

reduction across the West, we are going to have big fires. If we have big fires, we need to fight them. But we don't need to make the big fires more prevalent, more common, by cutting the fuel reduction budgets.

We had this discussion a bit in committee and actually found there was some common ground in this discussion. Certainly site rehabilitation and other activities, those are very desirable. But, again, to categorize them under firefighting I think could create major problems.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, in speaking of inadequate funds, if we were actually generating the funds by having actual timber harvest receipts, we wouldn't be looking to the government for the money for the type of fuel reductions that are needed. We would actually be making a living at it by taking adequate marketable timber, as well as operations that go along under a timber harvest plan that requires cleanup and replanting.

So we would be generating the receipts at the same time we would be doing this if we had this type of thinking involved with more of our forest management, not only in the current year where you're gaining those receipts, but in the future as you have a regenerated forest.

I would harken back to Weaverville, in Trinity County, in my area, where there was a fire some years ago that nearly burned the town; but then with no management, with no restoration, the land laid idle with brush, with snags, with all sorts of things growing back and remaining behind from that fire. It burned again just 7, 8, 9 years later and almost devastated the town once again. Whereas, we see on private lands, they're out there. They're salvaging. They're getting the job going again and restoring the forest, which is better for the habitat, better for siltation, better for the wildlife, better for the economy, better for everybody.

So let's move in the direction of fuel reductions, as my colleague from Oregon was talking about. Let's do the fuel reductions. But we don't have to do it with tax dollars. We can do it with the private sector having marketable timber being taken off and get the job done.

I, again, think this amendment will really help in this regard, so I respectfully, again, seek your support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Fuel reduction and salvage are two infinitely different categories. Salvage needs to be carefully planned. We already discussed earlier, the Forest Service doesn't have the resources to do that. Yet, if we take and add that onto suppression costs, that will take money away from fuel reduction and other programs of the agency.

I know around here we spend a lot of time talking about sequestration and a

lot of people think it doesn't have much real impact or it's just waste coming out of the government. That came out of the fuel suppression budget. Then a bunch of the firefighting money came out of the fuel suppression budget. And now we are going to act like there was enough money in the fuel suppression budget or the firefighting budget that we could spend it on other activities. Yes, we want to do restoration activity, but at some point we have got to suck it up and make the investments we need to make in our resource agencies so they can get the job done right.

We had a discussion of how to properly approach salvage earlier tonight. I'm not going to reiterate that issue. This amendment is not mandatory, but as an addition to an already inadequate account, which is stealing from other accounts, would not be good policy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to repeat and enhance the calls made by our colleagues today to end the disastrous spending cuts known as sequestration, to put a stop to the proposed disastrous cuts to SNAP benefits, and to urge the majority to abandon their plans to force the closure of the government and to default on the national debt.

I want to start with SNAP. Mr. Speaker, while nearly 50 million Americans struggle to put food on their tables, the majority are doubling their

cuts to basic food aid, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, also known as SNAP, which primarily helps children, seniors, and the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, 92 percent of the people who are on SNAP are children, the elderly, disabled, or already working. Food stamp recipients currently receive just \$1.40 per meal. SNAP is a vital tool to prevent hunger, fight hunger, and help struggling Americans feed their families as they seek new employment, send their children to school, and get themselves back on their feet.

Slashing nearly \$40 billion from SNAP, the majority bill takes the food out of the mouths of nearly 4 million Americans next year, particularly harming children, seniors, veterans, and Americans living in urban, rural, and suburban communities with chronically high unemployment. One in five children—that is 16 million children—struggle with hunger, a record high.

Mr. Speaker, here to address the effects of the SNAP cuts that we are talking about today is my valued and esteemed colleague from California, Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Congressman LOWENTHAL was elected to represent the 47th District of California after a long and distinguished career both in city politics and in the California State Assembly in Sacramento. Congressman LOWENTHAL serves on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as with me on the House Committee on Natural Resources. Congressman LOWENTHAL has stood up as a loud voice against cuts to the SNAP program. He has been quoted in the press as saying, "These cuts literally take the food from the mouths of babes."

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I appreciate his leadership in holding this vital conversation.

During my two decades in public service, I've heard many stories about how, when the economy slows down and when Americans fall on hard times, the American social safety net has helped our fellow Americans get back on their feet again.

I want to talk a little bit today, my dear friend, about what a constituent told me. I want to talk about his personal food stamp success, a story that really illustrates how SNAP is an investment in the future success of Americans.

□ 2015

This young man, whose name is Stefan, from Long Beach, recently wrote to me. He said:

My parents, after graduating from college in the mid-seventies, had to rely on food stamps for a period. They eventually went on to complete advanced degrees and began to have wonderful and productive jobs in the private sector and in higher education,

but they are both now quick to acknowledge the essential helping hand that food stamps—and also, for this young man, the WIC program for both his sister and him—played in helping them when times were tough.

Let us just remember what took place today, because these two Americans were low-income, childless adults at the time. It was for a very short period in their lives that they were low-income and also childless as adults. However, let us remember that this is one of the categories of people from whom the just-passed House bill would strip SNAP benefits. Stefan's parents, my friend, did not want to stay on food stamps, but food stamps provided them the ability to go on and become highly productive members of society because America invested in them through the SNAP program.

Contrary to the majority's claim, poor and unemployed Americans do not—and I repeat “do not”—want to remain unemployed in order to receive a meager \$1.40 per meal. That argument is specious. It paints a false picture of the masses of people who would rather have less than 6 quarters per meal than a paying job. This is not a rational choice. No one chooses the 6 quarters. These are people who need America's support and investment in order to survive.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. LOWENTHAL, to your point about no one would choose to take meals for 6 quarters and that no one would choose to remain on SNAP benefits, there is this myth running around that we hear all the time that people abuse SNAP benefits—that people are buying crab legs and lobster tails with their food stamps.

What is your opinion on that?

Mr. LOWENTHAL. My dear colleague from Pennsylvania, I agree that it's absolutely ludicrous.

On \$1.40 per meal, you are not having lobster dinners. You are not having real dinners. You are barely surviving. These are proud people who want to make a contribution to society, who went through a difficult period. As this son pointed out, after their getting through this difficult time, they moved on after receiving these benefits, which they proudly talk about how much they helped them, and they are now productive members of our society and contribute greatly to this society. It is fallacious and silly to think that people choose to be on SNAP because they want to exploit the system.

I want to talk a little bit about who our Congressional Budget Office estimates the bill that just passed today would deny SNAP benefits to.

First of all, it would deny SNAP benefits to over 3.8 million of our fellow Americans in the year 2014. Now, who are these poor, unemployed, childless Americans that this bill largely targets? According to the nonpartisan Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 40 percent are women; 34 percent are over 40 years of age; 50 percent are white; 30 percent are African Amer-

ican; 10 percent are Hispanic; and 5 percent are Native American; 40 percent live in suburban areas; 40 percent live in urban areas; and 20 percent live in rural areas.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that SNAP is an investment in America's workers, both current and prospective. To gut that investment—to let Americans go hungry—is to deny each of them an opportunity to become a contributing member of our society. This is not how America takes care of its people.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I want to thank the gentleman from California for really bringing home the point of the importance of SNAP benefits to our Nation, the validity of the program and the ridiculousness of the cuts that were passed out of the House today.

Instead of working to create jobs here at home, the majority is punishing people in America. It's pushing punishing legislation that abandons Americans who want to work but who can't find jobs. Even in communities with high unemployment, with double-digit unemployment, adults who can't find at least a half-time job under this bill would be thrown off SNAP after 3 months regardless of how high local unemployment is.

Now, this is unnecessary. SNAP currently has work requirements that can be waived by the States during times of high unemployment. Forty-six States, including almost every State with a Republican Governor, sought waivers in fiscal year '13 to provide SNAP for those looking for work—and repeatedly so over the last 10 years.

The bottom line here is that the bill that passed out of the House today on SNAP—cutting SNAP benefits close to \$40 billion over the next 10 years—is radical, and it won't pass into law. The Senate will not take up such a bill. The President would never sign it. It's radical, and it's a waste of time. By imposing such draconian cuts, the majority is really derailing any chance at the enactment of a responsible new bill, critical legislation to support our Nation's farmers and ranchers, to support food security, conservation, rural communities, and the 16 million Americans whose jobs directly depend on the agriculture industry. These majority cuts are almost 10 times those in the Senate bill, and they would make any chance at a bipartisan agreement on a much-needed farm bill nearly impossible.

I want to share with you some of the statistics from my own district in northeastern Pennsylvania. I represent the 17th Congressional District. This consists of six counties. In these six counties, we have fully 39,000 households receiving SNAP benefits at this time—an incredible number of people who really rely on these benefits, who use them to alleviate hunger and to prevent the situation in which kids are going to school hungry every day. The average monthly household SNAP participation in Pennsylvania in 2011 was 815,765 people. The average monthly

household SNAP participation in the United States in 2011, according to the USDA, was 21 million people in this country. In my district, over 14 percent of the households rely on SNAP benefits. These draconian cuts would go right to the heart of real people in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I want to switch gears, and I want to talk about the sequester. I want to enhance the calls by our colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus to end the disastrous spending cuts called “sequester.”

It has been months since these across-the-board cuts have gone into effect, devastating many important programs that Americans rely on every day. The purpose, of course, of the sequestration was to create a scheme of cuts so odious that Congress would do anything possible to avoid them, that Congress would be forced to come together and agree on a responsible budget. It was like a ticking time bomb that would force the Members of this House to come together, Mr. Speaker, and arrive at a reasonable compromise on an American budget; but the time bomb went off, and sequestration went into effect.

The bottom line here is that sequestration is going to cost 750,000 American jobs because of the disaster it wreaks on the American economy. That's not my figure. That's the figure put out by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—750,000 American jobs.

The majority's effort to make sequestration a reality shows it is ready, willing, and able to take our economy backward at a time when Americans are desperate to move this Nation forward. That's just missing the point. The majority has shown a willingness to vote on a fix for the front-page news FAA flight delay problem, but it hasn't addressed the 70,000 children who would lose access to Head Start or any of the other programs that have been crippled. Programs and services that millions of Americans rely on, like Head Start and even the Federal Emergency Management Agency program, are being decimated by draconian cuts in funding.

Funding for the FEMA agency has been slashed by over \$1 billion under sequester. Just as hurricane season began, cuts for the NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, will delay its weather satellite launch, causing an increase in cost to the program and an increased risk of inaccurate forecasts for future extreme weather. Public safety is being put at risk. It's also being put at risk as the U.S. Forest Service is facing fire season understaffed and underequipped with 500 fewer firefighters, 50 to 70 fewer fire engines, and two fewer aircraft. In fact, our transportation infrastructure in the United States is threatened by the sequester. The U.S. Department of Transportation will face \$1.943 billion in total budget cuts; and Amtrak, too, was cut by \$77 million under the sequester.

The services that keep us healthy are being hurt, including important mental health programs that are delivered through the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, which will be cut by \$168 million at a time when many are looking to expand mental health services to keep our communities safer, including communities like Washington, D.C. Food safety is being compromised as the Food and Drug Administration, the FDA, has to perform fewer inspections, increasing the risk of foodborne illness. Funding for NIH, the National Institutes of Health, shrunk by \$1.5 billion. Remember what the NIH does. It does life-saving medical research. Every single area of medical research in this country will be affected, including research to cure breast cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer's disease. The cuts from NIH alone will result in a loss of more than 20,000 jobs and \$3 billion in economic activity in this country. A \$285 million cut from the Centers for Disease Control research compromises our ability to detect and combat disease outbreaks, to facilitate immunizations, to plan for public health emergencies, and to conduct HIV and AIDS tests.

Critical support to everything, from putting police on our streets to agents at our borders, has been jeopardized. Our Federal public defenders are being furloughed, undermining the services that the already overburdened Federal courts face and forcing courts to hire private attorneys for defendants on an ad hoc basis at as much as \$125 an hour. It's being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

□ 2030

As for our national security, 800,000 Department of Defense civilian employees—including in my home district, where we have the Tobyhanna Army Depot—are facing 11 days of furloughs. These are families that are already struggling to make ends meet, to pay their mortgages, make their car payments, that try to put their kids through college. Eleven days of furloughs for these faithful employees of civilian defense contractors just isn't right. The Department of Defense budget was slashed by a total of \$37 billion this year, hurting economic growth in this Nation, among many other consequences.

In short, these cuts are putting the ability of our government to fully perform basic government functions that we need to keep us safe at risk. There are personal consequences. I represent Carbon County, Pennsylvania, in my district. Kim Henry from Carbon County is a participant in Head Start. Head Start doesn't just educate preschool children. It also educates and helps entire families. Head Start for Kim Henry in Carbon County helped her to figure out how to deal with situations she was facing struggling as a single mother, separated from her son's father. She was having a problem with her living arrangements. She was having a prob-

lem putting meals on the table. She was having trouble communicating her needs and figuring out how to get along in life as a single mother. Head Start, through its healthy family relationship singles workshop, helped her figure these things out.

We put too much on public schools in this country. We expect teachers to solve problems that parents need to solve. Kids don't come with instruction manuals, and a lot of times people need some guidance on how to be parents. Head Start helps provide that information, and it helped Kim Henry get her life back on track and get her relationship with her child back on track so that she's going to be a responsible parent and she's going to guide her child into being a responsible adult herself.

Meals on Wheels is cut by sequester, as well, not just Head Start. By the way, Head Start in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, alone, 49 kids alone are being asked to leave Head Start in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, because of the sequester cuts. They're never going to be 3 and 4 years old again. They're never going to have a chance to replay their time that they had to be in preschool. And they're going to spend their entire academic careers playing catchup with the other kids who have preschool. You know what that means. It means that they lose confidence in themselves as they struggle to keep up with the other kids, and they question their own ability to hang in there academically and to achieve and make the most of themselves. It's a big deal that kids get preschool through Head Start. When we cut kids from Head Start because of sequester, it's being penny-wise and pound-foolish because everybody knows that statistics show that the people who do worse academically, who struggle and fail academically, are way more likely to enter the criminal justice system in one form or another. It's a truth that is proven time and time again. The way to handle this problem is nip these problems in the bud, make good students out of kids, and do it through Head Start. Let's not cut these things.

Meals on Wheels is another great American program. In Scranton, Pennsylvania, which I represent, Meals on Wheels is a very important program. It doesn't just provide meals for seniors; it also provides socialization. People are showing up at seniors' homes and talking with them and communicating with them and checking in on them.

It's not just about socialization. It's also about safety. Just recently, a Meals on Wheels volunteer in Scranton was delivering a meal to an elderly man who didn't come to his door. The volunteer was concerned, looked through the window, and saw the man lying unconscious on his floor in his home. This volunteer was able to summon help, get the man medical help, get him to the hospital, and basically save his life. Meals on Wheels isn't just about a meal, it's about communica-

tion, it's about checking up on people who don't have other people to check up on them.

Old Forge, Pennsylvania, is another town that I represent. A different Meals on Wheels volunteer in Old Forge was delivering food during winter to an elderly woman and noticed that she came to the door wearing a parka and mittens and a hat. When the volunteer inquired as to why she was wearing that, as if she had to, the woman replied that she didn't have any heat. That volunteer was able to make contact with the appropriate social service agencies, figure out how to get the heat turned back on, and the heat was turned back on. Again, a potentially dangerous situation for the elderly woman was averted. Why? Because of Meals on Wheels. It makes no sense for us to cut Meals on Wheels. The people who are suffering by these cuts are our seniors. We need to be honoring our seniors, not cutting their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, while the sequestration process has obviously already begun, it is not too late to work together to change course. On behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I say we must change course. We can't take these sequester cuts and plan on living with them ad infinitum. It makes no sense. It's the wrong solution for America.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to address on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus the question about Congress acting to avoid another shutdown showdown. Once again, a deadline looms before the United States Congress, and once again the majority is set to play politics by threatening to shut down the Federal Government rather than work toward a budget compromise. Instead of working together to develop a budget that is going to work for all Americans, the majority is letting extremists and ideologues drive the agenda.

Just last month, we marked an inauspicious anniversary: Standard & Poor's downgrading the full faith and credit of the United States of America. So we have two things going on: we have the majority trying to extract political concessions in exchange for keeping the doors of America's government open and in exchange for America not defaulting on its national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America. We pay our bills. We pay our bills, and we pay them on time. That's what preserves the full faith and credit of the United States, it preserves our creditworthiness, and it prevents our interest rates from skyrocketing because that is exactly what will happen if we default on the national debt. Our interest rates will go through the roof, and it will cause not an immediate recession, but an immediate depression. That is ridiculous, to hold the national debt hostage in that fashion because you're not just holding the debt ceiling hostage, you are holding the American economy and the welfare

of every single American hostage, as well. We cannot let that happen. It is the most ridiculous thing. To have that held hostage for political gain, for political ideological purposes, is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I urge my fellow colleagues in the House to abandon this plan to hold hostage the American full faith and credit, the American creditworthiness, and the American economy on the basis that it's a good way to extract political concessions for what the ideologues in this House are after.

Mr. Speaker, instead of working together to do our jobs and resolve these critical issues, the majority are staking out a decidedly different approach from working together. In fact, Speaker BOEHNER has indicated that he is gearing up for "a whale of a fight" to push the interests of the majority's right flank ahead of the needs of the American people. In fact, Mr. BOEHNER has been vocal about his plans to use the need to raise that debt limit to call for cuts to the programs that we've been discussing, the programs that help American families. As Speaker BOEHNER said, "I'll say this: It may be unfair, but what I'm trying to do here is to leverage the political process."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I say, no, don't do that. Don't do that. Back off of that extreme approach. Back off of that dangerous approach. Holding hostage the entire American Government and holding hostage the American interest rate and economy doesn't make sense. Let's work together and figure out our problems in a responsible, reasonable, and a measured manner. We can do that. And on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I say we must do that.

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

#### THE MEDICAL DEVICE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight we'd like to spend some time talking about an issue that I think has bipartisan support and what the American people will want to pay a little bit of attention to. I am actually going to talk a little bit about the medical device industry. Mr. Speaker, I'm a passionate advocate for this industry.

Coming from the State of Minnesota, we have some giant titans in this industry. Many of the folks out in this country may know the names of Medtronic, Boston Scientific, and St. Jude, but I'll tell you there are also 400 medical device companies in Minnesota that are small. These are companies you have never heard of, but many of which I've had the opportunity to tour

and visit. They're all about entrepreneurship, innovation, improving lives, and saving lives.

Tonight we have a handful of Members who really want to devote some time talking about a challenge that has risen up against this industry, and that's the new medical device tax. It was part of the health care law. It just started being implemented in January. This is an excise tax that might not sound like a lot at 2.3 percent. This is also a tax not on profit, but a tax on their revenue. We'll get into a little more detail about why that is so dangerous to this industry and why it has become so much more challenging in just a little bit.

I will say this, though: of the 400 companies that are in Minnesota, about 200 of them alone are in my district, the Third District of Minnesota. So it's easy for me to be a passionate advocate. Many people think of Minnesota as just being the Land of 10,000 Lakes, but it's more than that. And there's no doubt that the innovative spirit that is alive in Minnesota is actually alive across the country in many States, and you're going to hear from some Members that represent some of those States that are being impacted very negatively from this new tax. It's a \$30 billion tax that is being collected. That's a significant amount of money.

What does that mean? It essentially means less research and development. It means less innovation. In the end, that means less opportunity for American patients to access new breakthrough technologies. I would argue that many of us would also say that that means it is also going to result in less access to health care and then lowering health care costs, because technology has the great ability to lower health care costs. There are many statistics that actually show that in the last 20 years, the medical device and technology industry has been responsible for a 4 percent increase in U.S. life expectancy, a 16 percent decrease in mortality rates, and an astounding 25 percent decline in elderly disability rates.

□ 2045

So medical devices that help to slash the death rate from heart disease by a stunning 50 percent and cut the death rate from stroke by 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of issues where Republicans and Democrats don't necessarily see eye to eye, but I think we can all agree on this: the single worst thing we can do in America is to crush our inventive spirit, and that is exactly what this new medical device tax does and is doing.

We've got some bipartisan support. I first want to thank Congressman RON KIND, my colleague from Wisconsin, for being the lead author and for helping build up the 260 coauthors to repeal this dangerous tax.

And I'm going to yield right now to my colleague from Utah, who also is

going to share some thoughts and a perspective on this tax. He has been a great leader tonight in gathering up some folks to come and testify and talk on the floor. I want to thank him and his staff for encouraging his colleagues to come out and speak tonight. He has been a strong leader and a great partner in this repeal effort. So I would like to yield to my friend and colleague, Mr. MATHESON.

Mr. MATHESON. I appreciate my friend and colleague, Mr. PAULSEN, for organizing this.

I think at the outset what should be noted most is, after the House finishes its regular business of the day, we hold these opportunities for people to take 60 minutes to talk about a particular issue; and, generally, these 60 minutes are divided up where one party has an hour and then the other party has an hour. And I just think that it's really important to note that here we are talking about an issue, and it's people from both parties getting together.

Everywhere I go, I hear about people wanting folks in Congress to work together; and here we have an issue where we've got, as Mr. PAULSEN said, 260 cosponsors. A majority of the House of Representatives is already on the legislation to repeal the medical device tax. So I applaud his leadership in working in a constructive way and building a coalition around this issue. And I'm going to take some time a little bit later to continue talking about this issue.

But if I could just for the moment, I would like to recognize my colleague Mr. PETERS from California for some comments on the medical device tax.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with many of my colleagues to urge the full and immediate repeal of the medical device tax provision in the Affordable Care Act. As we speak, there are thousands of companies nationwide that are working to develop new technologies that will transform the face of medical care.

My district in San Diego, California, is home to numerous medical device manufacturers, innovating each day to improve the standard of care, reduce recuperation time for patients, and lower health care costs in the long term. There are small businesses and large companies generating an increasingly large economic impact in local communities like mine across the country.

I will use a few examples from my district, and I will feel bad because someone will tell me that I have missed some. NuVasive has developed minimally invasive spinal surgeries that allow a patient to walk more quickly post-surgery, spend less time in the hospital, and return to work sooner. That's better care, and that's money saved. CareFusion creates devices to improve patient care in hospitals, which minimizes mistakes and saves money. ResMed creates unique sleep apnea masks that improve patient health and productivity and reduces the incidence of other diseases