

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?

The CHAIRMAN. What were you told by your colleague as to why women stay in that situation, or did she volunteer anything?

Mr. PAUL. Ms. Dunham said—and this is all that I really can say that I recall on my own—is that she said that this was a case of the fox guarding the hen house. That portion of the conversation I can recall on my own. I believe Ms. Dunham has had a conversation with the Judiciary Committee staff, but I don't recall.

The CHAIRMAN. She has. I just want to ask one last question. I realize my 15 minutes are up. Judge, I would like to ask you, you read a letter from your classmates at the law school. Now, were they classmates who were from the same graduating class, or were they people who were contemporaneously at Yale Law School at the time that Professor Hill was at Yale Law School? Do you know?

Judge HOERCHNER. I believe that they were from the same graduating class.

The CHAIRMAN. How many were in your graduating class, do you recall, roughly?

Judge HOERCHNER. I believe 131 people graduated and I am not sure whether or not that included people who were getting degrees other than the J.D.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the last question; how did this letter materialize? Did you circulate this letter?

Judge HOERCHNER. No. Due to the last-minute nature of these proceedings, I have not at all been involved in the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. How did it come to be placed in your hand then?

Judge HOERCHNER. When I came to the hearings, Friday, I saw a copy of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Who gave you the letter?

Judge HOERCHNER. I think my attorney, Ron Allen, had a copy and he passed it over.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge, help me out here. Do you know where the devil the letter came from? That's what I am trying to find out.

Judge HOERCHNER. I am not quite sure—

The CHAIRMAN. Fair enough.

Judge HOERCHNER. [continuing]. What you are asking.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, my time is up.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I yield to Senator Specter, who will examine the witnesses supporting Anita Hill.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I begin today with a statement that I made before that I have been asked to raise the questions by Senator Thurmond. But I do so in the context of I do not believe this is an adversarial proceeding. I do not represent anyone except Pennsylvania, and what we are trying to do here is to find out what the facts are.

Judge Hoerchner, you said when you were questioned by staff members, there had been a brief questioning of you a few days ago, back on October 10, and this appears on page 14 of the record.

*Question:* Did she ever relate to you that you were the only person that knew about these allegations or these problems she was having at work?

*Answer:* I think she told me that more recently.

*Question:* More recently that you were the only person that knew?

*Answer:* Yes.