

yours, a notarized statement. It is a sworn statement. It is an affidavit. And so I think I am ready to do anything you wish but the feeding frenzy is on.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no right answer, I expect, to this question. With regard to the person referred to by the Senator from Wyoming as soon as we became aware that such a person existed we contacted all staff within 20 minutes, and any discussions that took place with that person were done jointly.

But I only say that to put them at rest. I want to end this. I see your counsel has indicated that it might be a good idea for you to go forward. And if that is your decision, we will go forward; from now on, though, as I said, no document will be put in place until every member has had time, to examine it and we will abide by your counsel's recommendation to you.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain that she is ready to answer questions. The issue of whether or not to bend the rules is not ours, it is yours.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir, and this is the last statement I am going to make on this. It is very easy for me to insist on the committee rules being followed, but you and Ms. Hill's other counsel may rightly conclude that Senator Simpson is correct, and that this will mean that this affidavit will be sitting out there for 2, 4, 6, 8 hours without a response. Since it is not a court of law, I am not prepared to make the judgment on whether or not Professor Hill is prejudiced by the fact that she cannot respond. That is why the chair is not going to rule that the committee rules must be adhered to, especially as they are not the committee rules, but ground rules laid down in what is obviously an extraordinary, unusual, and unprecedented hearing.

So, ultimately, we must look to the witness and her counsel to determine what is in her best interests, not the committee's best interest. From the beginning, the interests at stake are those of Professor Hill and those of Clarence Thomas, not those of the committee.

Ms. HILL. Will there be an opportunity to respond to the witness if he is called?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. You will have an opportunity to respond today, this moment if you wish, and to the witness if he is called.

Ms. HILL. Then I am ready to go forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Specter.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think my time is up. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say initially for the record that I did not make this statement available to the media or anyone.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that, Senator, I know you better than that.

Senator SPECTER. And the election is to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The election of the witness is to proceed knowing that we may call Mr. Doggett here to testify under oath if we so deem necessary.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Professor Hill, I had started to question you about this affidavit. I had desisted in mid-sentence because I wanted you to have an op-

portunity to read it. There was a concern on my part about the document but I think it has sufficient value and since you are willing to respond to it, I am going to discuss it with you briefly.

This is an affidavit provided by a man who knew both you and Judge Thomas, and its relevancy, to the extent that it is relevant, arises on page 2 where Mr. Doggett says the following:

The last time I saw Professor Anita Hill was at a going away party that her friends held for her at the Sheraton Carlton Hotel on K Street, just before she left for Oral Roberts Law School. During this party she said that she wanted me to talk in private. When we moved to a corner of the room she said, "I am very disappointed in you. You really shouldn't lead on women and then let them down." When she made that statement I had absolutely no idea what she was talking about. When I asked her what she meant she stated that she had assumed that I was interested in her. She said that it was wrong for me not to have dinner with her or to try to get to know her better. She said that my actions hurt her feelings and I shouldn't lead women on like that. Quite frankly I was stunned by her statement and I told her that her comments were totally uncalled for and completely unfounded. I reiterated that I had never expressed a romantic interest in her and had done nothing to give her any indication that I might be romantically interested in her in the future. I also stated that the fact that I lived three or four blocks away from her but never came over to her house or invited her to my condominium should have been a clear sign that I had no personal or romantic interest in her. I came away from her going away party feeling that she was somewhat unstable and that in my case she had fantasied about my being interested in her romantically.

On page 3,

It was my opinion at the time and it is now my opinion that Ms. Hill's fantasies about sexual interest in her were an indication of the fact that she was having a problem being rejected by men she was attracted to. Her statements and actions in my presence during the time when she alleges that Clarence Thomas harassed her were totally inconsistent with her current descriptions and are, in my opinion, of yet another example of her ability to fabricate the idea that someone was interested in her, when, in fact, no such interest existed.

My question to you, Professor Hill, is, is Mr. Doggett accurate when he quotes you as saying, "I am very disappointed in you. You really shouldn't lead on women and then let them down."

Ms. HILL. No, he is not.

Senator SPECTER. What, if anything, did he say to you?

Ms. HILL. As I recall, before we broke I told you that I had very limited memory of Mr. Doggett. The event that he is talking about was a party where there were 30 or 40 people. I was talking to a lot of people, they were people who I had known while I was here in Washington, and we might have had some conversation, but this was not the content of that conversation. I have very limited memory of him. I did not at any time have any fantasy about a romance with him.

Senator SPECTER. In the earlier part of his affidavit he says that he met you in 1982 at a gathering of African-American lawyers on Capitol Hill, and that he had a number of contacts with you. Are his statements in that regard accurate, if you recall?

Ms. HILL. As I said, my memory of him is limited. I do remember at some point seeing him jogging near my home, but beyond that I have a very limited memory of any interaction that I had with him or how I might have met him, anything like that.

Senator SPECTER. I am shifting now, Professor Hill, to a key issue regarding your testimony that you moved with Judge Thomas from the Department of Education to EEOC because you needed the job. That is your testimony, correct?

Ms. HILL. Well, I think that is your summary of my testimony.

Senator SPECTER. Well, is my summary accurate?

Ms. HILL. Well, I said that I moved to EEOC because I did not have another job. This position that—I was not sure whether I would have a position at the Department of Education. I suppose that could be translated into I needed the job.

Senator SPECTER. OK. I am informed, Professor Hill, that you were a schedule A attorney and in that capacity could stay at the Department of Education. Is that incorrect?

Ms. HILL. I believe I was a schedule A attorney but, as I explained it, I was the assistant to the Chair of—oh, excuse me—assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Education. That, I had not been interviewed by anyone who was to take over that position for that job. I was not even informed that I could stay on as a schedule A attorney, as well as, as I stated before, the agency was subject to being abolished.

Senator SPECTER. But as a schedule A attorney, you could have stayed in some job?

Ms. HILL. I suppose. As far as I know, I could have, but I am not sure because at the time the agency was scheduled to be abolished.

I want to add, too, that one of the things that I have made the point about before was that the activity had ended at that time, and I enjoyed the work. I wanted to do civil rights work, but I didn't know what work I would be doing if I could have even stayed at the agency, at the Department of Education. I moved on because I assumed that the issue of the behavior of Clarence Thomas had been laid to rest, that it was over, and that I could look forward to a similar position at the EEOC.

Senator SPECTER. I understand that you have given that reason, that the behavior had ended, so that you have given a basis for not expressing a concern, but your statements in your earlier testimony involved your conclusion that you would have lost your job, and I am now—

Ms. HILL. That was one of the factors.

Senator SPECTER. Excuse me?

Ms. HILL. That was one of the factors.

Senator SPECTER. That was one of the factors, and I am now asking you about the correctness of that in light of the fact that you were a schedule A attorney. While you would not have been Judge Thomas' assistant or perhaps the assistant of the Assistant Secretary, as a class A attorney you could have in fact kept your job, had you wanted to stay there.

Ms. HILL. That really was not my understanding, sir. At the time I understood that my job was going to be lost. That was my understanding.

Senator SPECTER. Well, did you make an inquiry?

Ms. HILL. With whom?

Senator SPECTER. Anyone?

Ms. HILL. I did not make an inquiry. I went on what I was told in my conversation with Mr. Thomas.

Senator SPECTER. Well, Judge Thomas was replaced by Harry Singleton, and Harry Singleton in fact, according to an affidavit provided, was prepared to retain you as one of his attorney advisors. Now I pursue this in some detail, Professor Hill, because on