

Clarence Thomas any more times?" It doesn't say when, it says "any more times than may have sporadically shown up on these three pages?"

Did anyone consult with you or advise you?

Ms. HOLT. Absolutely not.

Senator SIMON. So, between the time of your deposition and right now, the additional five or six times, you didn't talk to anybody about that?

Ms. HOLT. You continue to say five or six times. It could have been two times, it could have been three times. You can't hold me to the five or six times. I'm not sure of that. I know for a fact that she called on instances when she was put directly through to Clarence Thomas.

Senator SIMON. But earlier this evening, Senator Specter said, when I read the deposition, said Ms. Holt will testify that she called an additional five or six times. Do you know where he got that information?

Ms. HOLT. I have no idea.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Chairman, I did not say five or six times. I said I was told that she would testify that there were calls made which were not on the logs, because the calls were received, but I did not say five or six times.

Senator SIMON. Well, my recollection is you did say that, but we will let the record show, we will print the record and we will find out. Senator Specter at least admits that he said that you were going to testify about—

Senator SPECTER. No, I don't admit anything, Mr. Chairman. I state a fact. I don't make admissions here.

Senator SIMON. Well, he said—

Senator SPECTER. Thank you.

Senator SIMON [continuing]. That you were going to testify to additional calls beyond the deposition.

Ms. HOLT. I did not tell him that.

Senator SIMON. You don't know where Senator Specter got that information?

Ms. HOLT. I have no idea.

Senator SIMON. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. Senator Thurmond.

Senator KENNEDY. I think our time is up on this.

Senator THURMOND. I just have a question I would like to propound.

All of you ladies have a close relationship with Judge Thomas. Did you consider him to be a clean, decent, thoughtful, caring man, who treated his women and co-workers, as well as women in general, with courtesy and respect? I would like for each one of you to answer that.

Ms. ALVAREZ. Yes, sir, absolutely.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Fitch.

Ms. FITCH. Most definitely, Senator.

Senator THURMOND. Ms. Holt.

Ms. HOLT. Absolutely.

Senator THURMOND. Ms. Myers.

Ms. BERRY. Absolutely.

Senator THURMOND. All of you answered yes, is that correct?

Ms. ALVAREZ. Yes.

Ms. FITCH. Yes.

Ms. HOLT. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you.

Is there anybody else on this side who has any questions?

Senator SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I just have—I understand what Senator Kennedy is saying, but the word “schizophrenic” did not appear from anyone on this side of the aisle. The word “delusion” did not appear from anyone on this side of the aisle. That was in the testimony or the statement of the U.S. attorney who said that was an impossible thing, to use a lie detector. Those names, those hot buttons, those phrases did not come from us, and it is curious to me how anyone could say that, when Judge Thomas was asked questions about what Professor Hill’s motivation was, that all of that entered the record, and that is all we are doing here.

So, I think just for the purposes of the record—and when you get to thinking about it, and all of us, as lawyers, have you ever seen a hearing in your life like this, where the opponents of the nominee and, in particular, a single witness, almost on a par in status with the nominee, is all out of balance—and that’s fine, I have no problem with that, but let us all realize what is happening here. This is about Clarence Thomas, nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court, not Anita Hill, and it seems to have tilted off in that extraordinary way.

One of the things that is in the public domain—and we have a rule, we have to see it for 2 days—I want to enter into the record this letter from Andrew S. Fishel, Managing Director of the Federal Communications Commission, where he said that he had listened to Ms. Hill testify, and he said, “At no time were any of the employes of OCR at risk of losing their jobs during this period”—this is the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education. They had a separate budget earmarked which was more sufficient to avoid any staff cutbacks. He was involved in the office, I understand.

“Additionally, no employees were made to feel that their jobs were in jeopardy”—I keep hearing this come up all the time. Quite the opposite was true, he said:

After Mr. Thomas announced his departure from OCR to go to EEOC, Mr. Thomas made a special point of walking the halls of OCR to introduce Mr. Harry Singleton, his successor, to OCR staff in order to facilitate the continuity of leadership. Any explanation of Ms. Hill’s rationale for leaving OCR to go to EEOC that is founded on her allegation that she would have lost her job at OCR is without basis.

I include that in the record, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The letter referred to follows:]