

□ 2130

So what do they do? They burn churches to the ground.

It is interesting. We have to learn the lesson, though, because they tried that. After World War II, the Soviet Union tried to destroy churches that way, but they learned the lesson that the church is not the building. The church is the group of believers who share common, deeply held religious beliefs. That is why when the Soviet Union fell, the churches that they thought they had burned to the ground rose up.

I would suggest that what is going on in Oklahoma City with Hobby Lobby and in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, with Conestoga Wood Products is a church burning without a match. In fact, it is even more insidious because you can't see something. You can't see the ashes. But in fact, if the government has its way with these two employers, they will attempt to persecute them for their religious beliefs and attempt to destroy them. That is not the way it is in America.

As the gentleman from Illinois said, there are plenty of places in the world where that may be true, but we do have a First Amendment. We have a First Amendment that doesn't protect church buildings, it protects religious believers in whatever walk of life they are in, whatever they are doing, from the government imposing their belief system, whether it is the case of a belief of a religious body or a belief that you shouldn't provide life-destroying drugs. Because that is what is at issue in these cases.

And I would hope that the Supreme Court realizes that this country does have a First Amendment and that its job, its duty, our duty is to protect the religious beliefs of every individual, including those owners of Conestoga Wood Products and Hobby Lobby, who deserve the right and freedom in America to believe their religious beliefs and not have the government impose theirs.

So I thank the gentlelady from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Well said. Thank you for sharing your story.

I now have a friend from Kansas, Representative TIM HUELSKAMP.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congresswoman. It is a pleasure and honor to join you tonight. I will keep my comments short.

You have heard the words here tonight. You have heard the words "religion tax." You have heard the words "religious litmus test." You certainly heard the words "religious liberty." Of course, we also heard that the principles of the First Amendment have to do with religious liberty and religious freedom.

I was on the floor the day after the Supreme Court decision on the President's health care law, and I would like to issue a challenge to what is generally considered the swing vote of this current court, the Chief Justice himself.

When I spoke about this issue, court challenges were already coming forward on this HHS mandate, but knowing that the Chief Justice is a Roman Catholic, I issue a strong challenge to the Chief Justice.

Given the history of the Catholic Church in this country, it has been one of severe discrimination at times. I would ask the Chief Justice—the deciding vote—to consider his core convictions. I believe he bears a particular burden to protect the religious liberties of employers and their employees from the excesses of his very own constitutional creation.

The court asked to be in the middle of this position. They asked for the government to have the right to tell businesses what to do, whether for profit or nonprofit or businesses or non-businesses as well.

What is at stake here is not the choice of businesses alone. What is at stake here is not necessarily what the government can tell selected entities. At stake is our Constitution and our rights and freedoms as Americans.

We were founded on the issue of religious freedom and liberty from our very beginning. Tomorrow, I stand with the businesses, the non-businesses, and the private entities as well.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman. Well said.

We have been here, and we are not done yet. My time is about done, but we are going to continue on here because we believe in standing up for the Constitution. We believe in the First Amendment: religious liberty. We believe in our country and our future and our children's future. We want to preserve those freedoms that others have sacrificed for.

So I want to thank all my colleagues who have come here tonight and have shared their wisdom and their insights into this. Let us pray tomorrow that the Supreme Court hears the words that we have spoken and rules on the side of freedom.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I also want to thank the gentlelady from Missouri for organizing the previous hour's discussion on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the people of faith at companies like Hobby Lobby and Pennsylvania's Conestoga Wood. These companies want to provide health insurance for their workers, and they should be able to do

that without violating their deeply held religious and moral convictions.

It is simply unacceptable that President Obama's health care law requires people of faith to violate their conscience rights. This happens when regulations issued pursuant to the law forces them to pay for services such as abortifacient drugs when they provide health insurance for their employees.

The hostility in the President's health care law towards people of faith is made clear when you consider the penalty scheme in the law. If these family-owned businesses do not comply with the mandate, they could be fined \$100 per day per employee. That amounts to \$36,500 per year per employee, even if the health insurance provided is of excellent quality.

Compare that with the \$2,000 fine per year per employee if they stopped offering insurance altogether.

How is that fair, just, or respectful of their beliefs?

This poster, Mr. Speaker, is striking. This discrepancy is simply indefensible. Looking at these numbers, you would think that this administration thinks that it is more important for an employer to provide abortifacient drug coverage than it is to provide comprehensive health insurance coverage that would cover items such as cancer treatment.

As the Supreme Court considers this case tomorrow and hears oral arguments, I join men and women of faith from western Pennsylvania and across the country in defending conscience rights and religious liberty, and standing with Hobby Lobby and Conestoga Wood.

I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania very much. They are very, very good points.

Also along the lines my friend was talking about, some of us were here when our fine President stood at that podium and spoke to all of us here and he said in his speech that in his bill there would be no funding of abortion. We all heard that. In fact, there was such an involuntary response of JOE WILSON to categorize that statement. From the bill, we had seen from the Democrats it was clear there was going to be money forced out of taxpayers' hands and forced to fund abortion, and we now know that is true.

Most of the time, the decent thing to do, if you find out that something you said was simply not true, the decent thing to do is to step up and say, You know what? JOE WILSON, you were right, but it was unintentional. I didn't mean to misrepresent anything. So I want to set this straight.

Instead, it is like this administration has doubled down and said not only is the government funding it, but you are going to have to fund abortion for your employees, and it doesn't matter that you have firmly held religious convictions against it.

I just wanted to mention to my colleagues that before I came to the floor

to hear the wonderful work that our friend Mrs. HARTZLER has been doing—is she from the “Show Me” State or what—I walked by where Roger Williams’ statue has always been since I have been here. Apparently, they have moved statues, because he is not there. It has been in the last week I know they have moved Roger Williams.

Roger Williams was born in England between 1603 and 1606. He grew up a member of a privileged class. He received a liberal arts education from Sir Edward Coke.

This is from the Capitol Web site.

He abandoned the study of law to become a priest in the Church of England. He was interested in the Puritan movement and the newly established Massachusetts Bay Colony. He was warmly welcomed to the New World by Massachusetts Governor John Winthrop. He arrived in Boston.

Williams was an adamant separatist. He accepted a post as an assistant pastor in Salem, reputedly a friendly place. However, his teachings were deemed radical, and he was banished from Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1635. He founded the colony of Rhode Island in 1636.

I know each State gets to choose which two statues you want to have. I look forward to him coming back. I am sure that they would never have permanently removed the statue of the founder of Rhode Island. There is nobody I can think of more appropriate.

I just thought it probably is appropriate that a man that staked his entire life on religious freedom would not have his statue here to figuratively witness what has gone on and what has passed in this Capitol.

To talk about this issue further, I want to yield to my friend from Georgia, DOUG COLLINS.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. I also thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, who started our night off. I think there has been a lot said as we go forward in bringing this important matter.

I want to take just a little bit of a different tack as we talk about the issues of tonight.

I believe we are blessed to live in a time when medical research and technology have allowed us to extend and improve human life in ways we never thought possible, and the truth of this matter is that why we are standing here tonight is about life. It is about an understanding of life, and it is about the life not only of the unborn, but also those born, and the right to express the life that is given to them.

From the moment of conception, each individual has unique DNA that dictates his or her gender, eye color, blood type, and countless other specifications. Even from his or her earliest moments, a child in the womb has the ability to respond to his or her environment, as well as adapt to that environment.

These scientific facts are amazing, but I have an even deeper motivation

for protecting human life because I believe life is a gift from God. I believe that that gift from God is also expressed and was expressed by the Founders when they said that they would stand up for the right to express our religious liberties. As ROGER WILLIAMS was just spoken of, that right to say: This is what I believe, and this is why I am in this country.

And that is what we are talking about here. It is not only life at birth and in the womb, but it is life expressed outside of that and the God-given, I believe, rights that are expressed in our Constitution.

So for me, I not only understand that life begins at conception, but life continues all through until natural death. That natural life here in America is expressed in ways that we can contribute our life to others. How we express it should not be taken away.

Unfortunately, this administration is too preoccupied with its own ideological commitment to its definition of good health insurance to care about other points of view. That is why it continues spending so much time and energy and, by the way, taxpayer resources trying to silence those who do not share its view of the contraceptive mandate.

Just a few months ago, I stood on the floor of this House and thought I would never have come to the House of Representatives and ever determined that it would have been non-essential to have religious liberty protected on the floor of this House or in this country.

□ 2145

That is just an amazing thought to me, that we would even have to think about that; but under the President's nonsensical policies that was just expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, businessowners would face fines of \$36,500 for each employer every year they were offered health insurance consistent with their religious convictions.

On the other hand, they could just quit offering health care altogether and only pay \$2,000.

Tell me what the priorities of this administration are, and I will show you the money. I have always said: you want to see the priorities of somebody in life, look at their checkbook, and look at their calendar.

This administration's priorities are found in their checkbook, and they are found in their calendar because that is what they want to punish us for, and they have got a timeline to do it, and they said now is the time.

That is the argument to be made by the Supreme Court tomorrow, the argument you want to step forward with Hobby Lobby and others, that when they step forth before those Justices tomorrow, they say here is the priority of this country.

The priority of this country should be that it protects religious liberties, it protects what is found in the Constitution, it protects those liberties upon

which we were founded and not an ideological agenda driven by points it made by hurting others.

I agree with my friend from Texas. I was always taught that, when you make a mistake, just say: look, I made a mistake.

But that is not what this administration wants to do. They want to continue to beat an ideological driven policy. They want to continue to beat down and say: this is what we believe, and you will believe like us because we are not so sure that the essentials of the Constitution are essential anymore.

It is time that I hope tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, that the argument made before the highest court in the land is that there is a right to protect life, that there is a right, even better, to have religious liberty protected; and that, when I get up and I go in or I have my business, that those rights aren't checked at the door, and that, when you look at priorities of this country—when, God forbid, they look back a number of years from now and they say: I hope they stood up for the rights that the Constitutional Founders founded.

And when they do that, then they will see our priorities. They will see the ones on this floor tonight, and they will say what is priority is what we spend on and what we plan on.

For this administration, it is obvious that theirs is an ideological driven agenda that says the Constitution only when it is convenient, and I will only pay for it, but I will punish you if you don't.

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. It is time to change it.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Georgia so very much. I need to come to where he preaches some time and get some more of that good preaching. That was outstanding; and I know, as a servant to the country in Congress and our military, as he is, as well as a servant of Christ, what a powerful message.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, you may not be aware—I wasn't until today—in past times, when there was oral arguments in which Members of Congress were interested, we could call over to the Clerk of the Supreme Court, and they normally just make one bench—sometimes more—but at least one pew there available for Members of Congress, either as the Speaker would allocate or first come.

But anyway, the Marshal of the Supreme Court, Pamela Talkin, has decided that, though it has always been reciprocity in the past, we invite the Supreme Court to come and watch speeches they may care to, reciprocity between the House and Senate, the Marshal, Pamela Talkin, perhaps she got guidance from one of the Justices or the Chief Justice, but Members of Congress are not going to have a reserved spot, which is interesting. We are supposed to oversee that Court, just as they oversee the Congress.

So as of today, I am going to be the most outspoken supporter of getting cameras in the Supreme Court. I think it is time. If they are going to do something untoward, we need to have people be able to see it.

As Members of Congress, if we are funding them, we need to be able to see what they are doing in there with our own eyes, so we need to get cameras in there, and we can thank Pamela Talkin for that.

At this time, I yield to my dear friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and also the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for putting this time together tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Hobby Lobby Stores and Conestoga Wood Specialties as they take a stand for religious freedom against the unconstitutional coercive ObamaCare HHS mandate.

All Americans, including family businessowners, should have the freedom to live and work according to their religious values without fear of the government punishing them for doing so.

This issue of religious liberty is not limited to these two employers. Many family-owned small businesses and nonprofits across this country have expressed grave concern about this mandate from the Obama administration. It forces them to violate their deeply-held religious beliefs or face crippling penalties.

In my home State of Colorado, Hercules Industries, founded in 1962 by William Newland, a family-owned heating, ventilation, and cooling manufacturer with locations all over Colorado, including Colorado Springs, has been forced into this legal dilemma as well.

As devout Catholics, the Newland family has always worked to run their companies in a way that reflects their sincerely-held religious convictions. This is why, when the Obama administration issued this mandate to force them to violate those beliefs and provide coverage of potentially life-terminating drugs and devices, they had to file a lawsuit to protect their religious freedoms.

Hercules Industries already provides generous health insurance for their employees through a self-insured group plan. With 265 full-time employees throughout its various locations, Hercules could be facing over \$9 million in government fines each year.

This comes if they refuse to violate their deeply-held religious convictions and if they don't comply with the Obama mandate to provide drugs to their employees that the Newland family believes can end human life.

What an unbearable choice the Obama administration has burdened them with. Not only is the HHS mandate an attack on religious liberty, it also puts into jeopardy jobs and health care of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I support businesses like Hercules Industries, Hobby Lobby.

And Conestoga Wood Specialties because of their principled stand against this oppressive mandate. Religious freedom is a foundational component of American greatness. It is of utmost importance that we do everything we can to defend it.

I look forward to the Supreme Court's decision, and I hope and I pray that this will be a positive precedent for future religious freedom cases.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Colorado so very much. We have done much together in our time here, and I am grateful for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from Florida (Mr. YOHO), for such time as he may use.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentleman from Texas, along with the gentlewoman from Missouri, for starting this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today—or tonight—not only in firm opposition to the Affordable Care Act, but also to the Affordable Care Act's religious mandate.

I would like to take you back to March of 2009, when a one-sided government passed a bill, and they said that we have to pass it to see what is in it, we have to pass it to see how it is going to work. I think what we are seeing today is evidence of that, and we are just seeing the tip of the iceberg.

In accordance to this terrible law, HHS issued rules that health care plans must include all FDA-approved contraceptives, including drugs that can terminate a human embryo and sterilization services.

The HHS mandate only contains an exemption for churches, but not for religious nonprofits or businesses run by people of faith who are morally opposed to such practices.

The HHS mandate puts jobs and the health care of millions of Americans at risk. It forces people who stand up for their conscience to choose between paying crippling fines and dropping health care coverage altogether for their employees, as you have seen expressed over and over again tonight; yet it excludes some people of certain faiths, the Muslim faith or the Amish faith, because participating in group health insurance is a form of gambling and that is against their religious beliefs, but yet it won't exclude people who are morally opposed against this.

The First Amendment was put in place for a reason, to protect religious beliefs from being attacked by the Federal Government. The ACA, or ObamaCare, completely disregards this and attacks the freedom of America's conscience.

We are a nation of free individuals who should not have to forsake our religious beliefs and rights of conscience in order to adhere to legislation that was quickly passed into law before all the disastrous effects could be considered.

We, as Americans, must take this opportunity to stand up to the Federal Government and to protect our First

Amendment. I would like to caution all of my colleagues and the American people that the more we allow the Federal Government to do for us, the less freedoms we, as Americans, enjoy.

For me, I will stand with the First Amendment, the Constitution, and with the American people and stand for freedom and liberty.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Florida for those strong words.

We had strong words from the Vatican Chief Justice, as reported by CBS today. They quoted him, the Vatican Chief Justice, as saying:

It is true that the policies of the President of the United States have become progressively more hostile toward Christian civilization. He appears to be a totally secularized man who aggressively promotes anti-life, antifamily policies.

I know he professed Christianity, so I don't necessarily agree with all of those statements; but how profound when the Vatican Chief Justice feels compelled to make that kind of statement.

Mr. Speaker, for the remainder of our time, I yield to my dear friend from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for your leadership in bringing to light an incredibly important issue that is going to be debated right across the street from where we stand today in the House over at the Supreme Court.

The Hobby Lobby case deals with so much more than just one company, but it really deals with one of the fundamental rights that has been laid out in our Constitution, and that is the right of religious freedom.

What does that right really mean? Just how much ability does the Federal Government have to impede upon that right, especially when we talk about the right of a President—in this case, Barack Obama—to put out an edict that would literally take away that right to religious freedom from millions of Americans that enjoy it today and have enjoyed it since the beginning of our country?

If you will look at the rostrum right above the Speaker, it says, "In God We Trust." A lot of people across the country would be surprised because there are school boards, there are other governmental bodies that right now have threats against them if they try to pray before any kind of governmental service.

In schools—in many schools across our country today, that right of religious expression is being challenged by groups every single day, and they threaten different groups, schools, other governmental organizations; yet, here in the House Chamber, we pray at the beginning and the start of every session every day.

We have "In God We Trust" emblazoned right above the Speaker's rostrum, and it is there for a reason.

It is because our Founding Fathers, when they created this Nation, they didn't say these were rights, the rights that they laid out in the Constitution. These were not rights that were given by men. These were rights that were granted through men from God.

Don't take my word for it. These were the writings of our Founding Fathers. They acknowledged God. They praised God. They talked about the great blessings of liberty given to us by God.

Yes, our Founding Fathers said that. This isn't some rightwing nut in the Tea Party. Thomas Jefferson may have been considered one of those rightwing nuts, using the definitions of some of the liberals running around this town today.

But if you look at what this President is doing right now, trying to trample on those religious freedoms, the Hobby Lobby case is the epitome of where those trappings of those rights converge, to our job creators.

This is a business that wants to just run and provide services to people all across this country, a few locations in my district. My wife likes going to Hobby Lobby.

They shouldn't have to be faced with a dilemma every time they cut their paychecks to their employees of whether or not they are going to violate their own religious freedoms just to continue operating as a business in this country.

Nobody should be faced with the threat of our government taking away their religious freedoms just to be able to operate as a business; and yet, that is what is happening right now with the President's mandate through his own health care law.

It is not just limited to businesses, Mr. Speaker. If you look at what is also happening, you know, the President loves talking about a war on women. This President loves dividing this country anywhere he gets the opportunity for political gain to try to divide Americans against each other. How shameless that is.

Where is the President's war on women when it relates to religious freedom?

It is against people like the Little Sisters of the Poor, a Catholic order of nuns that is just trying to do good for people. They are forced to sue the Federal Government because this President, Barack Obama, wants to make Little Sisters of the Poor pay for abortion-inducing drugs as part of their condition of providing health care. Otherwise, they are in violation of the law.

What law, Mr. Speaker, would force Catholic nuns to pay for abortion-inducing drugs just to comply with health care laws?

That is what is at stake here. That is why it is so important, this debate that is going to happen across the street, and that is why it is so important that we all come together to stand up against this kind of oppression of religious freedom.

It wasn't the tenth of all ten amendments in the Bill of Rights. It was the First Amendment that guaranteed religious freedom. That is what we stand here in support of tonight.

I sure hope the Supreme Court hears those arguments as well and recognizes not just what we are talking about tonight, but what our Founding Fathers laid out as one of the basic fundamental tenets of our Nation's constitutional guarantee, and that is the right of religious freedom.

I appreciate all of my colleagues standing up in support of it, as we all do; and hopefully, the Supreme Court hears those pleas and rules the right way.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to the gentlelady from Missouri for calling so many Members and leading this in this time.

Mr. Speaker, just closing with one line from Benjamin Franklin:

Without God's concurring aid, we will succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel confounded by our local partial interests and becoming a byword down through the ages.

Mr. Speaker, we pray for his wisdom for the Supreme Court. I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BENISHEK (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and March 25 on account of attending a family funeral.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 25, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5037. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amount of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center during fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7310; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5039. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection [Docket No.: NHTSA-2013-0121] (RIN: 2127-AK56) received February

25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5040. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-76, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5041. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 102(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236 as amended by 103-415), certification for FY 2014 that no United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5042. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses as required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5043. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5044. A letter from the Chairman, Occupation Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's strategic plan for fiscal years 2014 through 2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5045. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Eleventh Coast Guard District Annual Marine Events [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0361] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5046. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0466; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-156-AD; Amendment 39-17749; AD 2014-03-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5047. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0937; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-029-AD; Amendment 39-17762; AD 2014-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5048. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; 328 Support Services GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by AvCraft Aerospace GmbH; Fairchild Dornier GmbH; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0702; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-181-AD; Amendment 39-17753; AD 2014-03-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received