

Ms. HILL. Yes.

Senator LEAHY. And if there had been even more questions going specifically conversation-by-conversation it would be safe to say that you would have had even more specific language?

Ms. HILL. I would have attempted to.

Senator LEAHY. It would be safe to say, also, that you found it uncomfortable repeating even the language that we elicited from you in the questions?

Ms. HILL. Yes.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you.

I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator SPECTER.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a word or two. Professor Hill, when you say that by hindsight—because I wrote this down, it is difficult for me to understand. In looking at the entire record, it is difficult for me to understand. You have substantially enlarged a testimony which I had expected based on the FBI report and your statement as to what you allege Judge Thomas had done. The critical move from the Department of Education to the EEOC is not understandable to me, where you make the statements about his offensive conduct. For an experienced lawyer not to inquire about standing or even an inexperienced lawyer not to inquire about standing to stay at the Department of Education or not to make an inquiry of the people in charge.

The toll calls you characterized as garbage which you admitted to in your interviews with the newspaper although you denied other aspects. You know concede to be true, you did make those calls. It is one thing for you to say that you felt constrained to maintain some sort of an association with Judge Thomas in the face of this kind of conduct which you have represented, but why make the calls which you agreed to, the how are you doing, or I am in town, or tell the secretary you are in town? Why drive the man to the airport? Why maintain that kind of a cordial association in the face of this kind of conduct?

We have an office, equal opportunities, EEOC to enforce the laws on sexual harassment. And we have here representations that the nation's chief law enforcement officer sexually harassed his attorney advisor. That attorney advisor is dedicated to enforcement of the law against sexual harassment and tells us that she moved from the Department of Education to EEOC because she wanted to protect the women of America. And conceding that this is an enormous educational experience, the question is why with an experienced lawyer in that position being concerned about women's rights, do you leave a man, Clarence Thomas, as Chairman of the EEOC for years when according to your testimony he has been guilty of sexual harassment, himself?

Now, I do see explanations at every turn. And I have wondered about the quality of those explanations, candidly. But there is no description for this entire proceeding other than a tragedy. I do not know how Judge Thomas defends himself beyond stepping forward and saying that he is shocked, surprised, hurt, and saddened. And the shortest statute of limitations I have ever heard of is 180 days.

Until I got involved in this proceeding I did not know there was such a short statute of limitations. Contract cases are 6 years, tort cases are 2 years, criminal cases are 5 years, but the Federal law has put that into effect because it is so difficult to defend and to go back and to recollect all that has happened. And I appreciate the stark nature of the statements which have been made.

But I also see that your own statement that you prepared in your leisure, put aside the FBI statement, you were with two people, but no mention about the Coke bottle, no mention about sexual prowess, no mention about other major issues which are in your statement. So I conclude, from looking at this very complex day on our obligation to try to find out what happened between a man and a woman long ago, and nobody else was there, that I would agree with you, Professor Hill, it is very difficult for me to understand.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

The Senator from North Carolina—South Carolina, I beg your pardon.

Senator THURMOND. Well, don't forget it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. I realize there are certain things I should never say to the Senator from South Carolina, and one of them is that he is from North Carolina.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I just have one brief question.

Professor Hill, I understand you told the FBI that you had concerns about the political philosophy of Judge Thomas and that he may no longer be open-minded. Is that accurate?

Ms. HILL. I told them that I did not quite understand, but as they had been represented, yes, that I did have some concerns.

Senator THURMOND. I have the FBI report here, and I just wondered if you remember telling them that.

Ms. HILL. I remember discussion about political philosophy and I remember specifically saying that I'm not quite sure that we understand his political philosophies. But based on what I understand, yes, there is some discomfort.

Senator THURMOND. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Now, let me just say, Professor Hill, we have heard in a sense the half of this story today, all of your story, and we have not heard all of Judge Thomas' story.

But I, for one, can assure you that, assuming for the moment what you have said is true, there is nothing hard to understand. Having spent as many years as I have dealing with the issue of victimization and victimization of women, I have seen that every single psychiatrist and psychologist who considers himself or herself an expert in the field will point out that the nature of response is not at all atypical, assuming it to be true—and please do not be offended by my saying “assuming it to be true.” I view myself again here as a finder of fact and we have yet to hear the whole story from Judge Thomas.

This is a tragedy; and people keep mentioning that, and my good friend from Iowa hopes that this will never happen again in the sense of the way the committee handled it.