

more than \$5 million. So did Colin Gouley hit the jackpot with a \$5 million verdict if he has a lifetime of being in a wheelchair because of medical malpractice? Is this "jackpot justice"?

Kim Jones, 30 years old, went in for a simple tubal ligation and ended up in a comatose state in a nursing home for the rest of her life. Is an award in her case a jackpot? Did she hit it big if they gave her enough money for someone to care for her the rest of her life? Frankly, she will never be able to care for her daughter again.

Or Alan Cronin, 42 years of age, who went into a hospital in California for a routine hernia surgery and ended up with an infection so serious that it led to gangrene in all of his limbs and amputation of both arms and legs—Alan Cronin, would he be the winner of a jackpot if those who were responsible for his losing his arms and his legs had to pay and compensate him not only for his medical bills and lost wages but also for his pain and suffering?

That is the part of the calculation which those who bring the bill to the floor have not spoken of. They talked about the challenges facing doctors. We conceded that. In some areas of the country, malpractice insurance is too high. Don't overlook what this bill does. It closes the door and removes the jury from the decision about fair compensation for people who have been injured through no fault of their own.

That is why I think those who are pushing this bill will probably be unsuccessful tomorrow. People on this side of the aisle, and Republicans as well, believe this bill, S. 11, goes too far. This is excessive. This is not setting out to simply solve the problem. This is setting out to make a political point—that we are going to go after those who would be so bold as to file a lawsuit.

In the pages of this bill, you will see a limitation on what attorneys can be paid if they represent one of these clients or one of these patients I have mentioned—people who have lost their limbs, people who are no longer able to function as normal human beings. If they go to hire a lawyer to represent them in a case of malpractice, this law will restrict how much their lawyer can be paid.

If you believe in justice, wouldn't you also argue that those who defend the doctors and defend the hospitals should have their attorney's fees limited as well? Wouldn't that be fair? Isn't that justice with a blindfold? No. The blindfold is raised on one side. It is a wink and a nod to the defense industry representing the doctors and the hospitals. But when it comes to these poor people with limited economic resources fighting for compensation for injuries that are no fault of their own, this bill limits the amount of money that can be paid to those lawyers.

I will tell you that without the contingency fee system, most of these poor people I have described today will never ever have their day in court. No

attorney will be able to represent them.

Do you recall not too many months ago that sad story in North Carolina, I believe at a major university, where there was supposed to be a heart-lung transplant and they mistakenly brought the wrong blood and tissue type organs to be transplanted and a mistake was made? It was clearly not the mistake of the family or the little girl who was involved. Discovering this error, they tried to implant an additional set of organs—heart and lung—to save her after this serious mistake was made.

I can tell you that this little girl, who sadly died because of that malpractice, would have recovered little or nothing for that wrongful death under this legislation.

Where do you point to in terms of lost wages for a little girl who died during the course of the surgery? Where is the pain and suffering in a wrongful death lawsuit? Yet that is what it comes down to.

Those sponsors of this bill are prepared to close the courthouse door and say that for her family, they do not have the opportunity to get a lawyer because the contingency fee is limited, and once they have that lawyer there is little or nothing they can recover despite clear evidence of medical malpractice.

That isn't fair. It isn't American. It isn't just. We are talking about rewarding people who have been seriously and egregiously injured.

I hope my colleagues will join me tomorrow in voting against the motion for cloture. We should not proceed to this bill. This bill should proceed to a committee. It should go to a committee for a long period of study of compromise, of amendment, of a good-faith effort on both sides involving the medical profession, and the insurance industry which gets a windfall from this bill, as they do virtually every bill that comes through here, as well as the legal profession; and a bill that will end up in a resolution of the problems facing our doctors and medical providers whom we value very much, but I don't believe they would stand behind such a product that is so fundamentally unfair.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

A TRIBUTE TO ROZ WYMAN

• Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, 50 years ago today a young and dynamic woman was elected as a member of the Los Angeles City Council. She was just 22 years old, making her the youngest council member in the city's history.

The fact that such a record has been held for so long is in itself remarkable. But then again, we are talking about a truly remarkable woman, Rosalind Wyman.

For many years now, Roz has worked tirelessly, for her family and friends, for the city she loves, for the State of California, for the Democratic Party, and for women everywhere.

There is a wonderful photo of Roz when she was only 2 years old, smiling up at a portrait of Franklin Roosevelt. Her mother, Sarah, was a precinct captain for FDR's first Presidential campaign, running the operation out of the family's drugstore on 9th Street and Western Avenue in Los Angeles.

Roz's father, Oscar, worried that such a partisan stance would cost them customers, but Sarah believed that electing Roosevelt was much more important.

Small wonder, then, that Roz developed a deep and abiding passion for political activism and the Democratic Party. Her first campaign was working on behalf of Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, in her ill-fated 1950 Senate race against Richard Nixon, when he unfairly portrayed her as "the Pink Lady."

Then, 2 years later, Roz made history by becoming the youngest person ever elected to the L.A. City Council, and only its second woman member. She went on to serve in that body for the next 12 years, on the finance and budget committees, and eventually becoming president pro-tempore.

As another woman who entered California politics in the 1950s, I can assure you that it was quite a different world back then. It was still very much a male club. In both Los Angeles and San Francisco, one was hard-pressed to find a women's bathroom anywhere near the chambers.

Something else Roz inherited from her mother was a love for baseball. In fact, there is nowhere that Roz Wyman would rather be than at Dodger Stadium, at the home plate corner of the Dodger dugout, where she has had her seats for over 40 years now.

It is no exaggeration to say that the Dodgers would not have come to Los Angeles without the vision, fortitude, and sheer determination of Roz Wyman. Just ask Tommy Lasorda, who said: "What this lady did for baseball in this city, they should erect a monument to her."

Today, it is hard to believe how polarizing the effort was to bring the Dodgers from Brooklyn in the late 1950s. Yet Roz, believing that a professional sports team was just what L.A.