

Father BROOKS. In more than 20 years, I do not think I have experienced a shred of evidence of any dishonesty or even lack of candor in Clarence Thomas. I have always found him very forthright, very clear in what he is saying to me and very cooperative. There is not a shred of dishonesty in him, I do not believe.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is my reaction exactly. In less than 20 years, more like 15 years of dealing with him, I have found him to be a completely honorable person in all of his dealings with me and with others. I think, Senator Brown, the suggestion to which you refer is that he has undergone some kind of a conversion to obtain confirmation. I do not believe that for a moment. It is perfectly clear that his lot here would have been a lot simpler, if he had simply said, well, if I am confirmed, I will not vote to overrule *Roe v. Wade*.

The CHAIRMAN. I can assure you that would not be true. You would find an eruption on this side of the table similar to the one you found on that side of the table, and you know that not to be the case, Judge.

Mr. GIBBONS. But then he could count the votes. [Laughter.]

Ms. SUDARKASA. Senator, may I just say that I, unlike my colleagues here, am not a longstanding acquaintance of Judge Thomas. I joined this panel, because I was not able to stay for the afternoon. But I am a person who came to my assessment of the Judge, having read his speeches. I am not a lawyer, so I did not read all of the cases that have been referred to, but I read almost everything I could find about Judge Thomas, and I think that his observation early in the hearing is the appropriate one, namely that, before people knew who he was, they had made up their minds that Judge Thomas fit into one mold or the other. And I think that seeing the real person, who always came across to me as someone groping for answers to very tough questions, seeing the real Clarence Thomas simply put some people off-guard.

I do not think that he was dishonest. I think that where he had reservations about giving his opinions, he expressed those, despite vigorous questioning, and where he felt it was appropriate to give those views, whether they were ones that he held in 1974 or ones that he had come to more recently, he gave them, so I thought that he was very forthcoming.

Senator BROWN. Thank you. I guess I have come to notice this, because or a charge or at least a concern was raised that he had undergone some change of heart with regard to the use of natural law in that he did not now advocate it as a means of interpreting the Constitution. But in reviewing the cases, it appears to me that he has been totally consistent with that view in the cases that he has written, and I think, surprisingly to some members of the committee, the fact is he said exactly the same thing about not using natural law when he was up for confirmation for the Circuit Court of Appeals, in terms of conversion.

I do not know what kind of conversion this committee could induce. I suspect it would be not an angelical conversion, it might be one more akin to the Spanish Inquisition, but I doubt that, with a benign charming chairman as we have, I suspect even that conversion would not be available to this committee.