

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you indicated you spontaneously contacted Professor Hill via a letter when this all broke.

Mr. CARR. That's correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You were then contacted by several of her attorneys, or you ended up speaking to several of her attorneys. Now, have you spoken to any interest group, have you been contacted by anyone other than members of this committee or the Federal Government that have called you to encourage you to do, say, or characterize anything at all?

Mr. CARR. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Wells, you were quite emphatic about not being—I'm not sure it's your phrase—"a tool of or pushed by or any—"

Ms. WELLS. A party to—

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. Any interest group. Let's go back, if I may. Again, would you tell me the dates or the approximate dates of the conversation you had with the professor. Just tell me the date, and I will follow it from there.

Ms. WELLS. It was in the fall of 1982. And that, I know, well, I have a recollection that we had other conversations concerning the situation, but the one that stands out and is most vivid for me is that initial conversation when she made the disclosure.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what makes you remember that you had other conversations relative to her displeasure with her boss and how he was treating her relative to sexual advances?

Ms. WELLS. My—well, because of the way we operated, we were in frequent contact. We were a support mechanism for one another. I mean we shared the good news and we shared the bad news.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever see her, or was this merely a telephone relationship?

Ms. WELLS. Oh, no, she told me this in person.

The CHAIRMAN. She told you that in person?

Ms. WELLS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Give me a sense of the relationship that you had with her at the time. Did you go to dinner with her? Did you meet her for lunch? Would you visit each other in your apartments or homes? I mean, what was the nature of your social relationship?

Ms. WELLS. Senator, we had a very warm and close relationship. I would not say that we were best friends, we had other friends, but she and I shared certain values, and outlook about life. She would come to my home and have dinner. She would go on shopping sprees with my mother and sister.

We went out, did a lot of things together.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you seem like a very strong-willed person?

Ms. WELLS. My friends say so.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you not give her any advice, during this period when you knew she was unhappy. I mean did you not pull her aside, at any point, and say, hey, look, Anita, whatever? Or, did you do it at all? Did you ever raise the subject with her or did it only come up from her to you?

Ms. WELLS. It was something that came up from her. If I—to open the conversation—if I were to do something like that, I would say, well, you know, how are things going? I know Professor Hill as

a very private person. And I am a very private person. And I do not believe, and it is my experience that she shares this, that you don't walk around carrying your burden so that everyone can see them. You are supposed to carry that burden and try to make the best of it.

Now, if you need to talk about it, you need a good ear for that, then I am there for you. And if you want my advice, and you let me know that you want that, then I will give it to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Did it surprise you that she stayed?

Ms. WELLS. No, it did not, because I think that is something that a woman in that situation would do. I know, in my situation, when confronted with something not quite as of a long-term nature as Professor Hill's experience, I stayed.

The CHAIRMAN. Right. Now, Mr. Paul, you are corroborating that you were told about Professor Hill's displeasure with her boss and his sexual advances. Let me not characterize; what did she say to you? Did she use the term that she was harassed or sexual advances or uncomfortable? What was the term that she used to you when you asked her why she left EEOC?

Mr. PAUL. Senator, the specific terms that I recall were, that she said that she was sexually harassed by her supervisor at the EEOC.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, who is Susan Duncan that you refer to?

Mr. PAUL. Susan Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M—

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry.

Mr. PAUL [continuing]. Is the head of the legal methods program at our law school, Washington College of Law.

The CHAIRMAN. So she teaches at law school as well?

Mr. PAUL. Yes, she does. She teaches courses on legal methods and she also runs the legal methods program.

The CHAIRMAN. Why would you go from the lunch table to the—I assume that's where you were told this—

Mr. PAUL. Susan's office at the time was adjacent to mine. Susan had a practice prior to working on the faculty which involved employment discrimination cases. I was shocked and disturbed by what Professor Hill had told me. I did not know anything about that area of the law, as I have testified. My area of expertise is business law, and corporate law. So I went to Susan to sort of ask her, you know, what could have been done? Why wasn't any recourse taken, and that was how we had this conversation.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you going to her in the expectation or hope that there might still be recourse that could be taken? Were you thinking of going back and advising—

Mr. PAUL. No, Senator, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you say, well, I am still curious. If you were not doing it for that reason, to see if there was still a cause of action to go back and try to convince Professor Hill to do something. What was the motivation of going to your fellow colleague?

Mr. PAUL. My motivation was to try to understand better the position that women may be in, in that situation. It was simply a matter of academic—

The CHAIRMAN. What were you told—

Mr. PAUL [continuing]. Curiosity.

The CHAIRMAN. What were you told?

Mr. PAUL. I am sorry?