without access to reliable energy sources; a portable, low-water kidney dialysis machine; and an affordable and highly adjustable prosthetic limb system. These and many other innovations have improved the quality of life of millions of individuals.

By codifying H.R. 5796, we strengthen and recognize the importance of this program while providing the USPTO the flexibility to continue to improve its implementation.

In December, this bill passed the House Committee on the Judiciary unanimously, building upon the work of Representative MCBATH, who successfully led a bipartisan effort to pass the Patents for Humanity Program Improvement Act into law last Congress, which allows award certificates to be transferable.

Today, we go a step further by ensuring this program is a permanent feature of our innovation system and economy.

Once again, I thank Representative VICTORIA SPARTZ for her partnership on this legislation, as well as her leadership as it relates to the terrible situation in Ukraine. I also thank my colleague, Representative ISSA, for his leadership as well.

The Patents for Humanity program shows how American innovation and creativity can continue to change the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and vote ''yes'' on H.R. 5796, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in what I believe will be unanimous support for the continued promotion of works useful to humanity. This pilot program, after 10 years, has proven to be not only a good one but one that continues to be necessary.

In 1790, when President Washington evaluated and signed the first patent, he did so in a matter of a few weeks from submission. It was an expectation that a timely patent was, in fact, critical. That first patent improved the production of potash, often used in fertilizer.

The fact is, over the years, our ability to quickly evaluate patents has, in fact, not continued to keep pace. So, when you have something like these humanitarian offerings, the fact that we are able to, at least in these cases and for known inventors, reward them with an accelerated consideration as part of their continued work, I think that is the kind of an award that means a great deal when it is the advancement of items of humanitarian interest and need.

My colleague from New York did a wonderful job of talking about some of those inventions. We could go on for hours about what inventive genius has come from this and other incentives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this renewal and, lastly, to recognize that the one area that America leads in is innovation. This body has a continued obligation to do everything it can to promote that innovation, including the modernization and the improvement of the Patent and Trademark Office.

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his continued leadership in this area.

Once again, Congress is coming together in a bipartisan way to uplift American innovation and innovators, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5796, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COURTHOUSE ETHICS AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3059) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to provide for a periodic transaction reporting requirement for Federal judicial officers and the online publication of financial disclosure reports of Federal judicial officers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3059

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act''.

SEC. 2. PERIODIC TRANSACTION REPORTS AND ONLINE PUBLICATION OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS OF FEDERAL JUDGES.

(a) PERIODIC TRANSACTION REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL JUDGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) Each judicial officer.

''(12) Each bankruptcy judge appointed under section 152 of title 28, United States Code.

''(13) Each United States magistrate judge appointed under section 631 of title 28, United States Code.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to applicable transactions occurring on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) ONLINE PUBLICATION OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS OF FEDERAL JUDGES.—Section 105 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) ONLINE PUBLICATION OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS OF FEDERAL JUDGES.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—Subject to paragraph (4), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish a searchable internet database to enable public access to any report required to be filed under this title by a judicial officer, bankruptcy judge, or magistrate judge.

''(2) AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a report is required to be filed under this title by a judicial officer, bankruptcy judge, or magistrate judge, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall make the report available on the database established under paragraph (1) in a full-text searchable, sortable, and downloadable format for access by the public.

''(3) REDACTION.—Any report made available on the database established under paragraph (1) shall not contain any information that is redacted in accordance with subsection (b)(3).

''(4) ADDITIONAL TIME.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the requirements of this subsection may be implemented after the date described in paragraph (1) if the Administrative Office of the United States Courts identifies in writing to the relevant committees of Congress the additional time needed for that implementation.

''(B) PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT.—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall continue to make the reports described in paragraph (1) available to the public during the period in which the Administrative Office of the United States Courts establishes the database under this subsection.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) (as amended by subsection (a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (9), by striking '', as defined under section 109(12)''; and

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking '', as defined under section 109(13)''.

(2) Section 105 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) (as amended by subsection (b)) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''be revealing'' and inserting ''by revealing''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking ''be,,'' and inserting ''be,''; and

(II) in the third sentence, by striking ''may be may'' and inserting ''may be, may''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''described in section 109(8) or 109(10) of this Act'' and inserting ''who is a judicial officer or a judicial employee''.

(3) Section 107(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended in the last sentence by striking ''and (d)'' and inserting ''and (e)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 3059.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 3059, the Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act of 2021, embodies an important bipartisan effort to address an alarming lack of transparency in the personal financial holdings of Article III Federal judges and the conflicts, or appearance of conflicts, those holdings can create in the cases these judges are asked to preside over and decide.

This legislation makes incremental but necessary progress toward accountability by building on Federal statutes that already prohibit judges from deciding cases in which they have a personal financial stake in the outcome.

It has been the law in this country since the 1970s that judges must recuse themselves from any case in which they hold a legal or equitable interest of any size in any party or property under consideration.

To help ensure that recusals occur as required, Federal law often mandates that judges file annual reports disclosing their personal financial interests so that the litigants, press, and the general public can monitor and check these responsibilities.

Unfortunately, recent reporting by a Pulitzer Prize-winning investigative reporter and a hearing by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet have shown that the law is not working as intended. The infrequency of judges' financial disclosures and the inaccessibility of the reports have made actual transparency practically impossible.

When the House first passed this version of the legislation last year, an investigation revealed that, between 2010 and 2018, over 130 Federal judges had decided cases in which they are part owners of the parties before them. Over 60 judges have actively traded shares in entities involved in their courthouse deliberations while their cases were still ongoing and, in some cases, profited from these trades.

At the time, this investigation also discovered approximately 685 cases where judges should have, according to the law, recused themselves. That number has continued to climb and now stands north of a thousand cases. So far, judges in 836 cases have notified the parties that the case can be reopened because the judge unlawfully failed to recuse.

While these numbers are incredibly alarming on their own, they may simply be the tip of the iceberg. I am sorry to say that we can expect these numbers may continue to grow as more data becomes available and investigations continue.

The consequences of these actions are both acute and widespread. Failure to recuse can cause real harm to parties seeking fair and impartial justice and leave a cloud of doubt over any decision that is made once the conflicts are subsequently uncovered.

S. 3059 addresses these problems by requiring Federal judges to abide by the same periodic transaction reporting laws already applicable to Members of Congress and senior executive branch officials.

The bill also requires the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to create an online database of judicial financial disclosure reports and to timely update that database with searchable, sortable, and downloadable copies of disclosure reports as they become available so that litigants, the press, and the public can analyze and access this information in real time.

The two versions of this legislation, including the original version passed by the House and the bill currently before us, S. 3059, make two notable changes.

First, it makes it crystal clear that these reforms also cover bankruptcy and magistrate court judges. This is a welcome change.

Second, in response to concerns raised by the courts, it allows the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts to take more than 180 days to develop the public website and database containing judicial financial disclosure reports so long as the Director provides the Congress with a date certain when the website will launch. We expect that the Administrative Office of the Courts will request no more time than a few more months and will not use this authority to delay disclosure.

These simple solutions are long overdue and the product of bicameral and bipartisan collaboration.

I thank Congresswoman ROSS for her leadership in this area and Congressman ISSA for championing this legislation. I also thank my friend from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, as well as Senator CORNYN and the other Senators who worked on this bipartisan bill.

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

□ 1230

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I join with the chairman in support of all of the changes that were added in the Senate, they were thoughtful, and I believe not just appropriate but necessary.

I don't want to pile on the same statements made already because they were accurate and I agree with them. Rather, because there has been fairly public pushback from some members of the Article III court that we are meddling in their business, I have given it a lot of thought and discussed it with a number of scholars.

I think the American people need to understand that the executive branch does not have the authority to pass laws, and the judicial branch does not have the ability to pass laws. When it comes to establishing laws for transparency reporting and the American people's right to know, there is, in fact, only one body that can initiate and send for the President's signature statutes of transparency and accountability.

So even though this is a 1978 law being modified, the fact that there is pushback from a branch saying that under separation of powers we are somehow meddling by substantially harmonizing what the executive branch and this branch do to make sure the American people have confidence in what we own that might, in fact, be influencing what we do. It seems to be one of those areas in which I believe the American people, properly explained, would fully support.

For that reason, I would hope that as this bill becomes law that the members of the court would recognize we had no choice. Faced with clear examples—even one being too much—of a judge who had holdings and simultaneously affected the value of those holdings while either owning them or trading them or both, we had no choice but to recognize that that absence of transparency was critical.

I want to simply close by saying that this is likely not to lead to a lot more recusals. This is certainly going to lead to the kind of information that attorneys need to have on behalf of their clients when they are working through a case.

If you know that a judge or his spouse or her spouse owns something, why wouldn't you be aware of that when you have a case involving that company? If you know that they own a substantial amount of a sister company, one that is not involved in the litigation, but in fact, could benefit by an adverse decision, the attorneys for both sides should know that.

We are just not dealing in the failure to recuse here. Reporting transparency, in fact, empowers both sides to know the lay of the land that might be very meaningful in a case. Yes, there will be some that see that and ask for recusals. I trust that judges who, after the fact when these 130 cases were reported, some of the judges said they didn't know about it, they didn't know they had it, or they didn't know their spouse had these holdings. That may very well be true. Some of them said they didn't know they were supposed to report. That may be true.

But when this is implemented we will be in a position to say, of course the public knew, and empowering the public on this not private information because ultimately we are public officials. I am a public official, the chairman is a public official, the Speaker is a public official, and so are those honored to serve as magistrates, bankruptcy judges, and Article III judges.

I hope that this minor change will represent a major step for us in bringing back the confidence of the American people that they do not have to blindly go into a case not knowing whether the heavy hand of the law might be weighing against them without their knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like only yesterday I was speaking on this subject.

This is an important step. I know that we will have broad bipartisan support on it. I hope that we will have not just acceptance but an embracement by the judges who now will be reporting and providing more information to the public that the public has—and particularly litigants—have every right to know before they go before that judge.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair for his help in shepherding this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Framers, in their infinite wisdom, created a system of government with three separate and coequal branches: Article I, legislative branch; Article II, executive branch; and Article III, judicial branch, three separate but coequal branches of government.

Justice Brandeis once said: In a democracy, sunlight is the best of disinfectants. There are standards of transparency and disclosure that already exist as relates to the Article I legislative branch and senior officials within the Article II executive branch. Those same standards of transparency and disclosure allowing for accountability should exist across the three branches of government. This legislation takes a meaningful step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROSS for her leadership. I thank Congressman ISSA for his leadership. I thank Chairman JOHNSON, as well as Senator CORNYN, and those who have worked on this important legislation in a bipartisan, bicameral way.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3059.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OR TO RELEASE UNITED STATES CITIZEN PAUL WHELAN

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 336) calling on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide evidence or to release United States citizen Paul Whelan, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 336

Whereas United States citizen Paul Whelan is a resident of Novi, Michigan, and a United States Marine Corps veteran;

Whereas Paul Whelan traveled to Moscow for the wedding of a personal friend on December 22, 2018;

Whereas Russia's Federal Security Service arrested Paul Whelan at the Metropol Hotel in Moscow on December 28, 2018, and charged him with espionage;

Whereas the Federal Security Service has never provided any evidence of supposed wrongdoing;

Whereas Paul Whelan was imprisoned in Lefortovo Prison and was held there for more than 19 months after his arrest in pretrial detention;

Whereas a Moscow court extended Paul Whelan's pretrial detention multiple times without publicly presenting justification or evidence of wrongdoing;

Whereas even Paul Whelan's Federal Security Service-appointed lawyer, Vladimir Zherebenkov, said on May 24, 2019, ''[The Federal Security Service] always roll[s] out what they have, but in this case, we've seen nothing concrete against Whelan in five months. That means there is nothing.'';

Whereas the then United States Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Jon Huntsman, responded on April 12, 2019, to a question about the detention of Paul Whelan, ''If the Russians have evidence, they should bring it forward. We have seen nothing. If there was a case, I think the evidence would have been brought forward by now.'';

Whereas then Secretary of State Mike Pompeo met with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov on May 14, 2019, and urged him to ensure United States citizens are not unjustly held abroad;

Whereas the Kremlin has refused Paul Whelan full access to his lawyer and the so-called evidence against him;

Whereas any evidence he has seen is in Russian, a language Paul does not read or speak;

Whereas Lefortovo pretrial detention facility and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs refused to provide medical treatment for Paul Whelan's medical condition, despite being aware of its worsening state, resulting in emergency surgery on May 29, 2020;

Whereas Paul Whelan was wrongfully convicted on June 15, 2020, and sentenced to 16 years in a Russian labor camp by a 3-judge panel, in a trial witnessed by then United States Ambassador John Sullivan, who referred to it as ''a mockery of justice'' due to the denial of a fair trial and the exclusion of defense witnesses;

Whereas in August 2020, on an unknown day because he was moved secretly, Paul Whelan was transferred to camp IK–17, a penal labor camp in Mordovia, where he is forced to work 6 days a week in a garment factory;

Whereas Ambassador John Sullivan, while visiting Paul Whelan at the labor camp in Mordovia, stated that ''Russian authorities . . . have never shown the world evidence of his guilt,'' and reiterated his call that the Russian authorities correct this injustice and release Mr. Whelan; and

Whereas Secretary of State Antony Blinken spoke with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov on February 4, 2021, and urged him to release Americans detained in Russia, including Paul Whelan and Trevor Reed, so that they are able to return home to their families in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) demands the Government of the Russian Federation present credible evidence on the allegations against Paul Whelan or immediately release him from imprisonment;

(2) demands the Government of the Russian Federation comply with its international treaty obligations and provide unrestricted consular access to Paul Whelan while he remains imprisoned in Russia;

(3) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide Paul Whelan, Trevor Reed, and all others imprisoned for political motivations or otherwise unjustly imprisoned their constitutionally afforded due process rights and universally recognized human rights; and

(4) expresses sympathy to the family of Paul Whelan for this travesty to justice and personal hardship, and expresses hope that their ordeal can soon be brought to a just end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 336, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 336, calling on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide evidence or to release United States citizen Paul Whelan.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative STEVENS for her tireless work on behalf of her constituent, Paul Whelan, whom Russia has held hostage as a political prisoner for over 3 years.

For more than 1,300 days the Russian Government has put Paul and his family through unimaginable torment: taking away Paul's freedom, threatening his health, and denying him his most basic human rights—all for the purpose of using an American citizen—a human being—as a political bargaining chip.

Paul's treatment at the hands of the Russian Government and its so-called justice system is shocking, but unfortunately, hardly surprising.

As we witness the horrors committed by Putin, his enablers, and Russian forces in Ukraine, we are reminded of the lengths that the authoritarian regime in the Kremlin will go to achieve its nefarious objectives. But neither Paul nor any political prisoner is a tool to be used for an end. They are human beings with families who just want to see justice served and see their loved ones home safe and sound.