



Legislative Bulletin.....July 16, 2014

Contents:

Democrat Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3230

Democrat Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3230 — (Gallego-D, TX)

Order of Business: Representative Gallego [announced](#) his intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230 on July 15, 2014.

Summary: Representative Gallego’s motion would move the House managers on the conference committee to end their disagreement on section 601 of the [Senate amendment](#) to H.R. 3230. A vote in favor of this motion would indicate support of section 601 which authorizes major medical facility leases in the following locations:

- Albuquerque, New Mexico
- Brick, New Jersey
- Charleston, South Carolina
- Cobb County, Georgia
- Honolulu, Hawaii
- Johnson County Kansas
- Lafayette, Louisiana
- Lake Charles, Louisiana
- New Port Riche, Florida
- Ponce, Puerto Rico
- San Antonio, Texas
- San Diego, California
- Tyler, Texas
- West Haven, Connecticut
- Worcester, Massachusetts
- Cape Girardeau, Missouri
- Chattanooga, Tennessee
- Chico, California
- Chula Vista, California
- Haines, Illinois
- Houston, Texas
- Lincoln, Nebraska
- Lubbock, Texas
- Myrtle Beach, South Carolina
- Phoenix, Arizona
- Redding, California

Title VI of the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3230 authorizes the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to enter into leases to obtain the use of major medical facilities at specified locations. Under current law, the VA must receive specific legislative authorizations to lease medical facilities with average annual rental payments in excess of \$1 million. The purpose is for Congress to ensure there is equitable distribution of medical facilities throughout the United

States. According to [CBO](#), most of the costs related to these leases would increase direct spending by \$1.208 billion over the 2014-2024 budget window.

On December 10, 2013, the House passed H.R. [3521](#), by a vote of [346-1](#), which authorizes major medical facility leases through the VA. The locations included in H.R. 3521 mirror the list above with the one exception of Tulsa, Oklahoma, which was not included in the Senate amendment. Read the legislative bulletin for this bill from the Republican Study Committee [here](#).

Additional Background: The House may vote to instruct its conferees under [three](#) different circumstances. First, before the conferees are appointed; second, 20 calendar days and 10 legislative days after the conferees were appointed (if they had not yet filed a conference report); finally, when a conference report is recommitted to conference. The motion to instruct only instructs House conferees and not those that have been appointed by the Senate. It is important to note the instructions to conferees are not binding; therefore, a point of order cannot be sustained against the conference report in the event it is inconsistent with the instructions voted out of the House.

Committee Action: Motions to instruct are not referred to committee.

Cost to Taxpayers: The motion itself would yield no new costs to taxpayers. For costs associated with the underlying policy of the motion, please refer to the CBO score linked in the summary above.

Constitutional Authority: According to House rules, a constitutional authority statement is not needed for motions to instruct.

RSC Staff Contact: Rebekah Armstrong, Rebekah.Armstrong@mail.house.gov, 202-226-0678

NOTE: *RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.*

###