

vision or I'll tell you about it that took place between Ron Brown who was the lobbyist for the County Attorney's group and myself. I had raised the issue in addition to the one I've talked about, about the individual who does become a snitch or an informer or whatever you want to call a person like that. At the federal level if a person becomes a snitch he or she is given a new identity, relocated and kept safe from the persons against whom he or she would testify but Ron Brown stated and we all know it, that at the state level the patrol does not have the means to do this kind of thing. The county sheriff does not have this kind of means nor would the local police. So this is where we wound up. Senator Chambers: "So what you are saying is that whoever would testify would be left to the tender mercies of whoever was testified against and his or her cohorts." Ron Brown: "That very well may be the result." Chambers: "Now based on your experience and what you have read, would you say that 'may very well be the result' or is it likely that would be the result?" Ron Brown: "That is the probable result I would say." So in addition to putting yourself in danger of an additional prosecution you have the situation of testifying against people and not being protected from them later. If you refuse to testify, fearing that should you testify these people or friends of these people will get you, that is not a basis for refusing to testify either. Now there is some additional discussion between myself and Mr. Thalken who was the U.S. attorney at the hearing. I had asked if they intended to prosecute a person from whom they are going to compel testimony, would they have to tell that person that they intend to prosecute him or her anyway? He said, no, they don't have to and he doesn't think anything is wrong with that. So here was my comment. I was trying to give an example. "I'm going to be compelled to testify against Senator Nichol. You're sitting on some information that will provide the basis of a prosecution against me, but I don't know it. So you tell me, we'll give you immunity if you testify against Senator Nichol. So I testify against him and then I'm prosecuted. Now had I known that you had enough evidence and had intended to prosecute me anyway, I wouldn't put myself in jeopardy with Bill and his friends by testifying against him. The only reason I'd do that is to avoid prosecution. In effect, you make me think that I'm immunizing myself from prosecution when in reality I'm not and you're getting from me information that I wouldn't have given. There's no quid pro quo in other words." Mr. Thalken: "That person is informed and it is in the grant itself or in our letter of instruction that he can be prosecuted for offenses." Chambers: "But do you tell him that you've got evidence right now that you're using to consider a prosecution against him?" Thalken: "Not necessarily and I don't think that's necessarily evil to do that." Then we