before the Committee and help us with our work.

Madam Chair, I just want to describe a couple of documents that I am going to ask to have submitted into the record by unanimous consent. One is entitled—it is a *New York Times* article dated March 16. The title is, "Investigators See No Criminality by EPA Officials in the Case of Biden-Era Grants."

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LYNCH. I am still going to describe it. Thank you. And the subhead says, "A contentious investigation that questioned the legality of EPA grants has found very little to even suggest that government employees violated the law."

The second is a *Washington Post* article entitled, "Trump's False Claims That Stacey Adams Headed a Group That Got $1.9 Billion."

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

And I will sum up by saying that that allegation got four Pinocchios. All right.

So, Ms. Yentel, President Trump, Elon Musk, and DOGE have decimated essential services, lifeline programs, and services that millions of Americans rely on for food, for affordable housing, and for healthcare. Just yesterday, Ranking Member Rosa DeLauro of Connecticut of the House Appropriations Committee reported detailed information indicating that the Trump Administration is freezing at least $425 billion in Federal funding, that Congress had already approved, for communities in Democratic and Republican districts nationwide for critical services and programs that serve all Americans.

Some of the funding that has been frozen or terminated by the Trump Administration includes $3.8 billion frozen for justice programs, including grants that support community policing, cops programs; victim services, including the Violence Against Women programs that operate nationally; also, $770 million terminated for NIH grants that support Alzheimer's, cancer, diabetes, and wom-

en's health research. He also terminated $1 billion for states to support substance abuse treatment and mental health services.

And last—this is not last but the last on my list—$6.1 billion frozen or terminated to support cutting-edge scientific and biomedical research at higher education institutions. One of those programs is run by Professor Joan Brugge. She has a research team at Harvard University. She is working on early detection protocols for ovarian cancer. One of the tough things about ovarian cancer and why it is so deadly is that there are no early detection methods. So, Joan Brugge actually is working on identifying precursors that allow early detection of ovarian cancer, which affects about 20,000 women every single year.

So, when we think about this reconciliation bill and the rescissions that are going on here for funding for a lot of these not-for-profits and charitable institutions, what is the impact of that on those individual organizations and the work that they do?

Ms. YENTEL. Thank you, Congressman. All of these cuts, these arbitrary and often unlawful, illegal cuts to congressionally appropriated funding are doing real harm to your constituents, to the constituents of everybody on this Committee, and throughout Congress.

And, if I could, just for a moment to say in response to what the previous Congressman raised, he is absolutely right that nonprofit organizations enjoy strong bipartisan support. And there are many Republican champions for nonprofits. I know there are Republicans on this Committee and throughout Congress that serve on boards of nonprofits, that volunteer their hours for nonprofits. That is exactly right. And this is not a smoke screen. This is who nonprofits are. And the work that they do is essential. And when this Federal funding is cut that nonprofits use to meet local community needs, it harms Americans.

You mentioned the cuts to justice spending. That means organizations that are working to prevent crime are having their budgets slashed. We are seeing nonprofit health clinics have to shut their doors. We are seeing food banks who are already——

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

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

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Madam Chair. I also want to recognize that we have the Chairman of DOGE Texas, Giovanni Capriglione, is with us today.

Ms. Yentel, you are currently the—I want to get this right—the CEO of the National Council of Nonprofits. Am I right?

Ms. YENTEL. Yes, that is right.

Mr. FALLON. OK. And you were former president of the National Low Income Housing Coalition?

Ms. YENTEL. Correct.

Mr. FALLON. And your current job is the CEO of the National Council of Nonprofits. Are you familiar with the nonprofit that has been mentioned here up on the dais, the Power Forward Communities?

Ms. YENTEL. I am.

Mr. FALLON. You have, OK.

Ms. YENTEL. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. And that five organizations led the Power Forward. And one of them was—were you familiar with Rewiring America?

Ms. YENTEL. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. And do you know that Stacey Abrams was their counsel, lead counsel?

Ms. YENTEL. I believe she was an advisor, yes.

Mr. FALLON. Well, I just have it right here. It says that she was, this is from their press release, she was their senior counsel, OK?

Ms. YENTEL. OK.

Mr. FALLON. Stacey Abrams ran for Governor of Georgia, what party? Do you know? Are you aware?

Ms. YENTEL. Yes, she is a Democrat.

Mr. FALLON. Democrat, OK. And in 2022, she was also the Democratic candidate for Governor of Georgia?

Ms. YENTEL. I think that

Mr. FALLON. OK.

Ms. YENTEL. I am sure it is true if you are saying it.

Mr. FALLON. And she worked with, as we just mentioned, Rewiring America in 2023. Power Forward had a balance of—do you know what the balance was in 2023? It was mentioned up here earlier.

Ms. YENTEL. No.

Mr. FALLON. It was $100. And then, of course we know in 2020, are you also aware of Stacey Abrams' campaigned for Joe Biden for President?

Ms. YENTEL. If you say so.

Mr. FALLON. Yes, and she is a Democrat. So, Ms. Yentel, you are——

Mr. LYNCH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. No, I do not have enough time. I would if you want——

Mr. LYNCH. All right.

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. To give me an extra minute.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, my friend.

Mr. FALLON. I would love to.

Mr. LYNCH. OK. OK.

Mr. FALLON. Ms. Yentel, CEO of the National Council of Nonprofits.

Ms. YENTEL. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. How much did Joe Biden, his Administration, give—Stacey Abrams campaigned for Joe Biden. How much did they give to Power Forward?

Ms. YENTEL. So, I am so glad to have a chance to address the egregious——

Mr. FALLON. Do you know how much it was?

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Egregious mischaracterizations.

Mr. FALLON. OK. Was it $2 billion?

Ms. YENTEL. I do not know the number offhand.

Mr. FALLON. OK. It was $2 billion. OK. That is quite a bump from a C note to $2 billion. How did the Biden Administration justify this gift? Do you know?

Ms. YENTEL. So, what happened——

Mr. FALLON. Why did they give them the money?

Ms. YENTEL. Thank you. So, many of these organizations——

Mr. FALLON. Well, ma'am, do you know how—I do not have the time.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. That received funding——

Mr. FALLON. OK. You do not know?

Ms. YENTEL. No, I would love to answer the question.

Mr. FALLON. Was it for——

Ms. YENTEL. May I?

Mr. FALLON. No. Well, I am trying to help you because I do not have enough time. Green Energy Grants?

Ms. YENTEL. May I answer the question, sir?

Mr. FALLON. You got 10 seconds. Could you answer the question? Do you know what it was for?

Ms. YENTEL. These were coalitions of longstanding organizations.

Mr. FALLON. OK. So, you are not going to answer the question. It was for Green Energy Grants. Once Stacey Abrams got that money, it just so happens that two other nonprofits that she founded, Fair Count, have you ever heard of that one?

Ms. YENTEL. So, I am here to support——

Mr. FALLON. Yes, yes.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. The work of——

Mr. FALLON. Do you know what Fair Count is or not?

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Nonprofit organizations——

Mr. FALLON. OK. You do not know.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. And to oppose efforts——

Mr. FALLON. So, no. Madam Chair, I——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. To target organizations——

Mr. FALLON. Madam Chair, I reclaim my time.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. With views separate——

Mr. FALLON. Madam Chair?

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. From the Administration.

Mr. FALLON. Please freeze the time. You are here to testify and answer questions, and you will not answer the questions. You do not know what Fair Count is. I asked the question, do you know or not?

Ms. YENTEL. No.

Mr. FALLON. Have you ever heard of it? You have never heard of it. OK. It is a voter mobilization group for Black voters. That has nothing whatsoever to do with Green energy. And do you know, it just so happens, it is a mystery of the universe, it is a coincidence, that the president of that organization is a gal named—let us see where her name is. Her name is Jeanine McLean. Her middle name is Abrams because that is her maiden name. She is Stacey Abrams' sister. It is a miracle. You want to talk about incestuous. I mean, the Tides Center also was running an organization called Southern Economic Advancement Project. They got money as well, and they fund a lot of Hamas protest groups across the country.

So, this is incestuous, Madam Chair. It is back-dealing money laundering from nonprofits. Everyone up on this dais supports true charitable nonprofits, not political nonprofits, or basically government organizations, because it is funneling money into the pockets of democratic activists, nothing more. Case in point, Ms. Yentel, what is your total annual compensation?

Ms. YENTEL. I do not see how that is relevant. But if you are interested, it is public information, which is——

Mr. FALLON. Well——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Evidence of the accountability and transparency that nonprofits adhere to.

Mr. FALLON. Yes, your predecessor made $583,000. I suspect you get something similar.

Ms. YENTEL. I do not.

Mr. FALLON. You do not. Do you want to share?

Ms. YENTEL. That is not my salary.

Mr. FALLON. OK. But that was what——

Ms. YENTEL. You can Google it.

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. Your predecessor was because, as you said——

Ms. YENTEL. It is public information.

Mr. FALLON. it is publicly——

Ms. YENTEL. Yes.

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. Available information.

Ms. YENTEL. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. When you were the president of the, ironically, National Low Income Housing Coalition, what was your annual compensation?

Ms. YENTEL. That is not quite right, but would you like to——

Mr. FALLON. It was $399,000.

Ms. YENTEL. Would you like me to speak to executive salaries at nonprofits?

Mr. FALLON. It was $399,000, was it not?

Ms. YENTEL. Not quite, no.

Mr. FALLON. It was not? That is what it says. You are under oath.

Ms. YENTEL. I see that it says that. That was not my salary. Thank you.

Mr. FALLON. OK, so, all right. Well, we will check that out.

Ms. YENTEL. Please. Do.

Mr. FALLON. Madam Chair, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize Mr. Garcia from California.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Madam Chair.

We are obviously here for another hearing which has literally nothing to do with government efficiency. This Committee, of course, has talked about fencing, we have gone after foreign aid, and now we are going after community nonprofits, which actually help and support people. And our Committee is doing all of this without ever once getting testimony from Elon Musk, the head of DOGE, of which, of course, this Committee is now named from and, of course, who is now apparently leaving the White House as well.

Now, every Democrat on this Subcommittee voted to subpoena Elon Musk to come here and testify and be accountable to Congress, but that was blocked by our Republican colleagues, which, of course, in and of itself is irresponsible and outrageous. And you would think the Republicans on this Committee would want Elon Musk to testify just as much as we do.

Now, all our Republican colleagues might also want to ask Elon Musk about this message, which he actually just posted yesterday. Now, I am going to read this message Elon Musk posted. It says, "I'm sorry, but I just can't stand it anymore. This massive, outrageous, pork-filled congressional spending bill is a disgusting

abomination." And I will emphasize, "Shame on those who voted for it. You know you did wrong. You know it."

Now, this was actually just yesterday he actually posted this, which is pretty rough if you ask me. And on top of that, I would have printed it out, but just 20 minutes ago, he posted another message that says, "Call your Senator, call your Congressman. Bankrupting America is not OK. Kill the bill."

And, of course, we know the only people who voted for this bill are actually House Republicans, including every Republican in this room. All these Republicans here on this Committee, they all voted for this bill that now Elon Musk is saying should be killed and is saying is awful. I actually agree with Elon Musk on this. It takes healthcare away from 13 million Americans. It cuts food for veterans and seniors, all to finance, of course, huge tax breaks for the wealthy.

Now, it is also interesting because Chairwoman Greene, I understand, now regrets voting for this bill, as she mentioned yesterday. Is that correct, Chairwoman Greene?

Ms. GREENE. Are you yielding me time?

Mr. GARCIA. No, I am just asking if you are—I think you say now you regret voting for the bill. Is that correct?

Ms. GREENE. The bill actually destroys what you guys voted for, for the past 4 years, and I am proud to have voted for that bill to fund border security——

Mr. GARCIA. Actually, actually, Chairwoman Greene.

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. To deport all these illegals——

Mr. GARCIA. Yesterday——

Ms. GREENE [continuing]. You guys let in the country.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Chairwoman. Actually, Chairwoman, yesterday, you actually said that you regret actually voting for the bill. You posted after Elon's tweet that you did not know certain provisions were in it, and that you would have voted no if you had known. So, obviously, you did not do a thorough review of the bill.

And I am not surprised, of course, that Republicans in this Congress are now going back and forth on the bill. They voted for the bill. Now they want to oppose it. We do not know what to actually believe. And for instance, this is the same thing that is happening with other big programs like Social Security, which we know Elon Musk and DOGE have actually talked and attacked constantly over and over again. We know how badly already customer service has been hurt. People are waiting in long lines at Social Security offices, all because of these DOGE efforts.

Now, again, Chairwoman Greene invited to testify today one of our witnesses, and I think it is important to note this. Mr. Turner, you are one of our witnesses today, an expert on economics and a bunch of other things.

Mr. TURNER. I am not an economist.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Turner, you were invited to testify as an expert on government spending. This is your post. Is this correct? Did you post this, sir?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARCIA. OK. You called Social Security a Ponzi scheme——

Mr. TURNER. A hundred percent.

Mr. GARCIA [continuing]. Which we know Elon Musk has also done. I am glad you admitted it. "Social Security is a government-sponsored Ponzi scheme," as you said. Now, I——

Mr. TURNER. What about the second part, though, sir? "I should be able to keep 100 percent of my——

Mr. GARCIA. Sure, you can read the whole thing.

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. Money and not watch——

Mr. GARCIA. It is right up here.

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. Government waste it——

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, sir. This is my time, sir.

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. Giving $9 billion——

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, sir. My time.

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. Giving $9 billion——

Mr. GARCIA. Sir, reclaiming my time.

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. To climate groups."

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Chairwoman. Thank you. Thank you, sir. A Ponzi scheme. And so, I think it is interesting, of course, that as one of our Republican witnesses is calling Social Security a Ponzi scheme, and that is the person that we should be taking advice from here today. Without Social Security, 22 million people would be pushed into poverty. That includes over 16 million seniors and nearly 1 million children. And in fact, Elon Musk has also said and agreed with you, sir, that this is a Ponzi scheme. I think it is ironic that you are one of our witnesses talking about efficiency when you want to attack the single best program that we have to support people, not just out of poverty, but across this country to uplift them, to ensure they can afford a decent life.

We, on this Committee, need to work every single day, not just to protect Social Security, but to hold Republicans accountable for attacking Medicare, Medicaid, for attacking Social Security and the programs that we all depend on.

With that, I yield back. Thank you.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

I now recognize Mr. Timmons from South Carolina.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Madam Chair. It is hard to remember why we are here, given all the conversations we are having. But we are here because we have $37 trillion in debt, and we run a $1.8 trillion annual deficit. And we are here to seek out waste, fraud, and abuse, deliver on government efficiency, and try to right the fiscal ship of this country so we can have a country for another generation or two.

So, we are doing great work. We had a hearing a couple weeks ago with NPR and PBS, and we made clear to the American people that those two entities were not deserving of taxpayer dollars because they were not doing their job. They were wildly biased. They were wildly biased. And because of that, they do not deserve taxpayer funds. So, we are going to vote next week to stop giving them money.

And we are going along the same lines with this hearing because the EPA handed out $27 billion in the last year of the Biden Administration. And it was done really because they thought they were going to lose the election, and they wanted to get it out as quickly as possible. Biden appointees in the EPA specifically said

that the people that were getting the money were not deserving of that money, and there were a lot of concerns there.

Obviously, we have this conversation about one of the most egregious, which is Power Forward Communities. We keep talking about it. And Madam Chair, I would like to enter their 990 in for the record.

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. TIMMONS. So, this is from 2023. This is a less than a year-old entity. And as we have talked again and again, they had $100 in their account. And then the EPA, under the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, gave them $2 billion. Well, the funny thing is, is they did not give it all to them. They wanted to give it all, but the EPA said no. And so, now we are in this lawsuit where Citibank has the vast majority of it, and we are going to get it back. And that is why we are here. We are going to pass legislation. This is the hearing to show why this is ridiculous. This is, I would just say, waste. Maybe you would call it fraud. I do not know. It is definitely an abuse. So, this money is coming back. And this is the hearing to then warrant the rescission. And we are going to have a vote in a couple of weeks, and that is what we are doing and that is why we are here because we cannot spend money on ridiculous policies.

Mr. Turner, do you agree with me? Are we moving in the right direction here?

Mr. TURNER. Yes. And it is critical that we move in this direction. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TIMMONS. And this is just for the EPA. We have not even gotten into the border security nonsense. I mean, the invasion that was funded by taxpayer dollars over the last 4 years. The Biden Administration intentionally and systematically incentivized people to come into this country without knowing any idea who they were. And the best part is they are making Americans get these ridiculous vaccines, which we are going to talk about in a couple of weeks. But they do not have any tests for whether the people, the 20 million people they brought in this country, are vaccinated. The irony is just incredible.

So, back to the issue at hand. Power Forward Communities should not have $2 billion. Mr. Walter, do you agree that it is an egregious waste of taxpayer dollars to give $2 billion to a bunch of former Obama and Biden high-level employees?

Mr. WALTER. Absolutely.

Mr. TIMMONS. I will give you a better one. Do you think that they would have gotten this money if they were not the former HUD Secretary, the former OMB Director, the Special Assistant to Obama, the former Fannie Mae head for Obama? Do you think that if we just got a random group of Americans and said, hey, you want to go, you know, give clean energy appliances to reduce the carbon footprint of our country to a bunch of poor people? Do you want to go do that? Do you want to apply, and we will give you $2 billion? Mr. Walter, is there any world in which the EPA would have given a random group of people $2 billion?

Mr. WALTER. Not at all, and that is a critical part of the NGO sector in addition to the heroes who actually do charitable work.

Mr. TIMMONS. I will give you one better. Mr. Turner, should we be giving billions of dollars to 501(c)(3)s that have zero other income, 35,000 501(c)(3)s have zero other income. They are all government income. Should we do that?

Mr. TURNER. No, sir. And if I may, the egregious thing here is that they are bypassing the Congress. If you want to give Stacey Abrams——

Mr. TIMMONS. There is no transparency.

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. Two billion dollars, appropriate it. But they are using this process to bypass Congress because no one would put their name on a bill to give Stacey Abrams $2 billion.

Mr. TIMMONS. I could not agree with you more. And I am going to end with this. Dozens, dozens of 501(c)(3)s, tax-exempt organizations, organizations that we feel are pursuing some benevolent goal to improve the lives of Americans, dozens of these 501(c)(3)s, their CEOs make more than $10 million a year in salary. We have got to change this. I would put that in the waste, the fraud, and the abuse category, and we need to pass a law to make that better.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you.

I now recognize Ms. Crockett from Texas.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

It is interesting that we are talking about bypassing Congress. It seems like that is all that has happened, actually, this Congress. In fact, it is why we have had to spend so much time in courts. And thank God that we at least have one branch of government that has decided not to abdicate their duties and has decided that there are things such as, you know, impoundment. And so, when Congress does make a decision or does sign something into law or has been signed into law by a President, that you cannot just bring in your good little friend who helped you get elected to the tune of $300 million and say, hey, guy, you get to do whatever you want to, despite what these duly elected people have done.

But I digress. But I am going to get back to Elon because Elon is looming over every single DOGE hearing. You know why? Because that is supposedly what Elon was heading up. But now they do not want to talk about Elon because Elon now is a little upset. There is a family spat that is obviously going on, and it is going to play out, it seems like, all over Twitter.

But nevertheless, let us talk about some of the things that we should be talking about. And you know what? Every time I come in here, I really do wonder, what is the point? Like why are we here? Because it does not seem like we are doing efficiency, right? Like have we seen Elon? No. Have we seen anybody that works for DOGE? No. But we are in the DOGE Subcommittee, and we are talking to everybody but the DOGE people.

So, to hear the comments about Stacey Abrams, it really got me going. And a lot of times, when we come into this hearing room, it is all about politics. And it made me think that there was an issue most likely with Stacey because someone actually brought up the fact that Stacey has run for Governor a couple of times, and it seems like there is a gubernatorial race that is coming up in Georgia, and nobody knows whether or not Stacey is going to run.

So, why not muddy the water if we can to hopefully keep a strong Black woman down? But again, I digress.

So, let us talk about the things that we could be talking about while we sit here in the DOGE Committee. It seems like we could be talking about, you know, things like efficiency or oversight. When announcing this hearing, the chairwoman stated the DOGE Subcommittee would "continue bringing long overdue transparency and accountability to those who abuse tax dollars." But so far this Congress, Republicans have focused their oversight responsibilities on things like defunding Big Bird, as well as attacking, of course, trans kids because they are really the big threat that we have.

We could be talking about how the Trump Administration is ignoring these court orders, supporting American citizens, or targeting Members of Congress for prosecution, or how Trump signed an order deregulating the cryptocurrency industry just as his family launched a digital currency. We could be having a hearing on how Trump fired members of the National Labor Relations Board for bringing a suit against Elon Musk or how the Trump Administration dismantled the Office of the Federal Contract Compliance while the office was investigating Tesla for alleged racial harassment. Or how Trump dropped lawsuits against numerous large companies after they donated to his inaugural fund. We could have a hearing on whether Trump violated the emoluments clause when he not only—it seemed like he asked for a $400 million jet from a foreign government.

Trump has put a for-sale sign on the lawn of the White House and has allowed wealthy donors to dictate how the government operates. That is what we should be having a hearing about. But nope, they are here attacking nonprofits that deliver food to seniors and disabled folk, provide childcare and eldercare for working families, job training for teens, and shelter for the unhoused. The Republicans and their witnesses have accused nonprofits of being "radical" "addicted to government money."

And listen, I try to find agreement where I can, so I am going to say that I absolutely do agree with that statement to a certain extent because there is a nonprofit by the name of The Heritage Foundation. And last time I checked The Heritage Foundation, they are the authors of Project 2025, and we are living through the hell of Project 2025 right now. And something tells me that that is a bit of a partisan thing because they said it was the conservative playbook. So, as far as I am concerned, I do not know why we would ever look at The Heritage Foundation and think that it is anything but "radical" and "addicted to government money" potentially.

So, Ms. Yentel, before I do that, I am going to come to you because I want to make sure that I get these things on record. I have a unanimous consent, Madam Chair. It says "Donald Trump allegedly asked aides whether Elon Musk's DOGE promises were all bull-" and then you know what the rest of it is. Unanimous consent?

Ms. GREENE. Without objection.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much. I have another one from CBS News. "Despite Trump's promised cuts, U.S. spent more than $200 billion more in the first 100 days than last year."

Ms. GREENE. Without objection.

Ms. CROCKETT. If some reason we focused on some efficiency, we may have more money to work toward this deficit that some of my colleagues say that they are concerned about. And I guess, Ms. Yentel, I am going to run out of time because if we were going to focus on this deficit, then maybe you would not have your own friends coming out and talking about how we are going to have to lift the debt ceiling $5 trillion because how else can we pay for the billionaires to keep more money in their pockets?

Thank you, and I will yield.

Ms. GREENE. The gentlelady yields.

And for the record, The Heritage Foundation receives no Federal funding.

I now recognize Mr. Burchett from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Chairlady.

I think the irony of all ironies here is that our friends across the aisle keep bringing up Elon Musk and what a great person he is, and I guess about a week ago they were out to kill him, so this is a backward day, as always.

Mr. Krikorian, Alejandro Mayorkas served as the United States' border czar for 4 years. What did he do before his appointment?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. He is an attorney, and he was on the board of, among other things, HIAS, which is the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, which is one of the nonprofit groups that resettles refugees and was also involved in this movement of illegal immigrants up through Latin America.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK. Do you think it is a good thing that Mayorkas served at an NGO whose goal was mass migrant resettlement in the U.S.?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Well, I disagree with the goal, obviously, but no, I think it was a problem because there was a kind of, you know, conflict of interest there. I mean, he was essentially implementing a government policy and having these nonprofit groups—like HIAS, but many others—sort of as proxies to promote the policies that the administration was trying to implement.

Mr. BURCHETT. Well, in 2021 alone, this organization received over $40.9 million in grants from the Department of Health and Human Services, State, and Homeland Security. Don't you think that is a direct conflict of interest?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Yes, in the sense that some of that was spent on migration causes, yes, I think so. And that probably was at least part of the reason that the House impeached Secretary Mayorkas.

Mr. BURCHETT. I guess it is a little bit like a Congressman becoming a lobbyist.

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Kind of, I guess.

Mr. BURCHETT. A whole lot of——

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Nothing personal against anybody here.

Mr. BURCHETT. That is all right. Well, none of us better be lobbyists or we need to go to jail.

At what point do you believe humanitarian aid and assistance becomes material support for illegal activity?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. I am not sure I would be able to draw, kind of, a specific line and say here is where it is. But at this scale, there is simply no way that these organizations did not see themselves

as part of a network to subvert U.S. immigration law. You know, the occasional provision of, you know, water to somebody who is in real distress is one thing. Setting up a network, essentially a kind of aid station network——

Mr. BURCHETT. A pipeline so to speak?

Mr. KRIKORIAN [continuing]. To South—a pipeline from South America to the border is not something that you—it is not comparable in any way. It is not just different in scale. It is different in kind.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes. Myself and the Chairlady, she is my cosponsor on a bill to literally defund the Taliban. As it turns out, we are sending them close to $40 million a week. I have a State Department document that was a classified document. It has become unclassified that we have given them close to $5 billion with a B. Although that is not big numbers here, I can assure you in east Tennessee, that is a whole heck of a lot of money.

Would you have any idea how many—any of you all have any idea how many NGOs that we believe could be working out of Afghanistan right now? Anybody have a shot in the dark?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. No, I have no idea, I am afraid, sorry.

Mr. BURCHETT. Would you believe close to 1,000? 1,000.

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Yes.

Mr. BURCHETT. And yet, Congress in its infinite wisdom has taken almost, and we are working on 2 years now, to get this bill out and get it to the Senate and get them to pass it. To me, it is criminal. It is criminal what these organizations are doing. $40 million a week to the Taliban. They throw gay folks off of buildings. They rape women and children, and then they stone the women after, somehow, it is their fault. I mean, these are godless creatures and we are funding them with our tax dollars. And Americans, I believe, are getting rich off of it. I believe that some of the money is flowing back here through some of these NGOs, and I would sure like to see that paper trail solidified in my mind so I could point to it. And if the Member of Congress, again, they need to be led out of here in handcuffs.

Would any of you like to comment on any of that, kind of a——

Ms. YENTEL. I would like to say, sir, that nonprofit organizations, if they are working in Afghanistan, it is to meet the tremendous humanitarian needs that exist——

Mr. BURCHETT. I can assure you that, ma'am, yes, but——

Ms. YENTEL. I think conflating nonprofits with the Taliban is deeply dangerous and reckless.

Mr. BURCHETT. Well, actually, ma'am, they actually take a cutoff of everything that goes through there just like the mob would. There are three major banks, and they get their money off, and it has been documented by government officials.

And I have run out of time. Chairlady, I yield nothing back to you.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Burchett. Honored to be a co-sponsor of your Defund the Taliban bill.

I now recognize Mr. Moskowitz from Florida for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, for allowing me to waive on to today's Committee under the rules of the Oversight Committee. I appreciate it as I tried to waive on to a previous

meeting and was barred, so I do appreciate you allowing me to attend today.

You know, I was the first Democrat member to join the DOGE Caucus in Congress. Took a lot of crap for it, by the way. And I did it for the right reason because I thought government can get smaller, government can save money, and government can be more efficient. That poll is in the 1980's. Most Americans know that.

And I thought we were really interested in the E part of DOGE, efficiency, OK? But ask yourself, what have we made more efficient in the 6 months that DOGE has been around? Yes, there are things we have found that should not exist, but name a department, name a system, name a service that this Committee or the caucus or Elon has made more efficient. They said they were going to find $1 trillion. They fell 85 percent short.

Look, government is inefficient, but the DOGE Caucus and process was like, hold my beer, let me show you what inefficiency really looks like, OK? The DOGE Caucus has not met in months. It had two meetings. Congress was not involved at all in the process in the executive branch. Elon's gone, the effort is dead, buried. Rigor mortis is setting in. I feel sorry, ill, talking of the dead. I should not do that.

But I mean, seriously, the Newark Airport, that is the key example for the American people. You want to talk about how did we make government more efficient? We did not. We made government the Newark Airport. And by the way, now that the national divorce is happening with Elon Musk—and I am a child of divorce, OK? I mean, who is going to get Big Balls? I am worried about him in the divorce. The children always get caught in the middle, right? You know, if he is out there, I just want him to know we are rooting for him.

Certainly, we have not made FEMA more efficient. The Administrator apparently does not know there is a hurricane season. Wait till he finds out there are five categories. We are going to blow his mind. Nothing has been made more efficient by DOGE. No new technology in any of these departments, no lower costs, has not happened, right? We promised to tackle the national deficit and debt. They have not done that. They have made it worse by the big, bloated abomination bill, OK? I mean, Elon has turned on them, but he is telling the truth. The bill will add to the deficit, and it will add to the debt.

And so, listen, I ask my colleagues, point to me one thing we have made more efficient. If you want to drop the E from DOGE because we have not done efficiency, that is fine. We can rename it. We can always rebrand. They are great at that. But nothing has been made more efficient.

Here are the wins for congressional Republicans. You ready? They are going to do a $9 billion rescission bill, OK, which they are going to get rid of Elmo, which the American people were clamoring for, OK? But they are going to add $2.4 trillion to the debt, $9 billion versus $2.4 trillion. And then they want us to cheer for them and give them a trophy like they are a 5-year-old at a soccer game. Everyone gets a trophy for their participation, OK?

By the way, these things I am bringing up, Republicans themselves, including the Chairwoman, have expressed their frustration

that Congress has not codified anything at all. And so, look, it is interesting. Elon just retweeted this. "When are we going to flatten the curve?" It is fascinating.

[Poster]

We are using COVID graphics and COVID slogans. This is the debt. This is not COVID cases, OK?

And yet my Republican colleagues have always talked about the debt and deficit. I went out, I bought the debt clock that Thomas Massie wears, $99, by the way. I do not know if that is a great deal, but, you know, like 2-hour battery life. He told me you got to, like, if you dim the screen, it will last a little longer. Wow, it is still going up. It does not seem like these DOGE cuts, right, or this rescission bill have handled anything with the debt or deficit.

And so, yes, look, yes, Elon is—we love dark Elon now. Oh, yes, this is interesting times, right? And Republicans will say, oh, wait, he was a patriot. He left his companies. He was doing the right thing. That is what they said for 6 months. Now, they are saying, well, he is just mad because he is losing his EV credits. He did not get his Starlink thing. They got rid of his NASA Administrator, OK?

Look, we have got to do this together, guys, on a bipartisan basis to tackle the debt. I asked the Speaker to put a budget commission together to get Democrats and Republicans on a bipartisan basis to tackle the debt, but that bill should die.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

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

I now recognize Mr. Burlison from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Chairwoman, and thank you to our witnesses for being here.

I just want to remind people there is a huge difference between money that an individual voluntarily gives to a nonprofit or charity and the money that is forcibly taken from taxpayers and funneled through this town into a nonprofit or charity. There is a huge difference, correct, Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. Absolutely.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Krikorian?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Yes, of course.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. BURLISON. And Ms. Yentel, wouldn't you agree there is a huge difference?

Ms. YENTEL. There is a difference, sure.

Mr. BURLISON. OK. Thank you.

Ms. YENTEL. And there is a difference in accounting——

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. And auditing and——

Mr. BURLISON. There is. Thank you.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Transparency as well.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you. I am going to get my time back here.

Ms. YENTEL. Sure.

Mr. BURLISON. It is a simple question.

So, with that being said, the problem that it does not seem like anyone is recognizing is that we forcibly took money from taxpayers, and then these groups—then it was appropriated through

the Biden Administration, billions, billions of taxpayer dollars to organizations that were stood up overnight, organizations that did not have a longstanding history. These were not nonprofits. For example, *The Free Press* investigation revealed that of the $27 billion that was granted through the EPA, $20 billion went out the door to eight nonprofit groups right after Biden lost the election. $20 billion shoved out the door immediately. Several of them were formed that year, since August of that year.

So, Mr. Walter, did your organization—do you guys get billions of dollars when Republicans are in charge?

Mr. WALTER. We have never taken a penny from any level of government across 4 decades of existence.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. Sir, if I got $2 billion from the taxpayers, I would be in jail right now.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Krikorian?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. We have had contracts in the past with the Census Bureau and the Justice Department, but nobody has given us $2 billion. If you know anybody who is in the market for that, I am—give them my phone number.

Mr. BURLISON. Yes, so, I think that—here is the point to the American people. When the Republicans are in charge, we are not doling out your money to our friends and our family. We are not raiding the coffers. We are not putting America into more debt and more debt and more debt to fund these nonprofits.

Look, Mr. Walter, if somebody wants to give to Stacey Abrams' new venture or nonprofit, they can do that, right? She can stand up a nonprofit.

Mr. WALTER. Absolutely.

Mr. BURLISON. But the question is, Mr. Krikorian, nobody wants to open up their checkbook, right?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. I wish. Yeas, I have been working on that.

Mr. BURLISON. And that is the very reason why they come to this town is to convince lawmakers, their friends, their family member, their ally, to write a check that no one in the private sector would want to write, for an effort that no one really would want to believe in.

Mr. Turner, is it true that the Biden senior Climate Policy Advisor, Jahai Weiss, directed $5 billion to Coalition for Green Capital?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. BURLISON. And let us point out, she worked for the Coalition for Green Capital, right? She previously worked for them?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Mr. BURLISON. So, she sent money to the organization that she—$5 billion. Is that not blatant corruption, Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. And not only that, sir, $5 billion is very difficult to spend. Five billion dollars is an absurd amount of money. We heard a Congresswoman talk about the jet that President Trump got. That was $400 million. This is $5 billion.

Mr. BURLISON. It is——

Mr. TURNER. It is impossible to spend $5 billion ethically.

Mr. BURLISON. Yes, to put that in context, I remember being in the state of Missouri, and Missourians, at one point, we spent, whenever I was a lawmaker, we spent $5 billion for all the school

districts in the state of Missouri, OK? So, they funded every school district, the state funds. That was $5 billion.

How much money did the Biden Administration give specifically to Rewiring America initiative, where Mrs. Abrams was brought on as a senior counsel?

Mr. TURNER. Approximately $2 billion.

Mr. BURLISON. Two billion dollars. So, let me get this straight. Progressive loyalists like Abrams and other senior admin officials left the admin and feathered their nest on their way out with our taxpayer dollars, correct?

Mr. TURNER. Correct.

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

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

I now recognize Ms. Pressley from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you to our witnesses for being here today.

What we are witnessing from occupant Trump, his Administration, and Republicans writ large is not governance. It is a targeted, dangerous assault on the independence of our nonprofit organizations. We have seen these attacks take many forms, perhaps most visibly in my own district, the Massachusetts 7th, as the Administration continues its unlawful campaign against Harvard University. Trump has threatened to revoke Harvard's tax-exempt status, freeze billions in Federal funding for scientific research to save lives, might I add, and publicly vilify students and faculty, all part and parcel of his attacks on education.

But let me make it plain. This is not just about Harvard, and it is definitely not about government efficiency, the name of this Subcommittee. This is about Trump and Republicans punishing people who disagree with them. It is about attacking nonprofits of all sizes that serve the vulnerable and marginalized and stand in the gap for our communities. It is about trying to intimidate every charity and nonprofit in this country and spark a fear that if you speak up, if you do something the Republicans do not like, you could be next—a hospital that provides abortion care, a local food pantry that feeds immigrants, or an advocacy group that fights for civil rights.

Donald Trump is weaponizing our tax laws to attack nonprofits. At the same time, he is pushing for tax cuts for Elon Musk and billionaires.

Ms. Yentel, can the President or executive branch legally revoke a nonprofit's tax-exempt status simply because it disagrees with that organization's lawful speech or mission?

Ms. YENTEL. They cannot. The statute is very clear that that is illegal.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you. Republicans think the answer is yes, but that would mean every nonprofit in America is just one tweet away from being targeted by the Federal Government.

I am proud that in the Massachusetts 7th, community-based organizations are speaking up and fighting back against Republican attacks, and I know they are doing it at risk of serious threat. Ms. Yentel, can you make plain what are the consequences to charities and nonprofits losing tax-exempt status?

Ms. YENTEL. Well, tax-exempt status is given to nonprofit organizations that do essential work to meet needs in their local commu-

nities in exchange for significant transparency and accountability. And if nonprofit organizations lose their tax-exempt status, it could create significant challenges for them to be able to do their work related to how and where they get their funding, and it could cause them to have to shut down their work altogether.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Their work, which is to the betterment of us all.

Ms. YENTEL. Which is to meet——

Ms. PRESSLEY. To the collective.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Global needs.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Our shared constituents.

Ms. YENTEL. Yes.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Very good. Let us put this in perspective. Trump is firing government workers that administer programs like Head Start and Social Security, while also attacking nonprofits that provide resources and supports to vulnerable populations. Trump and his Republican cult do not care about helping people who are struggling. Instead, they want to make them suffer more.

Now, before I yield back, let me ask the Republican witnesses if you all think Trump is right for revoking tax-exempt status for nonprofits for their political views, raise your hand then if you think The Heritage Foundation, who wrote Project 2025, should also lose their tax-exempt status. Show of hands by the logic that is being applied.

Mr. WALTER. I am not aware of any nonprofit that has had its status revoked.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Again, the question that I am posing is, would you please raise your hand if you think The Heritage Foundation, who wrote Project 2025, should also lose their tax-exempt status? Show of hands.

Mr. WALTER. It is perfectly reasonable speech by a nonprofit.

Ms. PRESSLEY. So, none of you. So, none of you. None of you. The shame and the sham of it all.

Before I yield back, Ms. Yentel, I know that you have been harangued intensely throughout today's proceedings. Is there anything that you would like to set the record straight on or respond to in my remaining time?

Ms. YENTEL. Thank you, Congresswoman. I would like to use the remaining time to remind us all, and every Member of this Committee, of the vital, essential work that nonprofit organizations do in each of your communities for your constituents and the work that we do to support them in that work. nonprofit organizations are local. They are transparent and accountable. They are nonpartisan by law and in practice, and they do essential work to meet the needs of all of your communities and all Americans. Thank you.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Thank you. I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentlelady yields.

I now recognize Mr. Gill from Texas.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Madam Chair, for holding this hearing.

I would like to begin with Ms. Yentel. You have written a lot about anti-racism and White fragility and things like that. Do you believe that President Trump is a racist?

Ms. YENTEL. I do not believe that is relevant to this hearing.

Mr. GILL. Do you believe that he is?

Ms. YENTEL. I am not here to discuss my personal beliefs. I am here to speak about the important work that nonprofits do——

Mr. GILL. You have tweeted that he is a vile——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Across the country.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Despicable racist. Do you believe that much of his housing policy was racist during his first term?

Ms. YENTEL. I am here to talk about the vital work that nonprofit organizations——

Mr. GILL. So, you are not going to answer me?

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Do throughout our country——

Mr. GILL. You have tweeted that——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. And in your district.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. "It's explicitly racist and deeply harmful." Is that right?

Ms. YENTEL. I do not have the tweet in front of me. I cannot answer.

Mr. GILL. I have got it right here. You did tweet that. You tweeted that on September 25, 2020. You said, "It's explicitly racist and deeply harmful." Do you know who President Trump's Secretary of Housing and Urban Development was during his first term?

Ms. YENTEL. Yes.

Mr. GILL. Who is it? Who was it?

Ms. YENTEL. It was Secretary Carson.

Mr. GILL. It was Ben Carson. Do you believe that Ben Carson is racist or a White supremacist?

Ms. YENTEL. With all due respect, sir, I am not here to talk about former HUD secretaries. I am here to talk about the essential work——

Mr. GILL. You tweeted extensively about it.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. That nonprofits do in your district and throughout the country.

Mr. GILL. OK. We can move on then if you will not answer the question. Are you a racist?

Ms. YENTEL. With all due respect, sir, I am here to talk about the essential work that nonprofits do——

Mr. GILL. Excuse me. That is a very——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Throughout the country.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Simple question, yes or no question. Are you a racist?

Ms. YENTEL. I am not a racist.

Mr. GILL. You are not a racist. Particularly interesting because, according to one of your affiliate charities under your nonprofit umbrella, denial of racism constitutes covert White supremacy. Are you a covert White supremacist?

Ms. YENTEL. Sir, I am here to talk about the essential work that nonprofits do.

Mr. GILL. Are you a covert White supremacist?

Ms. YENTEL. Can I talk about the work that nonprofits do in your district?

Mr. GILL. No, I am asking you if you are——

Ms. YENTEL. Because I think that is——

Mr. GILL [continuing]. A covert White supremacist, which according to one of your own organizations, again, denial of racism constitutes covert White supremacy. Would you——

Ms. YENTEL. I am sorry, what is——

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Like to answer the question?

Ms. YENTEL. I do not know what the question is.

Mr. GILL. So, you refuse to answer whether you are a covert White supremacist.

Ms. YENTEL. I am here to talk about the essential work that nonprofits do. If you would like to ask me a question about——

Mr. GILL. I am utterly dumbfounded.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Nonprofits——

Mr. GILL. You are on record right now——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. In your district——

Mr. GILL [continuing]. And you will not say——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Or throughout the country.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. That you are not a covert White supremacist?

Ms. YENTEL. I do not have a definition in front of me. I haven't looked at the definition. I am not going to answer a question about my personal views.

Mr. GILL. That is——

Ms. YENTEL. I am here to talk about the work of——

Mr. GILL. You are not——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Nonprofit organizations.

Mr. GILL. No, I want to give you one more chance to do this. Are you a covert White supremacist?

Ms. YENTEL. Why are we so off track from the——

Mr. GILL. No, I am asking you——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Topic of this hearing?

Mr. GILL. I am asking you a very straightforward question.

Ms. YENTEL. I have heard your question. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GILL. And you are not going to answer whether you are a covert White supremacist?

Ms. YENTEL. I would like to answer questions about the work——

Mr. GILL. This is wildly painful.

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Of nonprofit organizations. Thank you.

Mr. GILL. That is really, really astounding. I can answer very directly that I am not a covert White supremacist, and I imagine all of my colleagues can as well. I think you ought to reevaluate what you are doing in the nonprofit sector. If you cannot answer that in a straightforward way, that is astounding.

Let me ask you another question. Do you believe that it is appropriate to host and promote LGBTQ+ meetups for 9-year-olds?

Ms. YENTEL. I am here to support the vital work of nonprofits, and I will say to oppose the Federal Government——

Mr. GILL. Do you——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Targeting groups——

Mr. GILL. My question is——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. With views that are different——

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Do you believe it is appropriate to host and promote——

Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. From its own.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. LGBTQ+ meetups for 9-year-olds?
Ms. YENTEL. I believe that the Federal Government——
Mr. GILL. Because one of your affiliate nonprofits does do that.
Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Should not target organizations that have views different from its own. That is wrong. Whatever party is in control, whatever administration is in control.
Mr. GILL. I think it—I think a lot of this is wrong.
Ms. YENTEL. To use Federal power——
Mr. GILL. Do you think that it is appropriate for young children to use gender transition paraphernalia?
Ms. YENTEL. I——
Mr. GILL. Because one of your affiliated——
Ms. YENTEL. I have no idea how that is——
Mr. GILL [continuing]. Nonprofit organizations gives bras, binders, breast forms, nipples—I am not even going to repeat this because it is so disgusting—for children of all ages.
Ms. STANSBURY. Point of order, Madam Chair. The gentleman is breaching decorum and attacking the witness. Can we please move on to something——
Mr. GILL. I am not attacking the witness.
Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Relevant to the actual——
Mr. GILL. I am simply asking a straightforward——
MS. Stansbury. [continuing] Issue at hand, sir.
Mr. GILL [continuing]. Question.
Ms. GREENE. Mr. Gill, I will be extending your time. You have been interrupted.
Mr. GILL. Thank you. Thank you. Do you believe that art exploration camps for transgender and gender diverse youth of the age of 11 is normal?
Ms. YENTEL. We support the vital work of nonprofit organizations and oppose the Federal Government opposing——
Mr. GILL. So——
Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. And targeting organizations.
Mr. GILL. So, you refuse to answer any of these questions. You refuse to even answer the question of whether you are a covert White supremacist.
Ms. YENTEL. I am not here to answer questions about my personal views or my personal stance.
Mr. GILL. Is that because you do not want to disclose whether you are a covert White supremacist?
Ms. YENTEL. I am here to talk about the essential work that——
Mr. GILL. I am giving you a chance——
Ms. YENTEL [continuing]. Nonprofits do.
Mr. GILL [continuing]. To tell the world that you are not a covert White supremacist.
Ms. YENTEL. Thank you for the chance.
Mr. GILL. Will you do that?
Ms. YENTEL. I will pass on your chance.
Mr. GILL. You will pass on that?
Ms. YENTEL. Thank you, sir.
Mr. GILL. That is astounding. That is really astounding. You are a radical far left activist, and you are masquerading as somebody promoting nonprofit, nonpartisan institutions and you will not even

tell this Committee that you are not a covert White supremacist. That is astounding.

I yield my time back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

Witnesses are reminded you are under oath, and you are here to answer questions to the Committee.

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

Mr. CASAR. Chairwoman Greene, you and my Republican colleagues have called this hearing that is all about cutting off money to nonprofits for things that are "contrary to the national interest." What we have heard here is my Republican colleagues going after nuns and priests that feed immigrants, going after nonprofits that do scary things like support our queer youth. It is astounding to me.

But we do have one nonprofit leader here, Mr. Krikorian. Mr. Krikorian, you are the Director of the Center for Immigration Studies, correct?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Yes.

Mr. CASAR. And according to your organization's website, you do receive taxpayer funding or have from the Department of Justice and the Census Bureau?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Yes, we did research contracts for them many years ago.

Mr. CASAR. Got it. And so, you do have a taxpayer-funded nonprofit, and your nonprofit, as we have discussed in Committee before, has shared articles from Kevin MacDonald, whose work argues that Jewish people, alleged by him, are "genetically driven to destroy Western societies." Is that correct?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. We distributed no such article.

Mr. CASAR. But you did distribute work from this antisemite, correct?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. We distributed work all across the spectrum——

Mr. CASAR. Right, from this——

Mr. KRIKORIAN [continuing]. *New York Times* to anyone else.

Mr. CASAR [continuing]. Antisemite. Got it.

OK. Your organization has also circulated an article by Holocaust denier John Friend. Is that correct? You said last time we were in a hearing that, yes, you have——

Mr. KRIKORIAN. We have distributed——

Mr. CASAR [continuing]. Distributed that?

Mr. KRIKORIAN [continuing]. No articles about Holocaust denial, obviously. That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. CASAR. But you have from Holocaust denier John Friend?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. I do not know, but I assume so, yes. I mean——

Mr. CASAR. Your website right here does——

Mr. KRIKORIAN. OK.

Mr. CASAR [continuing]. Talk about that.

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Yes.

Mr. CASAR. So, I have a yes or no question. Is promoting the work of Holocaust deniers and antisemites contrary to the national interest?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Promoting Holocaust denial, and what have you, is contrary to the national interest. That is why we have not done it.

Mr. CASAR. But you have promoted the work of Holocaust deniers——

Mr. KRIKORIAN. There was——

Mr. CASAR [continuing]. Like John Friend.

Mr. KRIKORIAN. There were several examples. We have also promoted the work of open-borders people in that broad—that effort to present a broad range of views, absolutely. And we do not endorse one way or the other.

Mr. CASAR. And so, you have promoted the work of Holocaust deniers, but have you received anything from DOGE asking whether they want to cut your funding? Have Republicans called you in to ask about your nonprofit and said, hey, we do not like that you have promoted the work of Holocaust deniers? Have you had any funding cut by DOGE——

Mr. KRIKORIAN. We do not——

Mr. CASAR [continuing]. Or by this Committee?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. We do not get any funding to be cut.

Mr. CASAR. But you have received Department of Justice funding——

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Decades ago, yes, yes.

Mr. CASAR. And so, look, let me just be real clear here. This hearing is not about taking on nonprofits that are going "against the national interest" or who are "extreme." This is all about trying to shut down nonprofits who might share political views that are different from that of the President of the United States.

This hearing, they are going after organizations they call radical because they are kind to kids that are having trouble in school, kind to kids that are trying to figure out who they are in the world. They are going after nonprofits, and you, sir, and your nonprofit are saying that the radical people are the priests and nuns that feed the hungry, the nonprofit organizations that, yes, give shelter to immigrants. And I understand your Center of Immigration Studies does not like immigration very much. But let me tell you, the radical folks are not the folks out there doing good. The radical folks that you might disagree with, their version of the good, but the radical folks are the people that in your face come to this Committee hearing and are sharing through their websites, through their listservs, articles by Holocaust deniers. And you are saying, yes, we did not share the Holocaust-denying articles, but we shared some of his other stuff.

I will make my last point here clear. I represent Texas. I have longstanding ties to the city of El Paso where in 2019, 23 people were murdered at a Walmart. The murderer said, "It was based on the Hispanic invasion of Texas." And after the shooting, Mr. Krikorian, you said that the manifesto was "remarkably well-written." Can you tell us which part of his manifesto was remarkably well-written?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. What I meant by that was for—that it seemed improbable for a nutcase like that to have written something that was relatively at least grammatically correct. That was my point.

Mr. CASAR. Look, folks here on this Committee are trying to shut down nonprofits because they disagree with them. You are a nonprofit and you, sir, are saying that the El Paso shooter had a manifesto that is remarkably well-written.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman's time has expired.
Mr. CASAR. That is extreme, and what——
Ms. GREENE. The gentleman's——
Mr. CASAR [continuing]. Goes around comes around.
Ms. GREENE. The gentleman's time——
Mr. CASAR. And it is just important——
Ms. GREENE [continuing]. Has expired.
Mr. CASAR. Chairwoman. OK.
Ms. GREENE. I now recognize Mr. Jack from Georgia for 5 minutes.
Mr. CASAR. Chairwoman, I just want to make clear——
Mr. JACK. Thank you, Madam Chair.
Mr. CASAR [continuing]. That what goes around can come around.
Mr. JACK. And thank you, Madam Chair.
As one of two Georgians on this Committee, yourself included, Madam Chair, I would like to first rebut the charge from one of our Democrat colleagues that we are today trying to politically tear down Stacey Abrams. To remind our Democrat colleagues, Madam Chair, a majority of Georgia voters have twice rejected Stacey Abrams in 2018, by 2 percent; in 2022, by 8 percent. So, there is no need for this committee to politically tear down Stacey Abrams when the people of Georgia already have.
But this Committee is focused on eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse across our government. And again, the purpose of our hearing today is to talk about waste, fraud, and abuse among non-governmental organizations or nonprofits. And if I could start, Ms. Yentel, as the president and CEO of the National Council of Nonprofits, is it fair to characterize your organization as an informed source of data for nonprofits and NGOs?
Ms. YENTEL. Sorry, yes, sir.
Mr. JACK. And how many, just an estimate, how many NGOs receive a majority of their money from the government as opposed to citizens, to the best of your knowledge?
Ms. YENTEL. The latest number I saw is that about 27 percent of nonprofit organizations receive Federal funding.
Mr. JACK. Does it concern you at all that a non-governmental organization is receiving a majority of its funding from the government?
Ms. YENTEL. Well, I did not say it was the majority. Let me correct myself. Thank you. Twenty-seven percent of nonprofit organizations receive some of their funding from the Federal Government.
It does not concern me, no. The Federal Government appropriates funds to be used for specific purposes, and they often partner with nonprofit organizations who are best equipped and able to meet local needs with that funding.
Mr. JACK. OK. Mr. Walter, in your opening statement and your written testimony as well, I think you addressed this. Could you inform and expound upon the issue that I see, and I always think you see, that a non-governmental organization is receiving a majority of its funding from the government? To me, that is totally contrary to the title of the organization itself.

Mr. WALTER. Sure. And the statistic from Candid, which is a nonprofit group, is about 35,000 receive the majority of their funding from government. And that is obviously a dangerous thing. Now, some of them may do good work, but of course, as everybody in Washington, DC. knows, if you are getting Federal dollars, you deserve a lot of scrutiny. The idea that they should just be passed over without scrutiny is quite unreasonable.

Mr. JACK. Without——

Ms. YENTEL. Can I add?

Mr. JACK. I am sorry. I am going to continue on——

Ms. YENTEL. OK.

Mr. JACK [continuing]. My line of questioning. And thank you.

Mr. Krikorian, I want to also give you an opportunity just to affirm for the record. I know one of our Democrat colleagues tried to suggest that you were immune from DOGE cuts. I heard you loud and clear, though. The funding and the contracts with Department of Justice and the Census Bureau were, to your point, decades ago. You are not receiving government funding right now.

Mr. KRIKORIAN. No.

Mr. JACK. Thank you.

So, earlier today, Mr. Krikorian, we had the Administrator of the Small Business Administration testify before the Small Business Committee. And the reason I mention that is, one of the issues we talked about was trying to turn off and eliminate the incentive structure that rewarded illegal immigration over the last 4 years under Joe Biden's Administration. Specifically, we talked about relocating small business offices from sanctuary cities or sanctuary jurisdictions to jurisdictions that honor Federal law enforcement law and immigration law.

And I bring that up because I would love for you in these last 90 seconds to walk us through what happened these last 4 years. If you want to look at the incentive structure that rewarded illegal immigration, I suspect you could look no further than a lot of nonprofits that operated on our southern border. So, I would welcome thoughts for you in closing in this hearing.

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Yes, absolutely. I mean, the whole point of enforcing immigration law is to make it impractical to live here as an illegal immigrant. In other words, it is not even just not rewarding, obviously it is that, but it is also to make it difficult. It is why you should not get driver's licenses for illegal immigrants, that sort of thing.

And so, what nonprofit groups during the previous administration did, and frankly, even before that, was to make it practical, to make it easier for illegal immigrants to live here illegally, thereby kind of undoing any deterrent effect or any incentive to self-deport, to go home. And so, that is one of the things that we need to reverse is to not just take away the incentives but to make it impractical to remain here so that people will take the Administration up on its offer of a free plane ticket home and $1,000 when you get home. There has to be some reason you want to do that. What a lot of nonprofit groups have done is take away the incentive to go home, and that needs to change.

Mr. JACK. And by the way, 70 to 75 percent of Americans agree and support President Trump's immigration policies, House Republicans' border priorities.

Just closing number from you and statistic, can you estimate over the last 4 years how much taxpayer money was funding, to your point, the incentive structure we are trying to eliminate today?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. I wish I had a number, but it is all over. It is billions, but I have no idea how much exactly.

Mr. JACK. Billions of dollars.

With that, Madam Chair, I yield.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

I now recognize Mr. Gosar from Arizona.

Mr. TURNER. Ma'am, excuse me. May I ask a question first before the Congressman speaks? I apologize for the rare point of order.

I was not able to ask Mr. Casar before he ran out the room, but he was looking at the witnesses talking about a murderer and said, "What goes around comes around." And I do not know what that comment meant. I do not have the luxury of Capitol Hill police to protect me. In the climate space, we get a lot of death threats. We got a lot of hate. The climate environmental groups——

Ms. GREENE. Mr.——

Mr. TURNER. [continuing] Are the original violence. I just do not know "What goes around comes around" meant.

Ms. GREENE. Mr. Turner, we will address you feeling threatened as soon as the hearing has ended. Thank you very much.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. GREENE. Yes. Mr. Gosar is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you for allowing me to sit down.

President Trump has worked tirelessly to weed out the waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars by nongovernmental organizations or NGOs. And my home state of Arizona is at the forefront of these issues where NGOs are shipping illegal aliens into the United States. Question for each one of you. Have you heard of the United Nations Resolution 1996/31 titled "Consultative Relationship between the United Nations and non-government organizations"?

Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. I am sorry, no.

Mr. GOSAR. How about you, Mr.——

Mr. KRIKORIAN. No, I have not.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. I am not familiar, sir.

Mr. GOSAR. How about you, Ms. Yentel?

Ms. YENTEL. No.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, I am going to give you some cliff notes on this one, OK? It states that if the U.N. gives money to an NGO that also receives voluntary contributions, the NGO must, must, must disclose the sources of these donations and explain why it is accepted for such a donation. If the U.N. can do it, why can't we?

And I am going somewhere here. In fact, I will read one of the sentences in this U.N. resolution. "Any financial contribution or other support direct or indirect from a government to the organiza-

tion shall be openly declared to the committee through the secretary general and fully recorded in the financial and other records of the organization and shall be devoted to purposes in accordance with the aims of the United Nations."

Oh, wow. That sounds like the only time I agree with the United Nations. May I submit this for the record, please?

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOSAR. My legislation, H.R. 2841, the Putting Trust in Transparency Act—and I think the President has something along the same lines—requires, requires NGOs that receive even $1 of Federal funding to disclose their extravagant donors, just like the U.N. does. Wow, what a concept. It applies to all NGOs. You do not have to take Federal money, but when you do, you have to pay the piper.

Now, if you are an NGO that advocates for limited government but accepts Federal dollars, you are a sock puppet for your donors. There should be zero taxpayer-funded advocacy.

Mr. Turner, you talked about the government slush funds and transparency in your testimony. We know many leaders of these NGOs use both public and private funding for their own political grift. Question: What do leaders have to personally gain by fleecing American tax dollars?

Mr. TURNER. Oh, the salaries, sir. And that is why this whole conversation of how these are puppy-raising organizations and they give food to the homeless, this is all a bunch of crap. These are organizations that fund political Democrats with enormous salaries, pay their consultants that then give donations to political Democrats. And that is why it is billions of dollars hidden under justice, climate, whatever you want to call it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Krikorian, is it illegal to aid and abet an illegal alien?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. It is indeed. And the question is, the real question is, what does aiding and abetting mean? And it has not been defined broadly enough.

Mr. GOSAR. I want to interrupt you. I want to interrupt you. Aiding and abetting, I guess, could be defined that, but when you are going into other countries and showing people the way here and then finding out that you can give them the luxury of things off of American persons, that would be aiding and abetting, wouldn't you say?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. It sure seems to me. Yes, it does.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, there is a reason why I want this, because if you thought the USAID was riddled with fraud, wait till you see these NGOs. I love what Ms. Yentel was saying. You know, the store, my Habitat for Humanity, I love that store. I love that store because they are building something. They are trying to put stuff to use and recycle it. But I got this perception over here from this lady that everything is hunky-dory. It is not. You cannot violate the United States laws. You cannot. Oh, I forgot. Yes, you can. You can violate any law you want to because we are void of a sheriff. Well, we were void of a sheriff for the last 4 years. But see, we want to see this transparency because we want to have those numbers for the American public.

Mr. Walter, are you scared of the American public for sunlight?

Mr. WALTER. Not remotely.

Mr. GOSAR. See, that is why I have another bill, and it is called the LASSO Act. Imagine this. I heard all our friends from the other side of the aisle say that we are attacking Social Security. Wouldn't it be interesting if I took 10 percent of all the public lands, all the revenues coming off public lands and off our oceans and I put it in a Social Security trust fund? Would that surprise you, Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. Possibly.

Mr. GOSAR. How about you, Mr. Krikorian?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. It is not my area. I do not know. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. GOSAR. I am putting it in there. Does it look like I am cutting Social Security?

Mr. KRIKORIAN. Right. No, it does not.

Mr. GOSAR. How about you, Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. No.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, Madam Chair, I got to tell you, this is too much fun. I got to let you, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

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. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

I want to start by saying this is not normal. I say this a lot, but today is certainly no exception because while we were sitting here, while we were sitting here, Mr. Elon Musk began tweeting again. He says, "Call your senator. Call your Congressman. Bankrupting America is not OK. Kill the bill," in all caps. Nothing is normal right now.

Attacking Federal agencies and dismantling vital services, firing thousands of Federal workers and shattering their lives, stealing your private data illegally and downloading it and using it on AI systems, letting children starve on the other side of the world while gutting vital public health programs, zeroing out funding for public media, none of these things are normal. And certainly, attacking community organizations and vital nonprofits that serve the public good is not normal.

But in addition to that, it is also not legal. And that is why there are over 200 Federal court cases currently in front of the Federal court right now, including dozens of injunctions and restraining orders against the Trump Administration for their lawless and illegal activities because not only is it not normal, it is not legal.

For months, the Trump Administration has been threatening that they will undermine the nonprofit status of nonprofits that they do not like. It is very clear that they have been searching for some sort of legal argument that will give them a path forward and they have yet to find it because it is not legal. The law is very clear. It is not legal. They cannot go after your IRS status. They cannot go after your nonprofit status. It is not legal.

So, if you are a nonprofit in America and you are listening to this hearing and you are feeling frightened, scared, you have received a letter, you have received a threat, or you have been contacted by DOGE or any Federal official to audit or enter your nonprofit orga-

nization, know your rights. Contact a lawyer. Make sure you understand what your rights are and what you can do to protect your organization.

Now, I understand that my friends across the aisle want to talk about corruption, waste, fraud and abuse. I mean, this is the DOGE Subcommittee, but it is so bizarre to see the high level of gaslighting that happens every moment in this Congress. They want to talk about corruption and nonprofit organizations that do voter registration and help fight the climate crisis and help starving children, but they will not even acknowledge that Elon Musk, who just left the Administration, gave himself billions of dollars in private contracts while serving in the Federal Government. That he, himself, changed out the communications infrastructure for multiple agencies, set himself on a path to get billions of dollars in private DOD contracts. And yes, he did download your data. And we will hold him accountable because no one is above the law, including the President.

So, if we want to talk about corruption, why don't we talk about a President who launches a meme coin and takes hundreds of millions of dollars in payments from foreign governments laundered through his family business? How about we talk about a President who solicited a foreign government for a $400 million plane that he wants to keep privately through his Presidential library afterwards? How about we talk about a President that wants to sell pardons for meme coins? You guys want to talk about corruption? Or we can talk about dark money and its influence on politics.

Now, I understand that some of the witnesses felt a little exposed here today by having facts presented about what their organizations are, who funds them, and what they do. But the facts remain. The facts remain. Project 2025, which is a 900-page document drafted by The Heritage Foundation and over 100 organizations, including those represented here today, is the blueprint for Donald Trump's America. It is being executed by more than 70 administration officials, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who is now executing DOGE and is being utilized to attack anyone that they disagree with politically or culturally. That is what this is all about. That is what this hearing is about. And we want all of you out there who are listening to know this is not normal, it is not legal, and we will fight it every step of the way.

I yield back.

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

There are a lot of things that are not normal, and that is using the power of the government to fund your friends and your family members and to employ former bureaucrats to enact policies that invade our country and hurt our energy, our American energy. Yes, those things are not normal, and that is why we are talking about them here today.

As we have heard here today, the American taxpayer dollars are being laundered through the revolving door of NGOs and Democrat officials. These pay-to-play schemes are so deep-rooted in the system and are such well-oiled machines, and they must be dismantled immediately. To be clear, we support charitable NGOs that help Americans in times of need, such as during the aftermath of

wildfires in California and the hurricane in western North Carolina, Georgia, and eastern Tennessee.

We do not support politically connected NGOs who rake in billions of Federal tax dollars to serve the Democrat Party and their friends and their priorities. We do not support Democrat officials creating slush funds, writing grants and contracts, and deciding who those funds go to, and then going to work at the same NGO that it just awarded those funds to. Yes, that is not normal. That is the reality of what we are facing and what we faced for the past 4 years.

As our witnesses stated, these corrupt NGOs do not serve the American people. They serve big government and the Democrat Party. If the American people support their climate and other woke causes, they can choose to personally donate to these entities. They can pay for it themselves. The American people are the most generous people in the entire world. In 2023 alone, Americans privately donated over $557 billion of their own money. They should be the ones who decide where their money goes. They can choose if they want to donate to a nonprofit and which nonprofit.

The American people are not just generous with their money, but they are generous with their time as well. In 2023, nearly 76 million Americans, almost 30 percent of Americans, formally volunteered through an organization. The government did not make them do this. They did it on their own. The government did not hold a gun to their head and make them volunteer. The government did not hold a gun to their head and make them donate their own money. They did it on their own. However, the government is forcing them to pay for things that they do not support and they do not want happening.

The United States is $36 trillion in debt. In 2024, the government spent over $1.8 trillion more than it took in. And in 2025, the interest in our debt is expected to exceed $1 trillion dollars. Our government is broke. Our government is going bankrupt. Our government is not a charity for the left to use to launder money through to their friends and to former government employees.

Notice this, this is extremely important, there is a difference of what you heard on this Committee today. Our Democrat colleagues believe taking money from the American people and forcing them to support the causes that they support is the right thing to do. They do not believe in the mission of this Subcommittee, which is DOGE, which is Delivering on Government Efficiency. And that is a mission that has been created in this Administration, thankfully, to President Trump, and it is a mission that we are continuing here on this Subcommittee, on Oversight, and we are proud of it.

As a matter of fact, we are delivering government efficiency, and we are proud to let everyone know that we will be voting next week for actual DOGE rescission cuts that this Committee held hearings on. And that is producing results for the American people because most of the time in Congress, all Congress does is create more laws, create more regulations, and spend more of the American people's dollars. But right here on the DOGE Subcommittee, thankfully to the hard work of its Members and staff, we are actually making a difference, and we are going to be cutting government

funding, government spending, government waste, fraud, and abuse.

In closing, we are incredibly grateful to the Trump Administration for directing all Federal agencies to review all agency funding to NGOs. These actions taken by the Trump Administration will finally provide long overdue oversight over the revolving door of NGO corruption. And we will continue our work here on the DOGE Subcommittee no matter how much pitching of tantrums that we hear from our Democrat colleagues. We are proud of what we are doing, and we know the American people support it. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 4:32 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]