who may live in the middle of our great Nation or the middle of Russia or the middle of India or the middle of China may say, what has that got to do with me? All of our food cycle chain and all of our wealth eventually is created from the sea.

So I am going to suggest in the future, if I have anything to do with it, with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], that we extend not only beyond the 200 miles, I mean brought within the 200 miles, to be beyond the 200 miles, internationally trying to come to grips with, are the seas healthy, are the species healthy, have we done something wrong, have the death curtains been eliminated, what should we be doing, not impinging upon people's rights but how do we prevail in maintaining a healthy sea.

Mr. Speaker, again, in closing, I can suggest that those who have worked with me over the years on these issues, the ocean, I deeply appreciate their friendship and especially their dedication. The staffs that have been working with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] are exceptionally good. We will continue to overview and to watch the great oceans that surround our shores.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today we will send S. 39, the Sustainable Fisheries Act, to the President. The bill before us is the result of a long process—it was almost a year ago that the House passed H.R. 39, the basis for the bill we're debating today. H.R. 39 was carefully crafted to limit over-fishing, rebuild depleted stocks of fish, reduce bycatch and protect our marine resources.

Of particular concern to me is the bycatch issue—when sea turtles, red snapper, and other nontargeted species get caught and die in fishing nets. During consideration of the Magnuson reauthorization bill, the House adopted an amendment I offered to address this issue.

It is clear that the delicate balance between protecting our marine resources and encouraging industry has been maintained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is slightly different than the House-passed bill, but on the whole, it is a responsible step forward and an environmentally sound bill. Reauthorization of the Magnuson Act is long overdue. I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of S. 39.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my colleague from Alaska, the chairman of the committee, for his work on this bill. As the representative of a coastal district, I appreciate the difficulties and complexities you faced in crafting legislation in the face of such diverse and complicated fishing interests.

As you know, the reauthorization of the Magnuson Act is crucial to continuing the sound management of our Nation's fishery resources. Responsible fishing practices are necessary for protecting our nation's essential fishery habitat.

Last October, the House completed work on the Magnuson Act. The bill we sent the other body was a good bill that went a long way to restore the health of our fisheries.

However, it was not until last week that the Senate completed work on this bill and sent it to the House for final consideration. Obviously with only a few days left in the session, our options are limited and the opportunity to amend it is nonexistent. This has left me and many of my colleagues with a difficult choice. Either pass the bill in its current form, as watered down as it is, or send it back to the Senate where it would surely die. With reservations I will support this bill, in the hope that when we return to Congress next year, further improvements can be made.

I first want to point out that the Senate failed to adequately address the interests of small coastal fishing communities in the version delivered to the House.

Second, while the House addressed the windfall profit aspect associated with ITQS, the Senate bill falls silent. In addition, the Senate bill does not prohibit the development of ITQS through the moratorium period and does not prohibit ITQS from being placed in perpetuity.

Third, limited access schemes included in the bill may require permit holders to register their permits with a lien registry and pay a fee every time the permit is transferred.

I am concerned regarding provisions in the bill that may give the Secretary of Commerce the ability to impose a limited access plan, including ITQS, at his discretion, on any fishery that is not currently managed by a regional fishery management plan.

My last point is of special concern to many of my constituents. The Senate bill obscures the fishing community language by including the home ports of the distant water, corporately held, factory trawlers under the definition of ''community-based fleets.'' The House bill gives consideration of local, community-based fleets and protects the interests of the historic, generation after generation family fishermen.

As I stated previously, while I have very real concerns and reservations regarding this bill, I will vote for final passage to further the process of protecting our Nation's fisheries.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 39.

The question was taken.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 39, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY FOR THE MARSHAL AND POLICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4164) to provide for the extension of certain authority for the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4164

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 9(c) of the Act entitled ''An Act relating to the policing of the building and grounds of the Supreme Court of the United States'', approved August 18, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 13n(c)) is amended by striking ''1996'' and inserting ''2000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the consideration of the House H.R. 4164, a bill to extend the authority for the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police to provide security to Justices, court employees, and official visitors beyond the Court's buildings and grounds. It is crucial that we take favorable action on this legislation before adjourning this Congress, since authority to provide this protection is slated to expire on December 29, 1996.

The authority for the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police to provide security beyond court grounds appears at 40 U.S.C. 13n(a)(2), and was first established by Congress in 1982. Congress has periodically extended that authority—in the past 14 years, there has not been an interruption of the Supreme Court police's authority to provide such protection. Congress originally provided that the authority would terminate in December 1985, and extensions have been provided ever since. In 1985, authority was extended through December 26, 1990; in 1990, it was extended through December 29, 1993; and in 1993, it was extended through December 29, 1996.

Chief Justice Rehnquist has written to me requesting that Congress extend this authority permanently. As the