

Harvey Peeler' told someone that. It makes me upset, Mr. Ed. It does. And I think there's been serious allegations made and I want some answers.

Ed
Bennett:

I don't blame you. Let me, in a small way, let me relate to something that had happened to me in the past and that this could have happened this way and been blown completely out of proportion. Four or five years ago a young man wanted to go duck hunting in my home town down at Bear Island. Well, you know, they draw for these. He asked me if I'd get him an application. I did. I got him the application and he came back. He said, 'Did you know my name was drawn?' The next year I got him one and it was not. So he brought me the application this next year and I brought it up here and I sent the thing by a page over to the Wildlife Office and his name was accidentally drawn again. I had other people there that wanted to go hunting down there to come to me and said, 'Mr. Bennett, we want you to take our application up there because we understand the only way you can get to go to Bear Island is that you approve it and take it up there.' And so help me, God, I never did go over there. I sent it by a page. This could have actually happened to one of the officers, or anybody, that knew that you had recommended, maybe you, I'm not saying you said you recommended, but they may have known it, or the man that you did recommend that he send his application in, he goes to one of his friends, his friends then go out, you know how we people talk...

Senator
Peeler:
Ed
Bennett:

Yes, sir.

We don't ever tell it exactly right. They had to go out and say it to their friends, there's no need in us going down there. Hell, the Senator has recommended so-and-so and you probably didn't say a dern word to anybody. Now, all I'm trying to do is to show you how this thing can happen. And in my small way, this is the way it went with me and so help me, God, I didn't touch it.

Senator
Peeler:

Yes, sir.



Ed
Bennett:

And if things like that were followed up, then you'd see what happened.

J.P. Harrelson:

Can I send my application for Bear Island by you?

Ed.
Bennett:

Let me tell you what, I can remember when I used to go down there and here'd come the son and we'd go hunting together.

Senator
Peeler:

Mr. Ed, you've been in politics a lot longer than I have and the Commission and this Department's concerned about my politics.

Ed
Bennett:

And I don't blame you one bit for being upset. But you do understand how this thing can happen?

Senator
Peeler:

Oh, my goodness gracious. Can you imagine these people that have applied and didn't get the job? They goin' to be mad at me. If you want to worry about my political future, you are going to make one person happy

Ed
Bennett:

You feel that you didn't do anything wrong and honest to God, I feel the same way about the other people that's involved.

Senator
Peeler:

I think you'll agree with me that my integrity was questioned in this letter.

Chairman Webster:

Senator Peeler, have you read the Charleston paper lately? I know how you feel.

Ed
Bennett:

Some of these things you have to take with a big old drink of orange juice like my mother used to give me castor oil, swallow it and move on.

Senator
Peeler:

My preacher preached two weeks ago, we had a revival meeting, they said a dog can always beat a skunk in a fight, but somehow it just ain't worth it. You know, that's kind of how I'm feeling, David. I'm telling you, it's what I'm made of. I've been a Senator for seven years and you don't here a whole lot out of me, Mr. Ed, but I think I've been wronged. I think in the process Roger Harris has been wronged and in the process it has shed a light, a bad light, on the Department. Let me use James O.'s wording here, 'It has shed a bad light on the Department' because my integrity has been



questioned and in the process, I am fully convinced that he was not helped in the process by me writing a letter of recommendation and supporting the man. Everything has been above board, on top of the table. I've supported the man and let me tell you why. He is very capable and qualified and would make a good one. If he embarrassed me or the County or this Commission, I'd be the first one to sit here and tell you 'no, don't do it. Don't do it.' But, I'm telling you the man is of integrity. He holds public office. He is a member of the Board of Public Works. But that's not in question here today. What in question is the attack on my integrity and how it affected the hiring process of a wildlife officer in Cherokee County and to be quite frank with you, my questions hasn't been answered yet. So, Chuck, if you would allow the people ...

Chuck Compton:

Mr. Chairman, Bill first, and then Linda.

Bill Chastain:

Senator Peeler, I understand about your integrity being questioned and your concerns and I have the same concerns also. I think that anyone that had talked to me about any allegations will tell you that my general attitude was all along was that this doesn't concern me. I'm going to speak personally to you, all right? About how I feel. I am in no way responsible for looking into the activities of the Senator. I made that statement several times. So these things didn't concern me. I was concerned about picking the right man. These individuals came in here and were interviewed. I scored as I saw it and in no way did anything that Roger Harris did or anything that I heard that you did influenced my opinion and do anything to harm him. I want to make that very clear. You mentioned awhile ago that you thought if he had been harmed. If he was harmed, he was not harmed by me. I scored as I saw it and I expect you to believe that.

Chuck Compton:

Who did you score Number 1?

Bill Chastain:

I scored Cunningham, 1.



Chuck Compton:

Give me some idea why you scored. I know I'm getting into some personal thing, but can you state in generalities, did he have a law enforcement background, did he have a college education, do you look into those kind of things when you interview somebody?

Bill Chastain:

Yes, sir. All those things looked into, but, ...

Chuck Compton:

Ok.

Bill Chastain:

...basically we have ten questions we ask. On the interview (inaudible) ...

Chuck Compton:

That's what I'm asking.

Bill Chastain:

All these applicants are asked the same ten questions. You score them on each question and then when you get to the end, you total up, and whoever's got the most points, that's the one that you score highest. There's also things in there that are subjective like appearance. There's some things in there on just how does this guy come across to you. So it's not all objective. There's a part of it that's strictly objective and the other part is mainly, just how does this guy come across, how does he look, how does he talk, does he relax. Just, just basic, if you were talking to somebody in an interview, what you would look for.

J.P. Havelson:
Chairman:

How they would represent the Department?

Bill Chastain:

Yes. What the best representation for the Department. But I just want to say again, that these allegations meant nothing to me. I didn't think about them. And I can prove to you, if you want me to, that I made the statement I am not in the position of looking into what a state senator does. So, in no way did that influence me.

Senator
Peeler:

Bill, Dr. Timmerman made the comment that he instructed you to make sure that the process operated properly. Why would he be concerned with that?

Dr.
Timmerman:

I'll answer that. I knew of your sensitivity on it and I was very sensitive that I wanted this process to be without flaw.



Bill Chastain:

Senator, Dr. Timmerman did not have to tell me that; I mean, to make sure that things were done right. I appreciate his telling me, but ...

Senator
Peeler:

That's exactly why I asked that question.

Bill Chastain:

...he didn't need to.

Senator
Peeler:

That's exactly why I asked that question.

Bill Chastain:

It would made no difference what anybody said, or what Dr. Timmerman said, or whatever, if someone had told me to give someone the edge, no way.

Senator
Peeler:

I understand that. Did you have a copy of Commissioner Thomason's letter?

Bill Chastain:

No, sir. (inaudible)

Dr.
Timmerman:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just repeat, the only person that had a copy of this letter from James O. was myself. I had not shown it. I discussed it with anyone other than Senator Peeler when he met with us, when was it?

Senator
Peeler:

Last Monday.

Dr.
Timmerman:

Last Monday. He asked me did I have any, did anyone respond to me concerning the allegations and I told him what I did with you earlier with Larry Cartee and a memo from Linda and as Chairman, I mean as Executive Director, of the Commission, as I said, that we have no intent to investigate this any way, but Linda Campbell had revealed in a memo to me that James O. had also checked into two of these candidates and I called him sometime about the first of October and I asked if he had looked into that and he said, 'he'd be glad to drop me some correspondence.' I told you I had some correspondence. You requested it. I told him the only way I'd release this is for James O. to give his approval to it and he did. And you and I and now everyone else has this correspondence.

Senator
Peeler:

Bill, did Captain Bobby Joe Smith enter into the process at all, did he speak to you about any of the candidates, or?



Bill Chastain:

No. We have the captains, I don't know really exactly what their role is in these interviews. They just come and probably if they know something about someone's background that might keep them out of it, you know, after we score or whatever, they might say something about it. But they are really no significant part of the interview.

Senator
Peeler:

During the interview process, he didn't talk to you?

Bill Chastain:
Senator
Peeler:

He ...

Made a comment about anybody?

Bill Chastain:
Senator
Peeler:

During the interview process, no.

After the interview, or when did he make comments?

Bill Chastain:

He made one small comment after, after the things had already been scored that something to the effect, he said, 'that's a good man.' Talking about Cunningham. But this was after the scores had already been done. During the interview process, he didn't say a word.

Senator
Peeler:

This interview process, and why I asked for the first meeting, Commissioners, if they would share with me the scores and they did eventually give me the scores of the written test and, of the three top individuals, and then the agility test is pass/fail, but I still don't have the scores of the interview or how it's scored. I'd love to have that if

Linda Campbell:
(female):

We don't give them to our Commissioners. Ed Bennett has tried to get them before.

Ed.
Bennett:

I've tried to get it. They wouldn't give it to me.

Linda Campbell
(female):

We don't, we've never done that.

Bill Chastain:

I don't even know how the other panel members scored.



Senator
Peeler:

Well, see, that to me, Commissioner Stokes, if somebody would just give me some glimmer of hope, just something that would indicate that this thing was done correctly. Just somebody (inaudible) ...

Chuck
Compton:

I understand that everybody has gone to pains to supply those numbers and that we couldn't do it; that Personnel had to do it and Personnel is here today, maybe (inaudible) ...

Senator
Peeler:

Personnel says that the Department has it. Has the scores.

Burford
Mabry:

Senator, at this time it might be appropriate if we ask Ms. Barbara Anderson from State Personnel if she'd like to make a comment. My understanding was that Ms. Anderson, in the course of her normal duties with State Personnel, happened to sit in on two of these interviews; three. All right. Would you just tell the Senator what you observed and how that came about, please?

Barbara
Anderson:

Senator, we usually; Senator, we usually monitor these interviews, maybe once or twice a year. On this particular day, on Thursday, I arrived at approximately 3:00. I observed Mr. Danny Dowell, Mr. Martin Vassey, and Mr. Roger Harris. At that time I saw no irregularities in the interview and the panel showed no opposition to any candidate.

Senator
Peeler:

Could you walk me through why you may say the (unclear) report may be privileged information? Could you give me some hypothetical way, or can you kind of tell me how this interview is scored? How they score that? This is why I am asking this question. I have been given the scores of the written test. Mr. Cunningham made 87.4; Mr. Vassey made 89.8; and Mr. Harris made 86.8. A difference between Mr. Harris' score and Mr. Cunningham's score is six-tenths, not 6 points, but six-tenths of a point. Mr. Vassey made the highest, 89.8, but he was ranked in the overall scoring as second. How could someone be that close on 50% and then drop significantly? And I was told that the final scoring was only 75 versus 70 or something?

Barbara
Anderson:

I am going to ask Sarah Pope to respond to that.



Sarah
Pope:

Questions are situational questions. They are developed based on the job analysis of what conservation officers actually do on the job. We come up with situational questions with the help of officers and we also come up with a scale of answers, a best answer and a worst answer, and an answer in the middle. And assign points to each of those answers. The panel is trained. At the beginning of this process the panel was trained and each year we have a refresher course where we train the panel again and give them an opportunity to practice on the scoring so that they understand it and (inaudible). The panel scores the response of each candidate to the situational questions based on whether or not they gave what a panel of officers who are successfully (inaudible) told us were the best, middle, and worst answers and a score is developed based on how they answered each situational question and then that score is 50% of the final score. The score that they have received on this interview is 50% of the final score.

Senator
Peeler:

In your opinion, could this interview process be affected by someone; could they also hurt somebody in the interview?

Sarah
Pope:

It certainly could and for that reason, everytime the interviews are conducted, after the interviews are conducted and before the results are released to the Commission, we analyze the data and apply some statistics to insure that each of the panel members is substantially interpreting the answer to the question in the same manner. And to do that we compare the scores and come up with a coefficient that tells us whether or not it's in an acceptable range of variance on the scores. And so that's something we do that's standard every year.

Senator
Peeler:

What was the result?

Dr.
Timmerman:

Could you tell us...



Sarah
Pope:

They were well within the acceptable range. The correlation coefficient was well within the acceptable range. We expect some variance. That's the reason for having five panel members. So that no one panel member impacts any greater than the other panel members on how they score the person. No one person has any more impact on whose chosen than any other person and we have checked it and the correlation coefficient is very much in the acceptable range.

Senator
Peeler:

So, in other words, whether the five members were Wildlife employees or someone you picked up off the street, and you gave them this refresher course on how to score and give them the best, middle or worst answer, no matter if one person wanted to, he couldn't fake the process.

Sarah
Pope:

He could and that's the reason that we check it every interview.

Senator
Peeler:
Sarah
Pope:

And if it checks out?

And if it checks out, its fine. We send back verification to the agency saying we checked the calculations and we checked, we've analyzed the data, and ensured that it is correct before they made (inaudible).

Senator
Peeler:
Sarah
Pope:
Senator
Peeler:

Thank you.

You're welcome.

From the first meeting on Tuesday, October 13th, til now, I've asked for the scores so I could, in my mind, be convinced that any allegations made towards me didn't affect the process. I was given the written test scores, and the pass/fail on the agility test, but it's been kind of a tennis match on the interview, which, here again, puts a question in my mind, Commissioner Stokes, everything, the allegations, the hurry-up-and-hire, the phone call to make sure that the letters go out, all this leads me to believe, or is apparent to me that there's a flaw in the process here. It certainly could be. I'm told that if there is a flaw, or could be a flaw, that it could catch it. It's evident here by this letter that at least two of the members of the interview panel was aware of the allegations



and like Senator Harrelson said, 'You can't erase that from your mind,' Bill. I know you want to be fair and I believe you when you say that. I question why Captain Fosberg (?) has to be involved in the interview process and why he needs to talk to you or why he even needs to say, 'Well, that's a good man or a bad man.' In the process I don't understand where that fits in. To me, it tells me that if somebody up there likes or dislikes someone, that is the ultimate influence in the process. But, given that benefit of the doubt, and I trust you, and Linda, and its a known fact that y'all knew about the allegations. I didn't. But y'all did. Didn't give me the opportunity to say, 'yes,' or say, 'no'. That's what burns me and I'm burned. And I don't mind telling you I'm burned. I feel like that now, since these allegations and since at least two members of the panel knew about these allegations, I feel that at the very least we should give, and its no allegation, and I'm not questioning y'all's integrity, but to make sure, can we not go through this interview process again, with five different individuals that know nothing about the situation? What's wrong with that?

Ed.
Bennett:

Chuck
Compton:

Before you go and do that, everybody in the State of South Carolina ...

Senator, I talked with you, Monday, two weeks ago, I talked with you before on the phone and I told you then, Senator, because you are a friend of mine, that I was afraid we were going to get (inaudible) this whole (inaudible) and we'd never come out with the answer that you would be acceptable to you. Now, I was hoping to be able to show, that the staff would be able to show that they were above board on this thing and then I asked Doc to see if Personnel could offer their expertise in this area. To see if everything was done right. We are told by Personnel that the coefficient numbers that were looked into after this interview process clearly showed that Bill Chastain or Linda Campbell, whether objectively, subjectively, or whatever, did not taint the process to be able so your man would not be Number 1. Now, you aren't going to accept



that, sir. I know that. I know that. But, we could sit around. Well, we are doing the best we can with numbers.

Senator
Peeler:

Well, give me the numbers. Just give me the numbers. That's all I'm asking.

Chuck
Compton:

You are alleging that we can't do the numbers. I asked about the numbers. I was told that there was a legal reason and I think, and you notice that this is not Executive Session, the newspaper's here, we are talking about a very sensitive thing, personnel involving people that we don't even know. We are using their names and all this stuff, which I don't know if today, this way we're doing it is right or wrong, but, of course, it's open. We were told that those scores, I was told we couldn't without everybody that took the test being notified and then, you told me this, that they would have to give us permission to get those scores, right? So, I accept that as being the truth. As that's why we aren't. And then you are concerned because Dr. Timmerman told Bill Chastain the reason why he wanted everything, you know, he wanted this to be done by the book and you feel that shows some "shady dealings". We have never, since I've been on this Commission, Senator, and due respect to you, had a Senator or House member that's been able to get a position in a particular county through as well as you did this year. We have never had a Senator or a House member take, hand-carry a candidate around to meet us. I don't think that hurt him. I was glad to meet the fellow.

Senator
Peeler:
Chuck
Compton:

My question's, what's wrong with that?

It didn't hurt him. It didn't hurt him with

Senator
Peeler:

All right, you say you're not going to satisfy me, Chuck.

Chuck Compton:
Senator
Peeler:

But we're not, are we?

You are not so far. You tell me

Chuck Compton:

But why?



Senator
Peeler:

What did we do wrong? What did I do wrong?

Chuck Compton:

You did nothing wrong. What I was comparing to what we do wrong.

Senator
Peeler:

What did Mr. Harris do wrong? What did we do wrong?

Chuck Compton:

Mr. Harris didn't do anything wrong. What did we do wrong? I mean, how can we convince you? Ok. The letter of James O. Linda Campbell, honey, I'm sorry to put you on the spot. How 'bout getting up and stating because your name is referred to in this letter, your integrity is being questioned and I would love to hear from you.

Senator
Peeler:

I don't know who's questioning Linda's integrity. It's certainly not me.

Linda
Campbell:

Well, I would like to apologize to you if you think I have, because I haven't. But I want to tell you what I did and why I did it. Ok? And I told you once and I will tell you again. I want the Commission to hear it.

Senator
Peeler:

I think they should.

Linda
Campbell:

We ran an agility test on September 16th. There were four candidates. Five people we had scheduled from Cherokee County didn't show up and that's very unusual for one county which I told you. I had gotten a call that morning from an applicant in Clarendon County who just got his letter and, you know, it scared me because I did not ask these people to respond this time to me and tell 'em that they were coming, which I usually do, but we were pushed for time. Ok? I told the guy from Clarendon County if I could possibly get Bill and Bobby to agree to run it over, the next day we would, but I didn't know at that point but when five didn't show up from Cherokee, Bobby Gifford told me, call the people. It's no big deal at all. Call the people. I went back to my office about 4:00 and I didn't get anybody so I took the names home with me and I called them. And I called two people and (inaudible) I wasn't going to tell anybody any names or anything, but two people told me they didn't come because they thought the job had already been filled. They thought



the thing was over. Called Bobby Gifford at home. He told me to call all the people and just assure them the job had not been filled. Just to tell them that and to please come. Ok. I called five people. Three people told me they thought the job had been filled. One guy had developed a heart condition and the other guy said he didn't want to talk to me about it, he just wasn't coming. All right. We ran it over the next day and one out of the five showed up. Mark Vassey showed up. And the reason I did all that calling, we had twenty some officers standing by to come back plus State Personnel. And it was routine. I can tell you, and you asked me if Frank Caggiano asked me this in a meeting before, had I ever done that before and I said, 'yes.' I do that everytime on every interview if something is going wrong, it's routine to me. And I can tell you, Bill and Bobby and some Commissioners, I do this all the time because it is my job. I wasn't investigating you. I made no allegation against you. And after that happened that night, there was nothing as far as I was concerned, ever going to be said if we wanted to give these thirteen people a fair shot at this job. That's our responsibility and Dr. Timmerman said at the meeting he would, he expects us to do that, to do our job. That's what I get paid to do. And in every, I call people all the time, and I can tell you we've had Commissioners who recommended people. I hear a lot of that. I could write a book about what people call and tell me about applicants. Lots of things. Mothers call. Fathers call. Senators call. Everybody calls. And I promise you, when I get to that interview, that is out of my mind because I've had more things said about people, (inaudible), and some Commissioners probably note things and we laugh about it, but that does not affect what I do in that interview. I can tell you that it never has, and it never will. I shouldn't be on the panel if it did and I don't think I would be on it if they thought it did. But, I apologize, you know, if I had any part in any of this. But I promise you my scores were not affected. And I don't think anybody, and I don't think this, I don't think that anybody has said that



Roger Harris would not make a good conservation officer. I think the point was, he, at that point, he was not the best. Nobody (inaudible) that anything's wrong with him. I don't think that anybody has ever said that, that Roger Harris was a bad person.

J.P.

Harrelson:

Linda, the fact that you are an employee and some of your superiors, perhaps, were on this same panel, they don't influence you or try to influence your decision?

Linda

Campbell:

No. At all.

J.P.

Harrelson:

Talking about their telling you to go write the letter or make phone calls, I just wanted to clear the air on that that they

Linda

Campbell:

Al didn't know I did it. He's my boss.

J.P.

Harrelson:

..that they don't instruct you?

Linda

Campbell:

They don't. I do what I do routinely all the time and obviously, this didn't turn out to be routine. But I have done things, other things like this, all the time, because that's just my job. I called Bobby Gifford that night because Bobby had the officers standing by who would come back the next day or not come. And I told Al the next day, we were running it over. We run it over. We ran it over last year. One guy showed up and then, I can tell you, Senator Peeler, when I talked to those three guys, they seemed happy for me to tell them the job had not been filled and you know, to get a chance at it. They didn't, they weren't mad at anybody, you, or anybody. They just were happy to hear the job had not been filled and we were getting them down here to run the test.

Senator

Peeler:

The only time your name has been mentioned is in this letter.

Linda

Campbell:

Well, I did the calling. I did it myself.

Senator

Peeler:

And said that you said that she told, you were told by Dana Allen and Jimmy Cash of Cherokee County that they did not come to Columbia to take their test because they were informed by Senator Peeler that this position was already taken and it would be a fruitless task.



Linda
Campbell:

All right. That night, I didn't write down what these people said because it didn't, it did not really concern me because we weren't investigating you. We don't do that to people. I did not write down the answer. An applicant had called me before this happened. He failed the agility test. I'm not going to tell you who it is, but I think you know him, he called me and he's tried year's past and said, 'Linda, I can tell you that job's already taken; why do I need to come?' Well, he failed the written test. It was pointless for him to even say it. But an applicant before this had called me, (inaudible) I really did, because he has been through our process every time.

Senator

Peeler:

I just wanted to point out ...

Linda
Campbell:

I didn't even put that in the letter.

Senator

Peeler:

Well, that's, and Commissioner Thomason told me those same words out of his mouth ...

Linda
Campbell:

They did. They told me they didn't come because they understood the job had been filled by Roger Harris.

Senator

Peeler:

But that's a lot. That's as different as day and night than 'Senator Peeler told 'em' or 'they heard Senator Peeler was supporting one man or another man.' And, Chuck, for you to say that there's never been a Senator or a House member get a Wildlife position through like I had this one

Chuck Compton:

No. I'm saying showed so much interest in an individual and all, the whole package deal since I've been on the Commission.

Senator

Peeler:

Ok.

Chuck Compton:

I think you've done a good job.

Senator
Peeler:

And James O. said in our meeting that a Senator had never gotten involved in the hiring process and kind of scolded me. The whole thing, and James O., if you, you said that you are not on the stand here, I feel like I'm, we're talking right here face to face. I haven't written any letters about you and if I did, I'd certainly confront you with it, and if I heard anything, I'd certainly confront you with it, or any other



member of the Commission. Now, that bothers me, that an employee, or anybody, if they heard something like that, I at least feel like I should have the benefit of the doubt to be contacted on this. But all this, like I say, put yourself in my position. You called in by your resident Commissioner to have a meeting with staff. I asked him what was the meeting about. He didn't know. He still says he didn't know. That we just needed to have a meeting. So, I came to the meeting and I was told then who was going to be hired as our Wildlife conservation officer in Cherokee County. I was told at that meeting. That afternoon, staff was told that there was some allegations made about me. The next day it was told that it was made by a Commissioner and that Commissioner, I needed to talk to him about it, but they didn't want to do anything. I went to the Commissioner, the Commissioner told me that a man in Cherokee County told him something and I later found out it wasn't true. Confronted him with it. The second time wasn't true. Confronted him with it. I asked that the Commission postpone this until we get this straightened out. The Chairman asked, the Vice Chairman asked, and the Department Head asked to postpone it. It was not postponed. That's unheard. Now, you talk about unheard of. That's unheard of in the annals of government. You tell me where the Department Head, the Chairman, and the Vice Chairman, out of just courtesy to the local Commissioner, to postpone it one, just one meeting til we can get this straightened out. Evidently, there's something wrong. There's a fly in the milk. Here it is. Here's the fly. Let's get this fly out of the milk. But, no. It was still kept under wraps. I had to go and investigate myself. You said there was no investigation of me. Wish there had been. I'd have been cleared. But, I'm investigating you. I'm asking you. I'm asking for help. I'm asking you, Mr. Stokes, to prove to me that this process is not tainted. Not because they want to be, but it's like the Senator said, 'You can't erase that from their mind.' I'm asking, and Commissioner Compton says I'll never be satisfied.' I'll never be satisfied that my name had been questioned. As an apology ...



~~Ed G. B. Stokes;~~
~~Mr. Bennett:~~

You wouldn't be saying it if we'd hired your man. That says (inaudible)...

Senator
Peeler:

I'm going to tell you what.

~~Ed G. B. Stokes~~
~~Mr. Bennett:~~

...satisfy you.

Senator
Peeler:

What's wrong with that?

~~Ed G. B. Stokes;~~
~~Mr. Bennett:~~

Nothing.

Senator
Peeler:

All right.

~~Ed G. B. Stokes~~
~~Mr. Bennett:~~

But you'd got that (inaudible)....

Senator
Peeler:

But, I think, I think because of the allegations towards me, my man, while the words wasn't hurt, it certainly didn't help.

Chuck Compton:

~~G. B. Stokes~~

How was it supposed to, I mean

Senator
Peeler:

I don't know how.

Chuck
Compton :

You know, your interest in this fellow and all, it meant a lot to me, but as far as the interview panel and everything like that, I still haven't seen evidence, and I haven't been convinced that the panel did anything wrong. I really haven't. And I as coming to this. I've tried to work with you. I've tried to work with Doc. I've tried to get third parties, outside third parties involved. I've tried to be as objective and hope that we can resolve this thing and Harvey, I'm sorry, but I just don't think this thing's going to be resolved. And I say that openly to my fellow Commissioners, staff, I mean, I just don't see that it's going to be resolved because Bill and Linda, I believe what they have said. I see that this has been a result of possible, or not possible, there's been just some distortion of what was said by who when. That's the whole damn thing here. What was said and, like for instance, this letter right here, and you know, August 21st, that all the Commission was advised, etc., or words to that effect, now, Senator Peeler, you're reading that to say that 'I was told at that meeting about affidavits and stuff like that.' And you read that letter. I can see how you can interpret it that way. That James O., I don't know. I'm sure he didn't mean that because I certainly was at that



Commission meeting and I didn't know, at that Commission meeting, about statements made concerning you telling somebody not to go, and Preacher Harrelson agrees, that he didn't either. But you can read this letter and you can read, in fact, that we were advised there that way. And that shows you another way how words can be distorted and not conveying what took place. And, you know, I just think that's what happened, Senator. I really do. And,

Senator
Peeler:

I didn't read into it. I'm reading it. I'm not reading into it. It says, 'I discussed with you, Dr. Timmerman, Bill Chastain, member of the interview panel, and all Commissioners present.' And then on down, the bottom paragraph, 'all Commissioners expressed concern and were assured.' I'm not reading into that. I'm reading it. Let me point out. I'm not a lawyer. As Senator Verne Smith says, 'I fix flat tires for a living.' I sell milk for a living. I'm not a lawyer. The legal ramifications of this. I don't know. But I do know this. I have signed, sworn statements by Mr. Jimmy Cash and Mr. Dana Allen and I'd like to read these right now.

'Personally appeared before me, Jimmy R. Cash, who first being duly sworn, deposes and says: that he is a citizen and resident

[End of Side 2, Tape 3]

