we'd use one as blackmail against the other. We had a 33-year contract with DEVCO. We were paying them $20 to $30 million premium for the coal. You know, you're committing to -- we committed to build this half a billion dollar plant so we could burn the coal. I wanted to do other things for DEVCO. But I couldn't understand why we were trying to link the two, and I thought they should be decoupled. There would have been a benefit to both if it didn't turn out this way.

Q. Is it correct that what your position was that until Westray was signed, no new arrangements with DEVCO would be signed?

A. My personal feeling, yeah, I didn't think that we should be pushed into blackmail, that we deal with -- they were separate issues. Westray clearly wasn't going to hurt DEVCO one little bit. And, you know, we should be dealing with them in separate issues.

Q. Would it be possible for somebody to draw the implication that you were blackmailing a bit?

A. No, it wasn't me that put me on the table; they did. I don't understand your comment. I don't understand why you're so pro everyone else. How would you say I'm blackmailing them when they put this on the table and say, "You sign this deal with DEVCO or else"? Wouldn't you think that they put it on the table?