that the requirements contained in this bill only apply to food subject to regulation by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). I would like to clarify that wine and other alcoholic beverages are regulated by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau. Subject to a Memorandum of Understanding with the FDA, the Tax and Trade Bureau has primary jurisdiction over the production and labeling of most wine and other alcoholic beverages.

In this regard, the Tax and Trade Bureau is sensitive to the issue of allergens in alcoholic beverages. For example, wine with levels of sulfites over 10 parts per million has been required to state "Contains Sulfites" since 1987. The Tax and Trade Bureau works closely with the FDA in determining whether such labeling is appropriate.

Because of the manner in which wine and other alcoholic beverages are produced, there are significant questions whether substances that Tax and Trade Bureau allows to be used in the production of wine would have any allergenic effect. In this connection, other countries have implemented or are considering additional regulation of allergens in their food supply. Due to the potential impact of this on the international wine trade, research specifically directed to the allergenic effect of certain substances used in production of wine in being conducted in Australia and elsewhere. In light of this research, the industry section of the World Wine Trade Group (WWTG) (an intergovernmental organization which seeks to facilitate trade in wine among its members, including the U.S., Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Chile), submitted the following statement to their Governments:

ALLERGEN LABELING FOR WINE

Several countries, including WWTG members countries, have introduced or are considering the introduction of labeling for potential allergens including, inter alia, fish, milk and egg products. The WWTG industry group recommends that any such labeling must be based on sound science.

To date the scientific community has no evidence on the allergenic affects of these products in wine. Australia is currently undertaking extensive research in this area. Therefore, the WWTG industry group urges the WWTG governments to take full account of the scientific findings, expected within 12 months, in formulating or revising their labeling regulations in this area.

I anticipate that the Tax and Trade Bureau, in consultation with the FDA, will take the results of this international research into account in determining whether additional regulations requiring allergen labeling would be appropriate for wine and other alcoholic beverages. Among other things, the Tax and Trade Bureau should evaluate whether any such regulation would create an inadvertent international trade barrier. In this regard, I would like to work with the Chairman and Ranking Member, as well as the author of this bill, to ensure there are no unintended consequences resulting from this legislation.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 741.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida (during consideration of S. 741), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–620) on the resolution (H. Res. 731) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4837, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida (during consideration of S. 741), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–621) on the resolution (H. Res. 732) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4837) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Stenholm moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1308 be instructed to agree, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, to a conference report that—

(1) extends the tax relief provisions which expire at the end of 2004, and

(2) does not increase the Federal budget deficit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

This is a very simple motion. The motion calls on Congress to extend middle-class tax relief without increasing the deficit. There is a broad, bipartisan support for extending the middle-class tax provisions which expire at the end of this year. There is also bipartisan support for the concept of pay-as-you-go to avoid further increasing the record budget deficits facing our Nation. Our motion would put the House on record in support of a conference report that achieves both of these goals.

I strongly support middle-class tax relief. I support extending marriage penalty relief. I support continuing the $1,000 per child tax credit and the expanded 10 percent tax bracket.

What I oppose is passing those tax cuts with borrowed money and leaving our children and grandchildren to pay our bills.

The Blue Dog budget and Spratt budget substitute called for extension of middle-class tax relief offset by suspending a portion of additional tax cuts for upper-income taxpayers.

More recently, a bipartisan group of Senators has put forward a proposal to expand the three middle-class tax cuts for 1 year, offset by an extension of customs user fees and closing corporate tax loopholes.

The question is not whether or not we should provide tax relief to middle-class families. The debate is whether we should do so with borrowed money, adding more debt on top of our $7.1 trillion national debt.

We should not pay for tax cuts by borrowing money against our children's future. Congress should be required to sit down and figure out how to make things fit within a budget, just like families across the country do every day. If we do not pay for tax cuts by cutting spending or replacing the revenues, every dime of the tax cuts will be added to the debt we will leave for our children and grandchildren.

At a time when our national debt is approaching $8 trillion and our Nation faces tremendous expenses for our troops overseas, it is irresponsible to continue passing legislation that would put our Nation even deeper in debt.

As of the close of business last Friday, our total national debt stood at $7,273,792,456,490.62. It appears very likely the debt limit will be reached sometime in late September or October, with the most likely date being early October, and here let me pause for a moment and say instead of working in a bipartisan way, which we could achieve in a heartbeat to increase the debt ceiling, what we continue to face are more and more bills to increase spending and decrease revenue and increase the deficit.

We offer the hand of bipartisan cooperation on this amendment tonight, and in my opinion, if this would suddenly become the leadership's position, we would pass the tax cuts that the folks on this side of the aisle are talking about unanimously tomorrow or the next day, and it would conference out of the Senate.

But instead, it appears very likely the debt limit that will be reached