

Senator SIMPSON. Would you tell me how that came to pass? I just have a passing interest.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to know the answer to that, too.

Mr. PAUL. Senator, I apologize. I didn't mean to take sides between you and Ms. Totenberg.

Senator SIMPSON. No, no, we are both able to do that. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAUL. I was being perhaps too glib there. I've never spoken to Ms. Totenberg. What I meant was that I had been woken up by my clock radio going off and I heard Ms. Totenberg say my name, as I woke up, saying that I had been subpoenaed to appear before this committee.

Senator SIMPSON. I see.

Mr. PAUL. It was quite a wake-up call, Senator. [Laughter.]

Senator SIMPSON. That saved us a further round. [Laughter.]

Now, wait until I tell you what she told me. [Laughter.]

I have it here before me, but it is Sunday in America, so I shall leave it out. [Laughter.]

One final question, and here it really is. You are speaking with passion and with truth, and this is my question: Does it seem odd to any of you here that these universally crude and obscene things which we have all heard, it is all that is out there, and we know that they took place, according to Ms. Hill, between 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984, somewhere in all that pattern, perhaps, that is what we are told, and that she has stated to this panel that pressure, that this man was exerting power over her, authority, status, a threat of a loss of a job.

Those things are all in this record, and yet others have said that, because she was a schedule A attorney, there was never any fear of that and that she knew that or should have known that, and others have given us information that there was plenty of budget there and she would have been taken care of, and that will come in later in the next panel.

So, here is, this foul, foul stack of stench, justifiably offensive in any category, that she was offended, justifiably, embarrassed, justifiably, and that she was repelled, justifiably. And I ask you why, then, after she left his power, after she left his presence, after she left his influence and his domination or whatever it was that gave her fear—and call it fear or revulsion or repulsion—why did she twice after that visit personally with him in Tulsa, OK, had dinner with him in the presence of others, had breakfast with him in the presence of others, rode to the airport alone with him in the presence of no one, and we have 11 phone calls initiated by her from 1984 through the date of Clarence Thomas' marriage to Ginni Lamp, and then it all ended and not a single contact came forward.

What does that say about behavior? Because Ms. Hill is not alleging sexual harassment—go back and look, go back and look at her press conference, go back and look at all of it—she is alleging behavior.

We are here today because of behavior. If we are here today because of behavior, may I please have a summary from you of what this says about her behavior? I would ask each of you—and I will defer my next round—I just think it is critical. We are talking about behavior. As human beings, I would like you to respond to this as behavior.