

walls right now is talking about this? How should they view us?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, I think they will view us as a foolish country that doesn't understand our priorities and doesn't understand where the money is coming from or where it goes.

I would say this call out: Mr. Netanyahu, why don't you just ask us to take that money and give it to Israel instead? Give it to the people that are promoting peace, the people that are surrounded by enemies throughout, the people that had to stand there and face the all-out attacks over and over again.

They are a democracy in the Middle East, a stabilizing force in the Middle East; and if we allow them to be weakened—sometimes by the willful actions of this administration—if we allow them to be weakened, if they collapse, so does a lot of freedom in the Middle Eastern part of world.

It threatens Europe, and in the end, it threatens us. So our safety and our security is tied together. We need to protect our brethren who believe in freedom, who believe in a form of democracy, and we need to encourage that everywhere in the world.

□ 1800

There are good people in the Palestinian lands. They need to have good leadership, and if we give them the right incentive, they are going to perhaps produce good leadership.

But if we pay them to hate people, there are going to be more people hating people. I think we should turn that money back around and reward the people that don't, those who need to be defended.

Mr. YOHO. I appreciate your participation in this and your leadership on so many other things that you have done. Thank you for being here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOHO. Madam 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 the Special Order of Ms. KAPTUR.

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

There was no objection.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-102)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in and in relation to South Sudan.

The order does not target the country of South Sudan, but rather is aimed at persons who threaten the peace, stability, or security of South Sudan; commit human rights abuses against persons in South Sudan; or undermine democratic processes or institutions in South Sudan. The order provides authority for blocking the property and interests in property of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

To be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following in or in relation to South Sudan:

actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, or stability of South Sudan;

actions or policies that threaten transitional agreements or undermine democratic processes or institutions in South Sudan;

actions or policies that have the purpose or effect of expanding or extending the conflict in South Sudan or obstructing reconciliation or peace talks or processes;

the commission of human rights abuses against persons in South Sudan;

the targeting of women, children, or any civilians through the commission of acts of violence (including killing, maiming, torture, or rape or other sexual violence), abduction, forced displacement, or attacks on schools, hospitals, religious sites, or locations where civilians are seeking refuge, or through conduct that would constitute a serious abuse or violation of human rights or a violation of international humanitarian law;

the use or recruitment of children by armed groups or armed forces in the context of the conflict in South Sudan;

the obstruction of the activities of international peacekeeping, diplomatic, or humanitarian missions in South Sudan, or of the delivery or distribution of, or access to, humanitarian assistance; or

attacks against United Nations missions, international security presences, or other peacekeeping operations;

To be a leader of (i) an entity, including any government, rebel militia, or other group, that has, or whose members have, engaged in any of the activities described above or (ii) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order;

To have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, logistical, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, any activity described above or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order;

To be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 2014.

MONEY DOESN'T BUY RESPECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I so much appreciate my friends, the Honorable Mr. YOHO, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. KING, discussing the issue that is very dear to my heart. And I appreciate my very dear friend, Mr. KING, quoting me accurately, because you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free.

We have spent billions and billions of dollars over the years paying people that have contempt for us. They don't like us. And from anybody that has ever tried to pay a bully their lunch money, they find they don't buy respect. They buy more contempt and more evil actions coming your way.

So it just makes no sense, especially when money is fungible, and we continue to send money to the Palestinians. We continue to see outrageous examples in the Palestinian textbooks of just raw, unbridled hatred and demeaning of the Jewish people.

And why should the textbooks among the Palestinians for their children be any different than what the adults are doing, when you find that Palestinian leaders are naming streets and holidays for people who have walked in and murdered groups of people with a bomb, children, innocent women, men, out with their families. They come in and kill them when they have done no harm, no wrong.

We still hear people talking about Samaria and Judea, written in the Bible hundreds, maybe 1,600 years before the birth of Mohammed, about the areas that were the promised land for the children of Israel.

So it becomes difficult for a people that didn't exist in 1000 B.C. to claim that someone who lived in that land, cultivated that land, had the prior claim to that land, somehow have a lesser right than people that came along hundreds and hundreds of years later.

But America has a financial problem, and we shouldn't be just squandering money, paying people that hate us to educate their children to hate us, to educate the population to hate us, to teach songs that glorify hatred against Israel.

As our dear friend Prime Minister Netanyahu has pointed out, Iran itself is developing intercontinental ballistic missiles, and they certainly don't need those to deliver a nuclear weapon to Israel. Those are coming for the Great Satan. That would be us.

So people wonder, well, what are we doing to protect ourselves?

Back after the fall of the Soviet Union, the United States of America's leaders pressured Ukraine to deliver nuclear weapons in their possession to Russia. Now, the Ukrainians have never really trusted the Russians. And, yes, the Russians have put people out of their homes in some areas, filled them with Russian people. There are areas that today feel like they are loyal to Russia because they are Russians. They sent them there. They displaced the Ukrainians.

But the Ukrainians went ahead and turned over possession of nuclear weapons to Russians whom they distrusted because they trusted America. And the United States' leaders made sure they understood: we have got you covered. We will protect you. You don't have to worry. Go ahead and give nuclear weapons to Russia.

Now the trust that the Ukrainian people put in the United States' leaders is coming back, potentially, to haunt them. That should never be the case. If we want to be taken seriously in the world, we can't be breaking promises to countries who rely on our integrity. We can't be doing that.

So as people ask when we travel around the world in the past 6 months or so, they ask: What are you doing to prevent more terrorism when you won't even acknowledge the source of the terrorism? As one of the Egyptian leaders asked: Why are you not helping us in the war on terror? Now you are helping the people that supported the terror.

They don't understand, and neither do I.

I was asked today, Madam Speaker: What has the military done to avoid another Fort Hood incident since 2009? Madam Speaker, it appears the answer is quite embarrassing.

What have we done to protect the country when this President has made our military so much smaller?

What are we doing to protect the country when this President canceled agreements that had been made, promised, relied upon to other countries' detriment, missile defense? What are we doing to protect our country?

This policy that this administration has had internationally to think that evil, hateful people will love us and want to be very good friends if we just downsize our military, we tie our own hands, we don't let our military really

protect themselves adequately, that surely they will come to appreciate and like us and they won't consider us divisive, derisive, dismissive, well, that is not what they are thinking. This Nation has lost respect around the world, and it is heartbreaking.

So they wonder, what are we doing to protect ourselves, because if we can't protect ourselves, how can we help stop evil people around the world?

Some say, and I think there are people in this administration that think we need to follow the European example where we don't have to have much of a military at all and we just show, look, we want to get along and go along. The trouble with that idea is the Europeans have had the benefit of downsizing their military and having smaller militaries because they knew the United States existed and that we would not let an evil power take over Europe, Britain, that we would stop it because we would not want another Hitler to get as far as he did last time.

We want to stop them before that happens because, assuredly, if Europe falls, England falls, they are coming for the United States. And now we know, because of radical Islam, they are more concerned about destroying America than they are even taking on Europe and England.

So these are serious issues. So what have we done to protect the men and women in our military who are protecting us?

It is heartbreaking. This administration, after 2009's horrendous accident—not accident—incident where a radical Islamist Muslim killed 13 fellow military members. They were not allowed to have weapons on post. And we start digging and we find out, well, gee, when the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate, apparently, back in 1992, there was a bill passed back around that time that prevented military members from carrying weapons on military installations.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. First I want to say thank you for your service as a Member of this body who has also served his Nation in uniform. Thank you, and how well you know and what you just spoke of.

□ 1815

I found it fascinating, on my most recent deployment to Iraq—it has been years now—we were mobilized to Fort Sill, Oklahoma. I am sure you know it well. So you carry your weapon around with you 24 hours a day in your training because you must always be prepared, except—this is the fascinating part—except when you go to the PX, except when you go to the chow hall. Then you must find a place for your weapon. You must leave a soldier out in the parking lot to guard all the weapons, or what have you. And I am thinking to myself: Here I am, a com-

mander of this task force. I have got men and women of all ages and all different backgrounds, and we are training and refining ourselves to go to war, to fight the enemy, to defend our Nation in arms, wearing your ballistic vest and all your gear, wearing a ballistic helmet so that if you do get shot, you are protected from that fire. But yet I am not trusted to carry my firearm on a military base.

So what we have seen during this administration is this horrific incident, the previous one with Nidal Hasan, and nothing has really changed. And now we see a repeat of it. Meanwhile, soldiers—men and women who are willing and ready to serve their country—are left defenseless and can't even turn to their own Constitution, which they take an oath to uphold and defend to protect them.

I find it the height of the dereliction of duty of this body and of this administration.

Mr. GOHMERT. During the time that my friend was in the military, what weapons were you required to qualify using?

Mr. PERRY. Well, as an officer, I qualified with a .9 millimeter, but of course everybody qualifies at some point M16, or an M4 now.

Mr. GOHMERT. And that really is amazing about the military in a military installation because, like the gentleman said, when I was at Fort Benning, we had to qualify every year. And here at Fort Hood, one of the largest military installations anywhere, it adjoins Killeen, Texas. And many people—most people, I think, in Texas recall that there was a terrible shooting incident in a cafeteria in Killeen that adjoins Fort Hood where a man went in and started killing people in the cafeteria.

And there was a woman there who had to put her gun in the glove compartment because we didn't have laws that allowed you to carry weapons around Texas. And she realized that she could have saved her parents from being murdered if she had been able to carry her concealed weapon. So she got elected to the State legislature. She is a hero. She got the concealed-carry bill through and signed into law. And that had been used in other States to get concealed-carry bills passed.

So when people say, well, how horrible, there had been a prior mass shooting before. Actually, there had been two right there, just right so close together. Killeen, though, civilians, who are not required to qualify with weapons every year, like you and I have been in the military.

Yet if, as someone trained with weapons, qualifying every year, you step one foot off that military installation, now you can start carrying a concealed weapon if you just got the permit. But if you step back on the military installation, where everyone is required to be qualified to use weapons, you can't have one.

We are working on a bill which will not just create the power, but it will

require that military installations allow people there to go through and apply for and get a permit to carry a concealed weapon, just as they could in Fort Hood if they put one foot off post into Killeen. And they ought to be able to step back on the installation.

Mr. PERRY. If the gentleman would yield, I am just curious—you have spent more time here than I have—what was the impetus for the current law which restricts DOD and commanders, as an installation commander myself, from exacting our own authority based on the Constitution?

Mr. GOHMERT. And actually, that was back around the time I became a district judge in Texas. And I didn't learn until I was here in Congress just recently that they had ever passed such a law. There was a Democratic majority in the House, a Democratic majority in the Senate.

I can't imagine why they were thinking they had to protect our military members from themselves when we give them far more lethal weapons—I mean, you give somebody an RPG.

Mr. PERRY. Who is better trained than the United States military, the different branches serving on those bases and posts all around the country, all around the world, dealing with weapons on a daily basis, dealing with ammunition and its effects on a daily basis? Most of what you do revolves around ranges, firing, qualifications because we train. Readiness is important, and using the tools of the trade; whether you like it or not, they are weapons, because there are bad actors out there. And that is what they have to use to be able to fight back.

So that is the one place, specifically the one place on the planet where you would think that people would be able to. As you said, they are trained, are prepared, are knowledgeable, are familiar, are comfortable with. And yet this United States Government does not allow them to defend themselves and, more importantly, the oath and the very Constitution, the set of rules with which we govern this Nation.

When you raise your right hand and take that solemn oath, unfortunately under the current paradigm, under this current administration, when you take the oath to join the military, you are giving away the right to defend yourself while you are on a military base.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman makes so many good points. I would like to yield to the gentleman to answer a question.

Having been a commander, we have talked about how military were qualified, were required to qualify to use weapons. But as a commander, do you know of any one civilian in the civilian world who has more training about not misplacing your weapon or setting your weapon down or leaving your weapon than somebody in the military? The gentleman knows what I talk about.

Mr. PERRY. Certainly you and I can both attest to this. It is a sensitive, it

is a controlled item. And from day one, you learn the very harsh reality that you do not ever, ever misplace your weapon. There are very serious penalties for misplacing your weapon. You learn to live with it, to sleep with it, to shower with it. It is you, and you are it. You are together at all times and all things. And accountability is paramount. That is what I mean. There can be no breach of this standard. And there is none. And the military trains you in that very acutely.

So, once again, I would say, there is no place where individuals—men and women—are more familiar, better trained, and more well equipped to deal with firearms than in the military, especially—specifically on a military base.

Mr. GOHMERT. I was talking with one of our Capitol Police yesterday after this shooting at Fort Hood, again. One of our great Capitol Police. We are so blessed with such great qualified protectors of the Capitol area. And he was in the military for 13 years and left the military and became a Capitol policeman. Well, I trust that gentleman now to have a weapon at all times. I am delighted if he will carry a weapon at all times.

But Washington, D.C., has these really well-intentioned laws. Let's eliminate weapons in Washington, D.C. They have been struck down by the Supreme Court because they are unconstitutional. But I want somebody like that, that I could trust, whether he was still in the military, as he was, or as a Capitol policeman. I am very comfortable with him carrying a weapon and feel better knowing that there were people like him around carrying weapons.

So when that question was asked, what has the military done since 2009's Fort Hood mass shooting to prevent this kind of thing from happening, I know that the military cannot do any more than the Commander in Chief orders them to do. I don't know of anything that the Commander in Chief has done, as the commander, where the buck stops, to provide more protection from an incident like as now happened again.

If the gentleman knows of anything that has been done.

Mr. PERRY. I do not. And I thank you for asking. But just thinking about it, the process by which a person joins and maintains the attendance, so to speak, in the military requires an investigation of your person, of your background, who you are, your capabilities, and so on and so forth. And for an administration, rightly so, very concerned about background checks and making sure that only those in our free country avail themselves of their Second Amendment right and not those who shouldn't, such as criminals, who would also not be allowed to either join the military or stay in the military, once again, I would say, there is no safer, no better a place than on a military base because all those folks have been vetted, have been checked, do carry a weapon.

So I find it interesting that maybe the military, maybe DOD has made a recommendation to the administration and said, part of the solution to Nidal Hasan and his heinous acts are to make sure that people can defend themselves, soldiers, servicemembers at different bases and different branches of the services can protect themselves under force of arms, if necessary, on base. But that has yet to be found out.

But it would be very interesting to know if DOD did make that recommendation and nothing was done about it, and nothing was done about it. If there was no cry from the administration to say, hey, Congress, this is a problem. Here is part of the solution set. Get to work.

As you said, we have already gotten to work on that here. But I suspect that that bill—well-intentioned, the right thing to do—will make it out of the House in due course but under this Senate and under this administration will languish. That is what my suspicion will be.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I would think, though, that at this point in time, with so many Senators of the Democrat persuasion being concerned about elections and the disaster ObamaCare has been, if we pass a bill that provides for military installations to allow permits to be applied for and obtained for a concealed-carry on a military installation, that the Senate will be in a difficult position if they don't take it up. And the President would hurt his party dramatically if it passed out of the Senate as well and he refused to sign it.

There will be other incidents like Fort Hood again. It appears that we have not been adequately addressing post-traumatic stress disorder. And you never know if someone is going to go off, like we see with Washington, D.C., having such a high murder rate. Just like the old bumper stickers have said in the past, When guns are outlawed, only outlaws have guns. That is exactly what has happened at Fort Hood both times. It is what happened in Killeen with the mass shooting in the cafeteria. And the problem is not honest, honorable, law-abiding Americans having a gun under their Second Amendment rights; it is the outlaws having guns.

There were thousands of cases that came through my court as a district judge, felonies—all of them felonies. And I couldn't remember any cases involving guns where the guns were lawfully acquired. The criminals get guns, and they don't care. The name "criminal" comes from the fact that they commit crimes, and they don't care what the law is. They break the law. So the people that are disarmed are those law-abiding citizens.

I really think we cannot stand another 5 years of calling such a terrible disaster just "workplace violence" when it is a tragedy that can be prevented, can be stopped. And since the

Commander in Chief has not taken action that would impede it or stop it, we need to do that.

And we need to reverse the law that was passed by the Democratic House and Democratic-controlled Senate back in the early nineties and get a bill to the President's desk. And if the Democrats—at least some of them in the Senate—are not willing to pass such a law or HARRY REID is not willing to bring that to the floor, the answer is very simple: We vote in Republican Senators so that they will bring it to the floor. And next January, then we can present it to the President.

□ 1830

And then if he does not and is not willing to sign it at that point, then we will either have enough to override the veto or we will have a President from a different party come November of 2016 who will allow the military to protect themselves instead of condemning them to helplessly watch while they and their friends are gunned down by an outlaw.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. PERRY. I agree with you on your assessment. I hope you are right about that. I hope you are right, that we accomplish something. It would be great if it wasn't partisan, if we could just do the right thing and allow people who have agreed to serve and take the oath to uphold and defend the Constitution to then have the same protections of that Constitution availed to themselves. And that would be, in my opinion, the right thing to do regardless—regardless—of your party.

So I would hope that we would see that now, see that as a solution set to—look, on this current case, it appears that when confronted with a firearm, this individual who carried out this most recent crime and these atrocities at Fort Hood, when confronted with a firearm himself, that is when the carnage ended.

So it seems to me that maybe it won't stop it, but it certainly can mitigate it, and maybe if these folks in the future that would ponder such an act, if they knew that other members on post would be carrying, as well, they might be reluctant to do the same thing.

Mr. GOHMERT. In the 1 minute we have got left, I just want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for all of his service to our country in the military and here in Congress. I hope that we are able to get a bill passed through the House, through the Senate, and to the President's desk.

Let me just finish by saying there was an atrocity here on Capitol Hill yesterday with the testimony of the former Acting Director of the CIA. Our military has become an international—it is tragic, but a laughing—

If they are not defending themselves, then how can we count on them to defend us? And after the testimony under penalty of perjury yesterday by a former acting director of the CIA, it

has told the world that the only place there has been worse intelligence than we have had, particularly during Benghazi, would have been back at Little Big Horn by General Custer.

We have got to turn this place around so that Americans can protect Americans and Americans serving our military can protect themselves and our intelligence does start living up to the name instead of making it such a tragedy.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CASTOR of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and April 4 on account of family obligation in district.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 4, 2014, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5179. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the internal and independent reviews of Department of Defense (DoD) programs, policies, and procedures regarding security at DoD installations and the security clearance process; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5180. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 10 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5181. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Annual Report on the Bureau's activities to administer the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5182. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Turk Hava Yollari, A.O. (Turkish Airlines) of Istanbul, Turkey; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5183. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on a request from Wells Fargo, N.A. for a 90 percent guarantee on a 36-month revolving credit facility; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5184. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of 10 Synthetic Cathinones Into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-386] received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5185. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final

rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Birmingham, Alabama) [MB Docket No.: 13-261] [RM-11707] received February 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5186. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Secretary of State, transmitting notification that effective February 23, 2014, the danger pay allowance for the Cote D'Ivoire has been eliminated, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5187. A letter from the Acting Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5188. A letter from the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's annual report on the No FEAR Act for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5189. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5190. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5191. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5192. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5193. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5194. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0697; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-015-AD; Amendment 39-17733; AD 2014-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5195. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0525; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-063-AD; Amendment 39-17730; AD 2014-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5196. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0611;