

Senator SPECTER. I think the record is plain that she did drive him to the airport. And it is, of course, very plain that she moved with him from one agency to another and that she went to Oral Roberts. She accompanied him on a trip.

We are interested in your perspective, and interested if you would have maintained all of those kinds of activities, given the feelings that were involved with the reprehensible statements alleged to have been made.

Ms. WELLS. Well, over the course of, let's see, what—I am not sure. I think it was 1983 when she started at Oral Roberts and we are at 1991. I don't see 11 calls, some of them on behalf of other people, as a lot of contact. It is business in nature.

Senator SPECTER. Well, there were more calls than that 11 which were recorded where he was not present.

Mr. Carr, you said that you found the comments outrageous. Did you give any thought, at the time you had this telephone conversation with Professor Hill, to saying to her what are you going to do about it; let's consider taking some action; here you have a man who is the head of the EEOC, chief law enforcement of the country on sexual harassment?

Did the thought cross your mind, whether or not she did anything, that these outrageous comments should at least warrant some consideration of some action?

Mr. CARR. I don't recall that we discussed that or that we did not discuss it. I, it may well be that at that point she had decided to leave his employ and she told me that. I just don't recall.

Senator SPECTER. Well, my question to you is did you give her any such advice? Are you saying that you might have given her that advice or am I to consider it if it were simply now? Do you not recall?

Mr. CARR. I am saying I don't recall today. That is right.

Senator SPECTER. Professor Paul, you testified about a comment made by an associate of yours, the fox in the hen house, and I believe as you characterized it you were shocked and astonished by what Professor Hill had told you.

Did you give any thought to any suggestion about her taking some action given the fact that this happened at EEOC, the agency which was charged with enforcing laws against sexual harassment?

Mr. PAUL. As I testified, Senator, I asked her if she had taken any recourse and she said no. And I asked her why not and she said that she felt that she had no recourse. I don't recall more than that conversation.

Senator SPECTER. Your testimony was that she said she had been sexually harassed by her supervisor. I am advised, and we have to have testimony on this, but I am advised reliably that she had two supervisors besides Judge Thomas, who was her ultimate supervisor as the Chairman of the EEOC.

Would the statement she made to you about a supervisor comprehend as well a supervisor other than the Chairman of the EEOC?

Mr. PAUL. Well, Senator, she said that she had been sexually harassed by her supervisor. From what I know of Professor Hill, it is not conceivable to me that she would now be blaming Judge Thomas for the actions of another man. So I would have to con-

clude that no, Senator, I believe that she was talking about Judge Thomas.

Senator SPECTER. Well, I am not asking you for a conclusion. I am asking you about what she said in terms of supervisor and whether that, aside from any other inferences which you may make whether the category supervisor or whatever it was she said would comprehend other supervisors, if, in fact, there were? And we have to hear about that.

Mr. PAUL. I don't know, Senator.

Senator SPECTER. Judge Hoerchner, let me come back to a couple of points which have been asked, that I asked you about by some other people. I turn to page 5 of the notes and testimony, and line 6.

Senator KENNEDY. Repeat the page, please.

Senator SPECTER. Page 5, line 6.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, I am not going to cut you off. But again, there are some who haven't asked over here, so you are beyond the 5 minutes.

Senator SPECTER. That is fine. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We are going back and forth.

Senator SPECTER. Glad to yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't we do that? And you will have an opportunity to ask again.

Now, Senators Simon and Kohl have not had an opportunity to ask, as I understand it. So, Senator Simon?

And again, any member of the panel who continues to have questions, we will allow them the opportunity to question. But I just want to make sure everybody gets a shot first.

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, not to the panel, but on a talk show this morning one of the commentators said that I was the source for the leak of the affidavit. That is just absolutely false. I don't operate that way. I have seen how leaks have damaged people, our colleagues. Senator DeConcini suffered a great injustice because of a leak. And I just want everyone to know that there is simply no truth to that. Neither I nor my staff leaked the documents.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator?

Senator SIMON. Yes, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry. If it is on that matter, continue. But before you get to questioning I want to ask the panel a question about—

Senator SIMON. Go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been on for a while now. Would you all like to break—yes. I can see the heads shaking.

Senator would you rather continue your questioning now or give them a break and then question? How would you like to do it?

Senator SIMON. The panel would like to take a break right now. I will take my 5 minutes after the break, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess for 15 minutes.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come back to order.

To explain to the witnesses what we are doing, we are trying to figure out the remainder of the schedule. I emphasize again that