

to the mayor or other officials because retaliation would be sure and certain.

Even so, bits and pieces do leak out. The situation reminds me very much of the Keim/Nave situation (and by the way, even more documentation has emerged) in the past because something is going on. You just don't know what. One of the problems of keeping everything undisclosed thereby protecting incompetence for job security reasons is that it also conceals wrongdoing. However, if you watched the behavior of the mayor at the council meeting with the eye of a very suspicious analyst, you know darn well something's wrong.

A couple of weeks ago, Tammy and her family were at the Lion's Den having dinner and it so happened that Mayor Kenny Smith and Mrs. Smith were also there. Tammy had a short chat with the mayor about the chief of police not fulfilling the residency requirement in city statutes

and noted that his reappointment was coming due. Nothing happened. Then she sent the e-mail.

Suddenly, Chief Paddock makes a trip to Effingham in a city police car at City expense to personally make a complaint about the e-mail and Tammy's boss then tells her about the complaint. What's the difference?

Paddock panicked. What caused him to panic was that the e-mail was addressed to three aldermen and not the mayor. What gave the e-mail credibility was that a member of the Illinois State Police wrote it even though the letter was entirely legal and nowhere does she say anything about being a member of or citing her position.

The real problem is that while police are a closed mouth group to outsiders, they do talk to others within. If she's sending an e-mail now, what might she tell outsiders (aldermen) later? Thus the action to silence.

If you describe the action to someone in law enforcement, you may, as I did, get a smile, a head shaking and then chuckles. It's the kind of dumb stunt that's the unpardonable shakedown sin. You don't go to someone's job and

try to get someone disciplined or fired because he/she wrote a complaint letter.

I don't need another incident to convince me. I will not change my opinion. Somebody who can influence the mayor needs to convince the him to get rid of this individual as quickly as possible. The city does not need a major liability lawsuit or worse.

Take the mayor's statement, "I'm here to tell you, if I followed up on what I could follow up on, it would be devastating to her career and I'm not going to do it." That's absolute nonsense. I happen to be a retired state employee and know the structured set up for discipline and no small town mayor's word has any effect.

When I asked him, "What would you do that would be devastating to her career?" He answered, "I'm not talking about it." He ended with "I've talked enough and maybe too much already." Indeed he had. I had him and he knew it. He does have the power at council proceedings to stop conversations. Otherwise, the emptiness of his threats and his pretending to have certain powers he doesn't have would have been made clear to all.

Warren Le Fever