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CHAIRMAN: I don't know if I am expected to say something. Well, I could say lean ar aghaidh, maybe that would help. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Go raibh maith agat.

MR. JOHN MCGUINNESS CONTINUED TO BE CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS:
1 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Deputy MCGuinness, I was asking you yesterday when we broke up about the notebook that you made -- I wonder would Mr. Marrinan mind moving slightly to the left, would that be all right, thank you. So you can see me now? 09:32
A. You can see me.

2 Q. You didn't make the note in the car park you have told us, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

3 Q. But you told us yesterday you made the note because you were so concerned at what you had heard, the Commissioner had just passed on vile allegations, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

4 Q. And your purpose in making the note was to ensure you had a correct version of the meeting, of the conversation at the meeting?
A. No, it was to highlight the issues that were addressed at the meeting, so that $I$ wouldn't lose sight of the
main points that were made to me.
5 Q. So it wasn't to have a correct version of it, was it not?
A. Well, obviously from the note, it's not a full note of the meeting, it's simply a note of the important points 09:33 that would have caused me concern that I wanted to reflect on.

6 Q. Was your purpose not -- amongst your purposes, was it not obvious it was also the purpose of having a correct record of what was said?
A. If I was to have a correct record, I would have written out everything that was said by each party and I didn't do that. But what I did do was, I took a note for my own purposes to reflect on what had been said in the particular instances of the main points that were made. 09:33
7 Q. So are did you --
A. And it's by no means a reflection on all of the meeting.
8 Q. Are you distancing yourself from my characterisation that you were anxious to get a correct record of what was said?
A. I am not distancing myself from anything. I am simply making it clear to you that the purpose in taking the note was out of concern that I might have forgotten the particular points that I needed to address over the weekend and the points that concerned me most.
9 Q. And I take it you had a purpose that if you had to come back, if you ever had to raise the issue of this conversation again you would have an accurate record?
A. No, that wasn't the purpose. I never envisaged that I would be before a tribunal talking about a note in my constituency book. So, therefore, it was for the purpose of my consideration of the matters that I had to address that were of deep concern to me and that needed to be addressed in the context of the hearings of the Public Accounts Committee. important note that you might need to rely on at some point in the future?
A. No, I didn't. I didn't look at it that way on that day. What I did have to rely on was the accuracy of what was said to me in relation to the particular points that were made and that I would have to address these points in terms of considering them over that weekend.

11 Q. So it never occurred to you that you might need it again?
A. It never occurred to me that I would need the note again, it never occurred to me that $I$ would be before a tribunal, it was simply a spur of the moment out of deep concern from what I had heard.

12 Q. But isn't it your position that what was said to you at this meeting disturbed you and caused you great concern?
A. Yes, it did.

13 Q. And isn't it your position that what was said to you on your case at this meeting was really quite improper, it was improper for the Commissioner to have made these
vile allegations to you about a serving member of An Garda Síochána and it was quite improper that he would seek in doing that to undermine the business of a Dáil committee, that was your position, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

14 Q. Right. That being so, I'm suggesting to you that it would have occurred to you that you may need to refer to the note again?
A. My purpose in taking the note was so that I would highlight the particular points that I needed to consider because I had been at the centre of this controversy because of my position as chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and I was deeply concerned by what was said to me by the Commissioner. It put me in a position where I believed for a moment that I could possibly be completely wrong about this and wrong about Maurice McCabe, and that I may have difficulties now in relation to the information that was available to the Public Accounts Committee. So I took a note of the main points that were made, not for the intention of using them elsewhere, not for the intention or for any other purpose other than being able to reflect upon and remind myself of the main points that were made to me.
15 Q. I was looking --
A. And over that weekend I used that note to consider each $09: 37$ and every point that was made.
16 Q. You used the note?
A. Obviously I looked at it and went through it and satisfied myself.

17 Q. So you came back to the note over that weekend?
A. That was the purpose of the note. And when did you next come back to the note?
A. The matter then was dealt with, as you know, through the Public Accounts Committee, that note remained in that book, the book was finished in September of the same year and I didn't come back to the note again until I was asked for information and it caused me to search my diaries, my phones, whatever elsewhere I could get information.
A11 right. We might come back to that issue in due course. I see from the transcript yesterday that you indicated that the note was written, actually written -- and I am quoting here, "actually written out of fear that I might forget some of the accusations that were being made". You now seem to be saying that that wasn't a reason for making the note?
A. Let me repeat again: I wrote the note because of the accusations that were made. It is a note that is short, it wasn't intended for any other purpose but to remind myself of what was said, and there is no change in my position as to the note and the purpose of the note.
20 Q. You were disturbed at the time you have told us, so I suggest to you the natural thing to do would have been to write the note out straight away before you left the car park?
A. Well, when you are asked to meet the Commissioner and it turns out that you have the meeting in the front
seat in my own car in the car park and you are told the things that I was told, your first instinct when the meeting ends is to get the he11 out of there. A11 I wanted to do was get out, find space for myself and reconcile some of the things that $I$ have heard directly from the Commissioner and relate it then in my head to what I had already known and to what I had already believed. And the purpose of the note, once again, was to remind myself of what was said at the meeting, for no other purpose.
21 Q. The Commissioner's car had left so there was nothing to prevent you making the note?
A. But why would I make the note? I was already deeply upset over this. I wasn't quite sure what to do. I wanted to reflect on this and I did so and when I felt that I required to take that note, I stopped and took the note. It's a choice that you make. And I believe I made the correct choice in listening, taking it in, attempting to analyse it, in a fearful state of mind, and then I decided I'd write down the number of things that concerned me not from the meeting, but things that I had to address arising from what was said.
22 Q. We are agreed, aren't we, that you didn't go into the hote 1 in your state of upset to get a cup of coffee and then to write the note there, are we agreed about that? 09:40
A. I had had a long day, I had had a meeting with the Commissioner which I didn't expect, I am not a coffee drinker, $I$ don't waste my time. I like to be accurate and --
A. I didn't meeting, Mr. O'Higgins, isn't it? I didn't, Chairman, because that meeting and what was said, you have meetings, these things are said after meetings, conversations happen. That conversation happened. I did not take a note of it, but then again, neither did I take a note of any other piece of tittle-tattle or gossip that I had heard around the house.
26 Q. When you made this note following the car park meeting, you didn't include a note of a conversation from the day before?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. But I suggest to you the same logic would apply surely, you would be concerned to ensure you had a correct record of what had been said?
A. No, there was a difference here, in that what was said 09:42 to me was said directly after the meeting. I had really no interest at that stage only in one topic, and that was the penalty points issue and the evidence that had been put before us. The next day was a different
matter altogether, it was a meeting arranged by the Commissioner. So I can take it, Chairman, that things are often said in the heat of the moment or arising after a meeting in a point where people are upset, perhaps, over what they have said or over what other people might have said. So, here was a Commissioner making a decision away from that meeting, requesting a meeting with me, that is entirely different.
But you see, Deputy McGuinness, on your case, you agreed to meet the Commissioner and you chose to do so alone without any official or colleague with you in circumstances where, on your case, the Commissioner had already made a disgraceful remark about Sergeant McCabe, namely he was a child abuser, the words you used were kiddie fiddler, he had already done that on your case, why in heavens were you now agreeing to meet the man?
A. If the Commissioner rang you, would you be inclined to meet him? I met the Commissioner out of respect for the Gardaí and respect for his position, and I met the Commissioner because he had something important to impart to me. I had met Maurice McCabe, John Wilson and numerous other whistleblowers which are noted in my diary that is referred to, Mr. Chairman. Those meetings are noted, in the same way as other meetings. I met them on my own. I brought no entourage with me, I brought no officials with me. This was a matter between me and the person that I was meeting.

29 Q. You see, absent from your description so far, Deputy

McGuinness, I suggest to you, is that either at the PAC on the 23 rd or in the car park meeting on the 24th is there any suggestion from you that there was disharmony between you and the Commissioner on either occasion when he made these disgraceful remarks to which you say 09:45 you took objection?
A. There was no disharmony between the Commissioner and I.
A.

We11, I don't know -- you know, I don't get upset that easily. So what happened at the meeting on the 23 rd happened, and what was said after the meeting was said, and it was said perhaps at the end -- well, not perhaps, it was said in fact at the end of a long meeting in which a lot of, you know -- a lot transacted 09:45 during the course of that meeting. So, when I met the Commissioner Callinan the following day there was no disharmony between us. I don't see -- I don't fall out with people over what they might say or do. I have to make a judgement call as to what $I$ will say or do on foot of what I hear. allegations, part of which were directed at undermining the very work, the very important work that your Committee does, and he was going into greater detail, you say, in relation to vile allegations, and I am suggesting to you if that occurred, you would have taken him to task and told him to stop?
A. He was expressing his opinion. I was suggesting to
him, as I have always done, and what I did the previous day, that he should meet with Mr. McCabe and discuss the issues that were being raised and come to a conclusion in the interest of harmony within the Garda force and in the interest of the health and well-being of the McCabe family. So the meeting in the hotel off the Naas Road was something that he arranged, I agreed to and the discussion took place. When he laid this information before me, I was quite shocked and I wasn't in a position to take on the commissioner, as it were, by probing him and by questioning his authority. He gave me that information out of a position of authority. He gave me that information as if he knew for a fact that that was the position, and that is what caused me the concern and that is what caused me the worry and the fear in driving home that day.
32 Q. So after this meeting did you go to Sergeant McCabe and convey to him what the Commissioner had said?
A. No, I didn't.

33 Q
A. I conveyed to Sergeant McCabe after the meeting, long after the meeting. The first thing to do was I considered what was being said. I had to decide whether or not to believe, one, the Commissioner, or two, Sergeant McCabe. And on the basis of the work of the Public Accounts Committee and what it was doing, I had decided that that work was highly important and should proceed, and that any intervention by me to introduce the meeting or the other gossip and so on
that was going on, would serve the purpose of preventing the meeting from proceeding.
34 Q. I am just a little bit unclear in your response. Did you or did you not inform Sergeant McCabe after the car park meeting?
A. Not immediately, no.

35 Q. When did you?
A. I'm not quite sure of that date.

36
A. No, I won't.

37 Q. Why not?
A. Because I don't do ballpark. I would like to be specific in relation to the question that you are asking me because $I$ think it's a relevant question. CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCGuinness, if you don't mind, I am certainly not going to hold you to, for instance, if you say, look, I have a vague recollection that it was the summer or whatever, I appreciate that, but that is all that counsel is asking you for.
A. Okay. Well, Mr. Chairman --

CHAIRMAN: I don't think it's a trick question as such. It's just, when do you think, and if you can help you can help and if you can't you can't, and that doesn't mean you are lying if you can't.
A. Okay. I will help by this reply: I had questioned Maurice McCabe on the issues before, the general issues of gossip and rumour within Leinster House, and he made it clear to me that he -- that none of this was true, that he had heard it somewhat before or partially he
had heard some of it before. before the Public Accounts Committee, which was in -wasn't it 2014?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Yesterday the date given was towards the end of 2013. And again, that is, to use your phrase, a ballpark kind of a date, but a vague kind of date, yes.
A. No, no, no --

40 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: We11, Deputy McGuinness, he on7y appeared once, didn't he?
A. He appeared just once, yeah. 30th of March.

We11, is that right? was it not -- was it not the
Thursday after Commissioner Callinan appeared?
A. We11, I met Mr. -- that was the 23rd.

CHAIRMAN: I think we may be getting our dates slightly
mixed up. You are being asked about two things I suppose. Firstly, the point seems to be the focus on the coincidence between the meeting in the car park with Commissioner Callinan and any meeting you then had with Maurice McCabe, and then the other date you are being asked about is when you were considering calling

Maurice McCabe before the Public Accounts Committee and the conditions that might be necessary to ensure that that went off fairly and lawfully, you had met him, as I understand it, in late 2013, so it may be that you and counsel are at cross-purposes. which date are you asking about, Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. MÍCHÉAL O'HIGGINS: Just following Judge
Charleton's lead there. First of all, I was asking you when -- you say prior to the car park meeting you had put the allegations of sexual abuse to Maurice McCabe, and I am simply asking you, when was that?
A. In the course of the end of 2013.

42 Q. Right.
A. Leading into the hearings.

43 Q. Right. And you have told us that subsequent to the car o9:52 park, or have you, you also put them to him?
A. Yes. After the car park meeting?

44 Q. Yes.
A. I informed Maurice McCabe of what had been said.

45 Q. And when was that?
A. I don't have a date for that, but it was soon after the -- I know that I met him on the -- in May -- I think the speech -- just one second, there might be a guideline for me. The 26th may 2016 was when I revealed in the Dái 1 the meeting that I attended with Commissioner Callinan, and either -- around that time, around that date, I would have told Sergeant Maurice McCabe of the detail of the meeting.
46 Q. And how are you able to time locate that?
A. On the basis of the Dáil debate.

47 Q. So did you tell him before or after the Dáil debate?
A. I am not quite sure whether I flagged him that I was going to say it or whether I told him afterwards. My recollection is that I may have met him afterwards, but o9:53 I did tell him the detail.

48 Q. After the Dáil debate?
A. Yes.

49 Q. Was this so that if he was hearing it from the Dái 1 debate or from publicity surrounding the Dáil debate, 09:53 he might be distressed and you wanted to tell him in person, is that the reason?
A. Yes.

50 Q. So would you not have done that before the Dái 1 debate?
A. The manner in which the Dáil debate occurred arose from 09:53 the O'Higgins Report, I think.

51 Q. Do you know my question?
A. I am coming to it, yes.

52 Q. My question is: If your purpose was to alleviate or prevent distress for the man, would you not have told him prior to disclosing it in the Dáil?
A. I may -- I said to you that the Dái 1 debate was on 26th of May --

53 Q. I have that.
A. -- and that I may have told him before or after that.
A. I am not quite sure. But he was told of the Commissioner's -- of the meeting with the Commissioner at that time.

55
Q
Q. You have told us the reason why you did it and I am suggesting to you the logic of that reason would have necessitated you telling him before the Dáil debate?
A. No, the logic of it is that he required an explanation, I felt, and I gave him the explanation, because I had not repeated the full content of that meeting to Sergeant McCabe since I had met the Commissioner, which was back in January of 2014.

But would the vileness and the disturbingness, if that is a word, of the allegations not endure such that you would continue not to tell him?
A. At the time of the car park meeting, I did not tell Maurice McCabe.
that it was there being told to me to serve the purpose of ensuring that the Pub1ic Accounts Committee hearing would not go ahead and, therefore, I decided that I would not relate that story at that time to Maurice McCabe. I had witnessed this man since I first came across him in 2011 being destroyed year on year, and when someone tells you a story or tells you what is a fact to them as vile as what I was told, it was even difficult for me to repeat it. And on the 26th May the reason I repeated this and read into the record of the House a circular which was sent to the district officer in the Cavan-Monaghan division in relation to how well they had all conducted themselves, $I$ had to correct what I believed was a wrong and I made it clear that from the highest leve1, that Maurice McCabe was being damaged by what I considered to be an attempt to smear his name and to discredit him. So following the meeting in the car park and around the date of the 26th May, I'm sure that I would have advised in a factual way what Commissioner Callinan had said, because in the 09:58 Dáil debate $I$ referred to it. I didn't go into detail. I described the remarks as vile, and I wanted Sergeant McCabe to know what those remarks were.
61 Q. And to enable you do that, doubtless you consulted your contemporaneous note?
A. I didn't consult anything.

62 Q. Sorry, this was two years and four months later from the meeting in the car park, isn't that right --
A. That's right.

63 Q. -- when you went to the Dáil? Are you saying you gave your speech on the blind?
A. Yes.

64 Q. Would that be your normal practice?
A. Yes.
A. Yes. I don't use notes. I had been living this from 2011. I had been Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I had been at the coalface of the investigation. I had gone out of my way to assist Maurice McCabe bring forward the issues that he wanted to address, so I was pretty clear on the big ticket items in all of that controversy.
Q. And one of the big ticket items was this somewhat incendiary conversation you say you had in the car park?
A. That I did have in the car park, yes.

67 Q. And you referenced expressly that conversation in your Dáil speech, correct?
A. Correct.

And what I want to know is, because that was your plan and intention, wouldn't it have been a natural and appropriate step to take to consult your contemporaneous note of that conversation, considering now we are talking about something that occurred two years and four months before your Dáil speech?
A. When I read my Dái 1 speech and the transcript of that speech, I referred to the car park meeting in a general way. I didn't go into detail of the exact remarks that
were made.
69 Q. We will come back to that, but what I want to know is --
A. No, I am telling you now.

70 Q. Sergeant McCabe --
A. And I didn't have a note of that going in and I think the transcript of that debate, you can deduct from it that there wasn't a note.

71 Q. But you told us you were anxious to ensure that whatever you told Sergeant McCabe was going to be correct, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

72 Q. Right. That, surely, even on your logic, whatever about the Dáil debate, that would have necessitated you, two years and four months after the conversation,
that would have necessitated you consulting the note for your discussion with Sergeant McCabe, surely?
A. I didn't require the note.

73 Q. Are you serious?
A. I am very serious, yes.

74 Q. So you were able to remember what was said by the Commissioner in a situation where, on your case, you were upset and disturbed by it and it had happened two years and four months earlier and you were anxious to ensure that what you said to the man was correct, you chose not to consult the note, is that your evidence?
A. That's correct. I didn't have to consult the note, Mr. O'Higgins, and Chairman. I was living all of this right through. I had addressed the issues that were of
concern to me in the context of the examination at the Public Accounts Committee, and I had done so meticulously, so as not to mislead anyone. And when it came to the evening of the 26th May 2016, with all of that was going on in terms of the report and the Dáil debate, I recalled generally what was stated by the Commissioner in that Dáil debate by way of reference to show that at the highest level within the force there was attempts being made to discredit Garda Maurice McCabe. So I didn't need a note to remind me of that.

75 Q. Did you know about your note in May 2016?
A. I never thought of the note in 2016, quite frankly. The note was there and I came across that note in the search of paperwork for the Tribunal.
76 Q. Yes. We will come back to that. Would you mind, Deputy McGuinness, I hope you don't mind us and I will be careful with it, would you mind if I had a quick look at your notebook just for a moment, your notebook you have present there?
A. The Tribunal have it, I think.

77 Q. I think it's on your desk there?
A. Sorry, yes.

78 Q. Would you mind opening it up at the relevant page?
A. Yes.

79 Q. And I won't -- you might just pass it down, would you mind, just for a moment, and $I$ will be careful not to look at material that a has nothing --
A. You can't avoid looking at material that has nothing to do with the Tribunal, but I don't mind you looking at

CHAIRMAN: Let's have a reference, if we could have 10:05 that, please.
MR. MARRINAN: Page 1422.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is what I thought. If you want to talk down 1422.
A. Volume?

CHAIRMAN: Volume 6, isn't it? I think we had it in a different iteration before, but 1422 will do fine.
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. (Handed to counse1)
A. There is also a lot of data there in relation to my constituents, which I am sure you will ignore.
Q. I will. And do you have a copy there of your -- of the note so you can help the Tribunal with any questions I have for you from the original. It's on the screen, actually, but it's --
A. Sorry? I see it here on the screen.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Now, I am interested in the position and sequencing of the note, Deputy McGuinness,
I will just hold it up so you can know what I am talking about. It's an A4 notebook and on the 1eft-hand page there is written the note which you say you took of the car park meeting, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

It's in the bottom corner of the left-hand side of the notebook, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it is located on the left-hand side to the left of
it. 10:04
an entry carrying the date the 25th January 2014 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- which is on the right-hand side, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q.

But you see -- do you mind if I look over the next page?
A. No, no, no, go ahead.

89 Q. There is a fully available blank white page a page over where you could have written that, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. It wasn't necessary unless, for instance, the right-hand side was already occupied with wording, it wasn't necessary to write it into the tight restricted spot that you did choose, is that right?
A. That was the page on the day. As you look at that diary, there is no mystery about it. On the right-hand side are lists of constituents and their complaints.

91 Q. I have that.
A. On the left-hand side are random notes. I don't mind telling you that, you know, on that particular day $I$ reference an individual about a canvass, I reference another individual about dog food for my German shepherds, I reference another individual about returning a phone call, $I$ have numbered each and every one of them down along, and then at the end reaching across, as the thoughts came to me, I just scribbled them down. I never considered it to be a note of a meeting. I considered it to be the, I suppose the main 10:08 points that $I$ had to address from the meeting. So the main points that $I$ had to address from the meeting was, and I will read them out:
"Sexual abuse. True or false. Individuals and their 10:08 family -- and family. True or false."

It relates to sexual abuse.
"Don't trust him. Story not credible. Investigations ongoing. He is not reliable. Trouble for PAC."

They were the main issues that I had to address. Now, I didn't write down in that note, for example, that $I$ had put it to the Commissioner that he should meet with 10:09 Sergeant Maurice McCabe and deal with the issues that he had discussed with me. I didn't write down the other matters that we had talked about generally. So these were issues that $I$ had to address. So it's not a
note, a full report of a meeting verbatim. It's just a note for me to reconcile in my head what had been said so that I could sit at home and address these issues, in the knowledge that I already had from Sergeant Maurice McCabe

CHAIRMAN: I do understand that, Deputy. I suppose the point of the question is: why squeeze it into that particular corner? It's in a particular context, it might help if you said what was written first, what was written second. And then the other thing is this: I am not understanding this but I am familiar with a September to September diary because obviously in the law world we used to use such a thing, I certainly did, is there a date on that page at all?
A. There is a date on the page aside from -- the 25 th, that was the day after, of the first '14. You can see it on the right hand side.
CHAIRMAN: And was the date previous, was that chockablock, was it? I mean, the day -- you are writing it on the date appropriate, the day after --
A. No, these are scribbled notes on the left hand side of that page then.
CHAIRMAN: But what date refers to that? Because it's blacked out in my copy, I can't see it.
A. What date is on that -- there is no date on that page. It's the 25th is the date that is dictating the whereabouts of this in the diary.
CHAIRMAN: I am sorry for not following that, but I don't follow it.
A. Can I have the diary?

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, please, you ask questions, $I$ can address that at the end as appropriate.
92 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: The Chairman has moved to the nub of it. You didn't put any date on your note, did you?
CHAIRMAN: We11, I am sorry, I just don't know if this is a thing that you date or it's just one of these open diaries where you write a date on.
A. It's not a diary, it's an open book.

CHAIRMAN: It's just your ordinary notebook.
A. Your ordinary notebook. It doesn't run from any particular date. This one actually started on the $20 / 12 / 2013$ and it ended on the 6/9/2014.
CHAIRMAN: Al1 right.
A. And on that particular day -- sorry, the following day then would have been the 25 th, yes, so that is -- the following day is the 25 th, and on that day $I$ would have had a clinic and these are all matters from that
clinic. So the previous day, the 24th, I had my random notes. That is how I follow my diary. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Did you date this important entry?
A. No, the entry is not dated. It comes before the 25th
on that page.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. And that is how it occurred.

CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately, I suppose what the public and
the media are looking at it is a completely blanked out right-hand page, but just for the purpose of information, the right-hand page says "25th", isn't it, "January '14" and underneath that there is a "40" and then there is a whole load of references to regulations, issues about constituencies, and I am paying no attention to those whatsoever.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So you are getting the date by reference to the fact that the blanked out date on the right-hand side of what is on the screen is headed "25/1/14"?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
94 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: would it not have been easier, Deputy McGuinness, to rest the book on the steering whee1 as you were making a note rather than trying to do it with the book on the passenger seat?
A. I sat in the car and I reflected on what was said and as a point would come to me that $I$ felt was important, I'd write it into this book.

95 Q. So this process of reflection and writing was made more easier, was it, by you leaning over to your left rather than putting the book on the steering wheel?
A. I was quite happy to do it that way. This is the way it was done, Mr. O'Higgins, there is no mystery to it and it wasn't a planned event. It wasn't me writing a complete narrative of what happened at the meeting. It was me sitting in the disturbed state thinking about what had happened and what had been said and then
randomly writing down a note of what I needed to address. what concerned me most, and I wrote it down. I don't take notes of meetings, I don't take long, you know, notes of every detail of a meeting that $I$ attend. So, I had attended many meetings with others and the same thing applies. You know, without showing you the name, because it's another whistleblower, you have the random -- you have the constituency details on one side, you have the other details on this side, they are marked with a chain bracket because they are different than anything else that is in the book. And the same would apply in other cases. For example, this one here, $I$ just stuck in the note. So $I$ don't do it on the basis that at some stage in the future $I$ am actually going to need this, I could be in the Tribuna1. I don't think myself like that. It's a reminder. It serves as a purpose of managing my constituency queries and it serves as a reminder to return telephone calls or other matters, but you can see, and you are welcome to look at it in this book, the way other details -- there is another one in relation to the Public Accounts Committee, you see where it's al1 ticked, al1 done, but you see this side here - sorry, Chairman - where it's marked again with a chain bracket. Again, if I was flicking through that book and I wanted to find something and I'd see a chain bracket, I would know it was different than my constituency work, I would stop and look at it and I would remind myself of it. And again, in relation to
those notes, they are general notes, they are not specific details of things that might have happened. There is another note here where $I$ just put it into a square. So it may not be the most professional or efficient but it has managed to get me elected over the 10:16 last 21 years.
96 Q. When did you apply the blue tick beside the number 6 on the left-hand side?
A. of that date?

Beside the entry.
A. I don't know that, because the practice has been -CHAIRMAN: Counsel is asking you about -- I am just seeing the book from here to there and there is what I would call a marker and you have marked loads of it AND put circles around it and ticks and all the rest of it, 10:16 and counsel is simply asking you when you did that or why do you do that, your methodology?
A. On this side I tick it when the job is complete, so I may go further on in the course of my work, I may go back to this because it's not completed until later date, I would tick that. If I was putting away the diary, I might go through the diary again to ensure everything is completed, and in instances where they don't refer to the constituency work, I mark them in a different way. So when did I put the mark on these things, I can't tell you because they don't follow a sequence.
98 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: But sorry, the markings with the blue pen or the blue marker, there is a tick beside
item 6 and there is also a half circle, just hold it up there for a moment so people know what we are talking about, so the Chairman can see it, would you mind just face it towards the Chairman so he sees what I am talking about, right, do you see there surrounding the upper part of this significant note, there is a semi-circle with the blue felt tip marker, are we agreed about that?
A. Yes.

99 Q. Within that semi-circle there is a blue tick beside a number 6?
A. Yes.

100 Q. The same marker?
A. Yes.

101 Q. When did you make those markings?
A. I would have no idea. Because the manner in which this is -- this diary is used, is on the basis of completing work which may not be completed on the date that it was written and at the end of the diary when it's completed, as you can see here, when it's complete, there, for example, is another two notes relevant to public accounts, it's just the tick going through it, I would go back over that diary at the end of its life and I would just look at everything to ensure, one, did I do everything relevant to my constituency work, and two, if there was something in there other than constituency work, would I mark it. when I would mark it, I don't know. It's a random thing. It's not done in the most professional of ways, but for me and my
job, this works.
102 Q. You recal1 I had asked you when did you come back to the note and I think you indicated for the purposes of giving your statement to the Tribunal, is that right?
A. Yes. its content. So, an examination of the content of that note didn't happen until $I$ had -- when did I come back to the note in the context of the marker and how it's marked out, I can't tell you that.
Deputy, you referenced the Dáil speech you gave in May 2016 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that right? That Dáil speech, you'd agree with me, generated a considerable amount of headlines and publicity?
A. Now this may surprise you but I don't read much about what I say or do. I had a particular experience, Mr. Chairman, during my political career which caused me to question whether it was good or bad to read what was in the media, so I find my life much easier if I

CHAIRMAN: A11 right. Let's take it as a given that it was an important speech, let's take it as a given that the media took an interest and then go on from there.

I mean, I suppose if you are asked the question were you doing it for the purpose of self-glorification on a false basis, well then we will get to that when we get to that, but you are not at the moment being asked that.
A. I am surprised at that. CHAIRMAN: what?
A. I would be surprised about that. CHAIRMAN: Well, I am not asking you that question.
A. Okay.

CHAIRMAN: I am not suggesting it at al1, so...
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: You gave a number of interviews, did you not, and you went on the radio and there was a lot of public interest in what you said in the Dáil?
A. I gave interviews and I went on the radio, yes.

107 Q. I'm suggesting to you that before going on the radio, it would have been natural and logical to consult your note?
A. You see, Mr. O'Higgins, when it's in your head and when you have lived through it, as I take every event in my life, I'm not going to complicate my life further by having to revert to notes every time I do something, and it wasn't necessary for me to do it. I had said what I said in the Dáil. That record stood, or stands, as a reference point, and that's the essence of my position and my work in politics, or how I do that work.
Q. You knew -- you were able to recall yesterday that you
pulled into a truck stop, you were able to summon that up from your memory, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

109 Q. Do you recall giving an interview within a few days of your Dáil speech about the car park conversation with Richard Crowley on RTÉ, a programme called This Week on a Sunday?
A. Yes. Well, you made that available late last night, I think.

110 Q. Yes. It was actually to ensure that you had what I was 10:22 going to be asking you questions about and you were provided with those materials, is that right?
A. I was, this morning, yes.

111 Q. Pardon me?
A. Yes, I have them this morning.

112 Q. And when were you told about them?
A. Oh, last night.

113 Q. Yes. And you are aware, aren't you, that Richard Crowley in this interview, on the 29th May 2016, which is some three days after your Dáil speech, specifically 10:23 asked you if you had made a note of the car park conversation and you confirmed that you had not?
A. Yes.

114 Q. Are we agreed about that?
A. Well now, I'd like to get to the actual transcript of the interview. Was that the 9th October?

115 Q. No, that was the 29th May 2016.
A. Okay.

116 Q. We will come to the October one in due course.
A. So the 29th May, yes. What page is that on?

117 Q. And I think this is up on the screen there, the cover sheet for the RTÉ This Week programme, 29th May 2016 ?
A. Yes.

118 Q. And on page 2 the presenter, Mr. Crowley, is
introducing the programme and is referencing, on page 3 , if we go to the top of page 3 , he is quoting -- or the programme quotes from a part of your Dáil speech, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

119 Q. And then towards the bottom of that page we have Richard Crowley, just they have it there on screen --
A. Yes.

120 Q. -- indicates "Fianna Fail TD and former Public Accounts Committee Chairman, John McGuinness, speaking in the Dáil on Thursday. Last night speaking from his home in Kilkenny Deputy McGuinness told us more about how that secret meeting came about."
A. Yes.

121 Q. Just pause there, we will come back there to the notion 10:24 it was secret in due course, but we might just stay with the transcript for a moment. And perhaps if we might go to -- while just looking at that, can I ask you this: In terms of the allegations that you say Commissioner callinan uttered in the car, were they new 10:25 allegations or were they allegations you had heard before?
A. As I said previously, the allegations of sexual abuse were ones that we had heard before.

122
Q. They were ones you heard before?
A. Yeah.

123 Q. So there was nothing new in what was being said?
A. Oh, no, there was a lot new in what was being said in terms of the other matters, but in terms of the accusations or the -- I suppose, the gossip in Leinster House in relation to sexual abuse, these were not new. The detail was different.

124
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. The detail was new.
Q. We11, look, if there was new detail they are new allegations surely?
A. No, they are not, they are the same allegations.
Q. So is it your position that what you say was relayed to you by Commissioner Callinan in the car park meeting was one and the same of the subject matter that you had already heard previous7y?
A. With the -- yes, in relation to the matters of sexual abuse, but then he spoke about the family members, he spoke about the file that was there and so on, and that 10:27 was different. I was never made aware that there was a file against Sergeant McCabe or that there would be prosecutions imminently in relation to this, so these are matters that were not known to me.
127 Q. But in terms of the actual matters alleged by way of 10:27 sexual abuse, they were not new?
A. They were not new, no.

128 Q. And what about this business about family and nieces --
A. Yes.

129 Q. -- is that not new?
A. Oh, that is new, yes.
A. The general accusation and gossip around sexual abuse and Maurice McCabe was not new. It's a matter that I had addressed with him from 2011 to '13, nearer to '13, where he had denied it. what was new and disturbing was the fact that it was being suggested to me that there was a file, a live file, and that the prosecution in relation to this was ongoing, and the fact that the sexual abuse involved family members, that extended completely the description, if you like, of what was happening and it came directly from the Commissioner as a fact. So to that extent, all of that was different, very different.
131 Q. So there were new allegations being relayed to you in the car?
A. Sorry? That question?

132 Q. You are telling us, therefore, aren't you, if I am understanding what you are saying, what was relayed to you in the car were in fact new allegations?
A. Yes.

133 Q. Right. So insofar as you may have earlier indicated they weren't new --
A. The allegations around sexual abuse, these were not new. These were part of the gossip and the story around Leinster House.

134 Q. We11, te11 us about that. What had you heard before the car park meeting?
A. The same as I had heard -- before the car park meeting, we were dealing with Sergeant Maurice McCabe and a lot of what was being said about Sergeant Maurice McCabe was that he had issues around sexual abuse and these were matters that I had asked Sergeant Maurice McCabe about. What was new in terms of the car park was the fact that the Commissioner indicated that a file was being prepared and, as I said yesterday, presumably for prosecution. The Commissioner was confirming this so, therefore, it was no longer a rumour, it was no longer a piece of tittle-tattle or gossip, it was something that was being presented as fact. That was entirely different. And for matters to be, I suppose, there in the form of gossip and tittle-tattle is quite different. Quite, quite different. You have used, if you don't mind me commenting a rather general term, there were issues, abuse issues that you had heard from the rumours; what had you heard and what did you hear from Sergeant McCabe when you say you put them to him prior to -- at the end of 2013 ?
A. That he had sexually abused someone.
Q. You put that to him?
A. And I asked Sergeant McCabe during the course of the consideration of matters leading up to the Public Accounts Committee about these rumours and he categorically denied those rumours.

137 Q. Was that the extent of the information you asked him to confront?
A. Yes.

138 Q. That he had sexually abused someone?
A. Yes.

139 Q. Is that it?
A. Yes.

140 Q. Who was the someone that you were asking him about? I don't mean the name, I mean his relation with the someone or did he know the someone?
A. I wasn't -- I didn't mention a name.

141 Q. No. Tel1 us what the rumours had said that you had heard --
A. The rumours had said that Sergeant Maurice McCabe had abused people, that he had sexually abused people.
142 Q. People?
A. Yes.

143 Q. People?
A. Yes. That was the general comment throughout Leinster House.

144 Q. Right.
A. And I required, then, at a stage to ask Sergeant McCabe was this true or not. He told me he was aware of the rumours and he told me they were completely untrue.
145 Q. And what else did he tell you?
A. In relation to what?

146 Q. He presumably gave you a degree of detail --
A. I wasn't interested in detait, Mr. O'Higgins. I was interested in whether the man that $I$ was believing in and that was informing me in relation to a hearing of the Public Accounts Committee, had sexually abused someone or not, according to the gossip. He was asked
and he answered, and I accepted that answer. So there was no need for me to probe into any of this gossip, no need at all.

So you weren't interested in hearing any detail from him or giving any detail to him, is that your evidence?
A. I gave him the detail of the rumour of sexual abuse.

148 Q. And what detail did you give to him?
A. That he sexually abused people.

149 Q. That is not detail, that is just one line. what detail did you give him?
A. I think that is detail enough for me, quite frankly. I find the whole thing absolutely disgusting that, these rumours were circulating in Leinster House, without any foundation whatsoever, and then I directly asked the man central to these rumours were they true or false. I felt that I needed to know and I wanted to know. But it was sufficient for me to hear it directly from him that they were absolutely false, because I had always believed that he was an honourable individual being dealt with improperly by the State and what I was concerned about was, that if these rumours were correct or if I didn't even ask about these rumours, it would have been wrong of me. And I felt embarrassed and upset to have to ask Sergeant Maurice McCabe about his family affairs, about his -- the affairs that were before us in the context of rumours, when in fact the Public Accounts Committee wasn't dealing with that; we were dealing with something entirely different. We were dealing with a matter that was the subject of $a$
report of the Comptroller \& Auditor General, not anything to do with Maurice McCabe and his character, because, remember, we already had the evidence to prove that he was reporting a serious wrongdoing in the State.

10:35 I wanted to know from him was that the rumours were not true, they were just that, rumours.

154 Q. But surely the rumour mill had that detail, there had been an investigation?
A. Well, Mr. O'Higgins, I just deal with facts and the fact of the matter is, there was a rumour. The fact of the matter is, I had to get a response because I wanted to ensure that what I was embarking upon was -- in the company of Sergeant McCabe, was someone that I can trust and someone that would -- someone that needed to perhaps explain in relation to the rumours, whether they were true or false and I did that, I asked him and he said no.
Deputy McGuinness, it's a simple: Did the rumour mill have it that there had been an investigation?
A. That's not how $I$ heard it. The rumour mill in the context of what was being said about Maurice McCabe was that he had sexually abused people and that he was a paedophile. That was what was being said generally about Sergeant Maurice McCabe.

156 Q. And are you seriously suggesting to the Tribunal that Sergeant McCabe didn't tell you the outcome of the investigation?
A. Seriously.

157 Q. Did he?
A. I am seriously telling the Tribunal that he didn't tel1 me about the outcome of an investigation.

158 Q. You see, this Tribunal has -- and you wouldn't have been here in fairness to you, but at earlier phases of this Tribuna1, the Tribunal has heard about perhaps understandable lengths Sergeant McCabe went to to ensure that relevant people were aware, fully aware, not only that the DPP had directed no prosecution but
why the DPP had directed no prosecution; he was anxious that, if you like, the world would know that?
CHAIRMAN: Well, that has been disputed, Mr. o'higgins, and you will appreciate I have been told I have made an error in that respect, I think Ms. Leader has been told $10: 38$ she has made an error in that respect. Now, I will sort that out when I come to think about this in due course. But what seems to be between us is that I had taken the view that the reason for asking for the circulation of the DPP's letter was that it would counteract, I suppose, the Rooney letter of the 4th July 2011, but secondly, the other thing, given that there was, and there's two different views of this as well, either a confrontation or merely staring in Bailieboro District Court, and again there's two different views of this, did Ms. D actually chase him through Bailieboro, which is a public fuss, or was it the case that he saw her and went upstairs in the Garda station. Two diametrically opposed views have been given of this. But as I understand the position of Maurice McCabe, is that his request to Superintendent Rooney for which he was to make out a business case was that given that he had had the detail from the state solicitor, that the letter itself from the DPP should go to the D family and that that might calm them down
in the context of the incidents I have spoken about, again which there are, I am reiterating, diametrically opposed views as to what happened. So I mean, I don't think it was the world at large because that would have
made things worse, but it was certainly at least two families, his and the D family, and perhaps more widely than that, I don't know.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Thank you, Chairman, that puts context on it.

159 Q. If I could then rephrase my question to you, Deputy McGuinness: In circumstances where you were, if you like, directly confronting Sergeant McCabe with this rumour and asking for his position on it, I'm suggesting to you it would have been a logical and natural thing for him to say, look, there was an investigation but the DPP decided not to bring a prosecution for reasons $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ and Z , all right, that would have been a natural thing for him to relay to you, would you agree with that?
A. I don't know what is natural for Sergeant McCabe, so you will have to ask Sergeant McCabe that question. I can only relay to you in truth what I have been -- what I know.
160 Q. We were looking at the Richard Crowley interview you gave and on page 5, towards the bottom, on line 26, Mr. Crowley asks a specific question, he says:
"Just to be clear on this, there was nothing that the Commissioner told you at that meeting that you hadn't heard before and that you hadn't satisfied yourself was untrue."

Do you see that there?
A. Yes.

161 Q. And you are recorded as answering:
"I had heard all of this before and I had satisfied myself to the extent that I had already asked Sergeant McCabe about these matters and he dealt with each of the issues that I spoke to him about in detail."

In detail is what you said.
A. Yes.
Q. "And I believed him." So do you want to revisit your answer in relation to detail?
A. No, I don't.

163 Q. I see.
A. I have given you the detail.

164 Q. And do you see on line 12 Mr . Crowley asked you a specific question, it's further down the same page. Mr. Crowley, line 12:
"Just in terms of the meeting, did you record it or take notes or write out notes later of that meeting?"

And you responded:
"No, no, I did not."
A. And I did not. I did not record it and I did not write out the full notes of the meeting. What was written, as I told you before, were the points that I had to address and what Mr. Crowley here was getting at in the
context of the interview was the detailed exchange between Mr. Callinan and I. Did I write out a note in length about that, that was how I took that question, and the answer to that question is, no, I did not take a full note of the meeting.

165 Q. Are you seeing something that I am not seeing? The question that was asked of you was:
"In terms of the meeting, did you record it or take notes or write out notes later of that meeting?"

And you said "No".
A. Yes. You see, Mr. O'Higgins, what you are attempting to do here is to provide me with a single line from Mr. Crowley's interview and not allowing those that are 10:43 listening to us having this exchange read through all of the interview, but it is clear that Mr. Crowley wanted detail of what transpired between Mr. Callinan and $I$, and I did not take that kind of note during the meeting or after the meeting. Neither -- and I would refer you to his first question, which was did I record it. That is a clear signal, $I$ think, that he wanted the precise detail. There was no precise detail of the exchange between both of us written down. There was simply the four or five points of a note to myself. Mr. Crowley wasn't asking me about anything short or sweet. He was asking me for the long format of the transcript of the meeting and there is none.
166 Q. So you are standing over, are you, as correct, the
answer you gave to Richard Crowley in that interview?
A. The answer that I gave to Mr. Crowley in the interview is as I have explained to you and in context. what Mr. Crowley was looking for was almost a transcript of the meeting. He referred to a tape-recording that would be detail, detail. He then went on to say: "Did you take notes or write out notes later?" I didn't write out notes of the meeting later in its full format. I took four or five points which I had to address for myself.

167 Q. Deputy McGuinness, you were given this overnight. You see, I thought your answer was going to be I just forgot, but you are saying --
A. But sure, why should I tell you that? I didn't forget, I am telling you exactly what happened.
168 Q. You didn't forget?
A. You are choosing to ignore the content of the interview, you are choosing to ignore the fact that generally speaking when you are being interviewed they are not interested in short snappy notes, they are interested in the full detail. I didn't have the full detail. I didn't write down the full detail. I never claimed to write down the full detail. I claim to write down four or five points for my own interest and consideration. So it's not unusual that I would have said to him, no, I don't have a recording of the meeting and $I$ don't have a transcript of the meeting.

169 Q. Did you deliberately answer Mr. Crowley's question and withhold from him that you had made a note, perhaps not
a full note but a note of the meeting, was that something you intended --
A. Deliberately?

170 Q. To withhold that information?
A. No, I didn't, no, no.

171 Q. But why didn't you simply say I am not going to go into the detail of it but I took a note?
A. You see, that is what I said on the day. I have given you the reason why I said it. I have explained the reasoning behind it. I don't know what else you want me to say. But there isn't anything else for me to say. And as I told you earlier on, I rely in general throughout these interviews on the information that I have in a general way, and I present it as such and that is what $I$ had done right throughout that interview. And I see no difference whatsoever in the position or the answer that I gave then in relation to a transcript type of document, a recording of the meeting. There was none. There is none. Surely, Mr. O'Higgins, based on the note in this diary, based on that note, which you have read, and in your experience, is that a note of the transcript of a meeting that lasted 20 minutes to half an hour?
172 Q. So can we take it, Deputy McGuinness, that when you were having this interview, you -- this isn't the case that you had forgotten about the note; you remembered the note during the course of this interview?
A. I didn't even think about the note because the question wasn't -- the question that he was asking was about the
detailed transcript of a meeting. He wasn't saying that in words, but when he mentioned tape-recording and notes, I'm simply saying to you --
173 Q. Where does it say tape record?
A. It says here recording of the meeting. I think.

174 Q. "Did you record it --"
A. Did I record it.
Q. "-- or take notes or write out notes later of that meeting?" where does it say tape-recording?
A. It doesn't say tape in the transcript.

176 Q. Where does it say full notes?
A. It doesn't say full notes, Mr. O'Higgins. But the fact of the matter is, recorded, to me, in the course of the interview, was, in my mind at that time, the suggestion that it would have been recorded on tape. The recording in relation to the notes and take notes for me means take considerable detailed notes. There was no notes, there was no recording. And when I said to you earlier on in my answer about recording I was referring to what $I$ believed to be in Mr. Crowley's mind, which was tape-recording, but maybe that is a question you should ask Mr. Crowley.

177 Q. Do you see there on line 20 you are recorded as saying -- I don't want to rob it of its context, Mr. Crowley asked you on line 16:
"We haven't heard from the Commissioner, I don't know if we will hear from the Commissioner on this but I suppose people might say it could be your word against
his."
A. Yes.
Q. You see, I'm suggesting to you that that is a skilled presenter who is conducting an interview, who has received information of your position that you didn't take a note or write out a note of the meeting, on foot of that information being received by him he is saying to you, look, people might say it's your word against his because you don't have a note, do you understand? CHAIRMAN: Well, that might be so, but God knows we have had every kind of note in this Tribunal which has been challenged by everybody in multiple ways, so it actually doesn't make a difference. It seems to me the only thing you can do is to record everybody as you go along. Like those things that bicycles have on their helmets which shows their route, so they can look at it, I don't know, and feel good about themselves on their computer later on. Anyway, I am sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, your question $I$ think is, that anyone would take the plain reality of the answer of Deputy McGuinness as being no, there is no note, as opposed to no, I didn't transcribe it or I didn't sit down and fully write out every single thing we talked about from memory and certainly whether it's a mobile phone that you can switch to record, I don't think I can do that on my mobile phone, not that $I$ would be bothered, you didn't do any such thing, that was the sense of your answer.
A. That was the thrust of the question and that was the
thrust of my answer.
179 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Do you want to answer the Chair's question?
A. Which is, sorry, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN: Which is, what do you think, you say in my head I didn't think of the note, what was the import do you think of the answer you actually gave as it appears on the page?
A. Well, on the -- during the interview, it was -- and following the sequence of questions and the answers that were given, it was clear that Mr. Crowley was looking for a detailed note of the meeting. Now, had I answered 'oh, yes, I have a detailed note' I am quite that people would have got quite a bit of fun out of the short note that was there, in a half hour meeting. So I didn't think that have note. And it didn't enter my mind because what Mr. Crowley was after was a recording. Now, you questioned tape-recording, was it a recording on paper. That was a recording of the meeting. No, I didn't record the meeting on paper in its detail.

180 Q. Al1 right. Could we move down to the bottom of the page down and Mr. Crowley asked you a separate question, the bottom of page 6:
"Did you tell Sergeant McCabe about this meeting on the Naas Road and tell him about what was said?"

And you are recorded as answering:
"No, I did not because what was related to me was so vile and disturbing that I did not want to relate it to Sergeant McCabe and I had heard it before."

Do you see that?
A. Yes. He was speaking about the meeting on the Naas Road and had I told him immediately after that and the answer was no.
181 Q. No, the question he asked was:
"Did you tell Sergeant McCabe about this meeting on the Naas Road and tell him about what was said?"

не didn't time-restrict the question.
A. He didn't time-restrict the question, but in the course of the interview that is what we were referring to: we were referring to the meeting on the date that it happened, the note on the date that it happened and then did I go and tell Sergeant Maurice McCabe after it had happened, after it had happened on the date that it happened. And the answer to that question is, no, I didn't. Now, to go through the interview, you are being interviewed and you are taking from the person carrying out the interview the questions that you believe he is asking, as you understand him to be asking, and because of the fact that previous to this we were discussing all of the relevance of this meeting, the answer to the question was that, no, I
didn't tell him. And, as I said to you earlier on, I had asked him previously but that was not about the meeting with Mr. Callinan.

182 Q.
In line 7 he asked:
"Did Martin Callinan swear you to secrecy on this? Did he say this all off the record?"

And you responded by saying:
"No, no, no, I am not sworn to secrecy. Obviously I am not, $I$ have raised it now."

And then Mr. Crowley asked you --
A. Sorry, what page are you on now?

183 Q. We are still on page 7.
A. 7, yes.

184 Q. Mr. Crowley asked you:
"Sure. And did you tell anybody else about the meeting or the content of the meeting subsequently?"

And you responded "No", isn't that right?
A. Yes.

185 Q. And he asked at line 14:
"You didn't tell your party leader?"
A. Yes.
Q. It says Michael Martin, I think it should be "Micheá 1

Martin, about this"?
A. Yes.

187 Q. And your answer was:
"No, no, I don't believe I did, no."
A. Yes.

188 Q. And this is an interview where you are being asked that specific question on the 29th May $2016 ?$
A. Yes.

189 Q. And you go on then and you actually give a reason as to $10: 56$ why you didn't tell your party leader, because in line 17 Mr. Crowley asked you:
"Do you think you should have?"

And you gave the following response:
"No. Because, firstly, it was a matter between me and Maurice McCabe as to how he was bringing forward the evidence and what he was doing, and secondly, you know, when you do something like this the political establishment is against you and all sorts of rumours and allegations are made against individuals, that's the nature of this and what happens within the State. So, you know, I heard what the Commissioner had to say, 10:56 I have heard what others have had to say and my judgment call was that there was no need to pursue this except directly to Maurice McCabe." Do you see that there?
A. Yes.
Q. So you gave not only -- not only did you say that you believed you hadn't told your party leader, but actually you went to the trouble of giving a reason as to why that was so?
A. Yes.

191 Q. And you have been provided with the full interview, but I think if we move to page 10 , you were asked the question by Mr . Crowley on line 26 towards the bottom of page 10:
"Do you regret not bringing this information into the public domain earlier? It's a very pertinent important piece of information about how a senior garda attempted 10:57 to influence you in relation to the credibility of a key witness?"
A. Yes.

192 Q. And you responded:
"This in my opinion is the first opportunity when after the O'Higgins Report, when all of this is now being talked about in terms of Dáil debates and in terms of further investigations and clarifications that are necessary, I think it is necessary to put on the public 10:58 record the fact that this was being said at the highest level. This is my proof that it was being said and I believe it now needs to be clarified."

And that is the answer you gave.
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Crowley asked you on line 11:
"And you don't think it would have been more useful to do it earlier in the proceedings, to let people know that the most senior garda in the country was having a secret meeting with the Public Accounts Committee Chairman?"

You gave us a reason in line 16:
"I am not sure whether it would have been more useful at that time because given the efforts that were being made it might have actually caused the prevention of that meeting of the Pub1ic Accounts Committee and I wasn't prepared to allow that to happen given that the evidence that I had received from Maurice McCabe and given the documentation that was before the Public Accounts Committee, I could not jeopardise the possibility of that meeting being halted at any stage and I was proven or have been proven and so has Maurice McCabe been proven to be correct in that assumption."

So you appear to be giving a reason there, Deputy
McGuinness, that the reason you didn't tell -- you didn't come forward publicly with this car park incendiary conversation at the time was because it might have actually caused the prevention of Maurice

McCabe giving evidence before the PAC, is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, sorry, yes.

202 Q. The 24th?
A. Yes.
Q. And six days after the car park meeting, Sergeant McCabe appeared before the PAC in private session?
A. Yes, yes.

Right. So that necessity, that justification for not making pub7ic the car park conversation came to an end on the 30th January, after Sergeant McCabe has given his evidence?
A. Yes, you could say that, yes.

We11, what do you say to that? Isn't that logical?
A. Oh, yeah. Prior to Sergeant McCabe giving evidence, I felt that it was important to stay focused on the issue at hand, so the car park meeting, to my mind, while it was trying to discredit Maurice McCabe, there was no need for that to interfere with the work of the Public Accounts Committee. So you are asking me then after that it might have been, $I$ think is your question, to make it public, and I didn't think it correct to make it public because, again, a lot of what was being said at that meeting was incorrect, it was wrong, and I was not going to allow myself to be used by Commissioner Callinan to spread the type of rumour and information that I was given.
Q. On your case, Commissioner Callinan had made disgraceful remarks about Sergeant McCabe and had done so for the purpose of undermining the PAC?
A. Yes.
Q. And the important work it does, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

208 Q. And I'm suggesting to you if we just step back for a moment and look at the wider political landscape at that time, in terms of current affairs --
A. Yes.
-- I'm suggesting to you it would have been politically opportune and appropriate for you to report the car park conversation at any number of points after the car park meeting on the 24th January 2014 ?
A. Yeah, but I chose not to do that because I didn't see the relevance of putting that into the public domain at 11:04 that time, because while you set the date of the meeting and Sergeant Maurice McCabe's appearance before that meeting at the 30th, that didn't end the -- that didn't end the treatment of Maurice McCabe and didn't end his case and his hearing. There was lots of other matters that were going on. So had I intervened at that stage with this story and this report of the meeting, $I$ felt that it would further complicate all of those issues and simply almost give truth to the rumours that were being circulated, because the matters 11:04 being dealt with by Maurice McCabe didn't start and finish with just the penalty points, so it would have been, $I$ think, a bit reckless of me to add all of this unproven material to the mix in terms of the public perception of Sergeant McCabe, and the reason I raised it much later, on the 26th May 2016, was because of the o'Higgins Report and because matters were continuing in relation to those rumours and the attempts within the force to discredit Maurice McCabe. And quite frankly,

I had enough of that, so I decided at that juncture to mention this in my Dáil contribution of the 26th May.
210 Q. Let's bring it close to the car park time and let's look at the political controversies that arose at that time. January 2014, after then-Commissioner Callinan makes his PAC appearance, there is, and I am going to use neutral language here, there was a fallout or publicity surrounding his use of the adjective disgusting, all right, and you'd agree with me that the airwaves were reasonably full with politicians offering views on that and Commissioner Callinan and An Garda Síochána came under a degree of pressure, is that fair?
A. Yes, there was public --

211 Q. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, there was commentary on it, yes.

212 Q. Right. And that's one thing. But way more politically potentially explosive or certainly something that would have greater political, $I$ suggest to you, impact, would be you bringing out in public the fact of this disgraceful conduct in the car park which you accuse Martin Callinan of, libeling, attributing -- accusing sexual abuse to a serving guard for the purpose of undermining the work of the PAC, that was potentially significant politically, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yes, you could say that.

213 Q. You didn't avail of the opportunity in January 2014 in the fallout from the adjective disgusting, nor did you raise it in February 2014 when Sergeant McCabe met Micheál Martin, isn't that right?
A. Sorry, repeat that there.
Q. Nor did you raise it in the context of your party leader meeting with Sergeant McCabe in February 2014, isn't that right?
A. I'm not sure of the meeting with Sergeant Maurice McCabe and Micheál Martin.
Q. We11, do you recall on the 19th February 2014, Micheá1 Martin, in my recollection, passed a dossier to the Taoiseach, Enda Kenny, then Taoiseach --
A. Yes.

216 Q. -- of documents and information that had been passed to him by Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

217 Q. Right. In order to do that he had to meet him, isn't that right? You don't remember that, no?
A. Why would I remember it? I wasn't at the meeting.
Q. Sorry, are you aware that Sergeant McCabe -- I don't intend this as a quiz, Deputy McGuinness, but just are you aware --
A. I am aware that Micheál Martin had received some form 11:09 of dossier, or as you call it, and that he had presented that to the Taoiseach at the time.

219 Q. Right.
A. I also remember, Mr. Chairman, that Micheál Martin raised that matter in the Dáil, I think, around that time.

220 Q. Yes. So there was a degree of publicity --
A. There was a degree of publicity around that.

221 Q. Yes.
A. And because of the nature of that publicity, I, at that time, following a meeting with Micheá 1 Martin, mentioned to him that I had met the Commissioner and that certain matters -- or that he had made allegations about Sergeant Maurice McCabe. So --

222 Q. And was he shocked?
A. Well, I gave him that information, I think I should explain that in my role as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and in fairness to the party leader, Micheál Martin, he insisted on a separation of
interest; in other words, you are Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, it's a cross-party committee and what you do is what you do, I don't want any involvement in it, you behave as you do. So I would never have been reporting, as it were, to Micheá 1 Martin on the matters that were before PAC and certainly didn't report to him in relation to Maurice McCabe, but because of the fact that Micheál Martin raised this matter in the Dáil - and he covers this in a letter to the Tribuna1, I understand - at the end of a meeting I mentioned to him about the meeting and I didn't recollect that until I actually saw the letter. 223 Q. Deputy McGuinness, this was hardly an issue that would be dealt with in a throwaway remark at the end. This was explosive potentially, surely?
A. Oh, no, it wasn't a throwaway remark. It was a piece of information given to a party leader who had been brave enough to raise the issue and in order to give him some comfort around what he may or may not hear in
the future, I wanted him to understand, but because of the unwritten policy of not being involved with Public Accounts Committee from his perspective, I felt that this one-line explanation would suffice.

How do you mean?
A. And that is the way it was.
Q. I don't follow that.
A. That should he be challenged at some date or other in relation to the matter that he raised relevant to Maurice McCabe. I just wanted him to, out of courtesy, 11:12 be aware of it. And I think Micheá 1 Martin, Mr. Chairman, has reported that meeting on that remark --
Q. oh, yes --
A. -- to the Tribunal.

227 Q. Certainly, we will come to that. But I am just interested in you indicating that you gave him one line of information, is that what you said?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that mean that you didn't give him full or
A. I restricted it to the information that he may have heard in relation to -- or might hear in the future in relation to a meeting with the Commissioner and what transpired at that meeting. I didn't go into detail because of the fact that Micheál Martin allowed the Public Accounts Committee to function completely independent of the party.

229 Q. Sorry, this was a stand-alone issue not related
directly to any line of demarcation between PAC and Taoiseach; this was incendiary information that the then-Commissioner had made disgraceful remarks about a serving guard to you in a meeting only attended by you and the commissioner in a car park, isn't that right?
A. Correct, yes.

230 Q. Just, I want to ask you about that. Was he shocked?
A. I'm sure he was, yeah.

231
Q. He was shocked?
A. I'm sure he was. You will have to ask him that now.

232 Q. We11, did you know by his demeanour was he shocked?
A. Of course he was shocked.

233 Q. He was?
A. Yes.

234 Q. So his being shocked by it, presumably he asked you
A. To my knowledge, he didn't.

235 Q. How do you mean to your knowledge, do you not recall it?
A. No -- well, I gave him this piece of information to be helpful and the detail of the meeting I did not go into.

236 Q. No, no, but I presume he did, when you relayed this --
A. No, he didn't.

237 Q. So just give us the run of the conversation.
A. It's outlined in --

238 Q. No, no, forget what he says. I want you to tell us what did you say and what did he say in response?
A. The meeting -- the meeting occurred, I think -- the
meeting happened in his office in Leinster House and it was, I think it was a meeting about some other matters, and I had gone and thanked him for raising the issue on behalf of sergeant McCabe and then at the end of that meeting, to the best of my recollection, I said to him that I had met with the Commissioner in a car park and that he had accused Sergeant McCabe of sexual abuse.
239 Q. Well --
A. Now, you will have to understand, at that time Micheál Martin would have had the dossier because he handed the 11:15 dossier to the Taoiseach, that he had raised it publicly in the chamber and that what $I$ was doing was simply clearing the lines in relation to my meeting. I'm sure that he was shocked that the meeting took place in a car park, and how shocked he was in relation 11:15 to what the Commissioner related to me about sexual abuse, I don't know, but I'm sure he was.
240 Q. Did you make an appointment to see him with this important information?
A. No, I went to thank him for raising the matter in the Dái1, and that was the purpose of why I was there. There was no need to make an appointment. I am on floor 3, he is on floor 4, he is quite an accessible 1 eader.
241 Q. Was your purpose to thank him, to call into the office to thank him for raising the matter in the Dáil or was your purpose to relay this important information about the car park conversation?
A. Both. the car park meeting?
A. I went in with the purpose of thanking him for raising the matter on behalf of Sergeant McCabe and for pursuing it in the Dáil and for accepting the dossier and following it up. And as a -- not a throwaway remark, but as a fact that may be of assistance to him, I told him that I had met the Commissioner. Because often, more often than not in Leinster House, you know, stories gather legs, so it's better, I always find, to deal on a one-to-one with the person that you want to inform, so if you wanted to meet with someone or inform them properly that they would hear it from you rather than hear it from some sort of other third, fourth, fifth, sixth party, when then $I$ think that is the best way to do business.
Q. So I am just a little bit unclear, you might just indicate this one way or the other. Prior to going into Micheá 7 Martin's office was it your intention to relay to him that the meeting had occurred in the car park?
A. My intention was to thank him and to put him on
notice --
246 Q. I have that point.
A. If you let me finish the point, Mr. O'Higgins.

247 Q. Was it also your intention --
A. My intention was to thank him for raising the matter and then to put him on notice that the car park meeting had taken place.

248 Q. Right. So you had a dual intention in meeting him?
A. You could say that, yeah.

249 Q. Right. So talk us through, you have thanked him for raising the matter in relation to Sergeant McCabe and the dossier, is that right?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. And bring us on to what you said in relation to -- and what he said in relation to the car park meeting.
A. I informed him of the car park meeting, to be aware of it, but I don't think he said anything more about it.

251 Q. No, no, what did you say?
A. That I had met Commissioner Callinan, that it was in the car park, that he had -- that he had reported to me 11:18 that Maurice McCabe had sexually abused -- was involved in sexual abuse. So that was really the extent of it, as far as $I$ can remember. But again, Micheá 1 Martin has covered this by way of letter, I think, to the Tribunal.

252 Q. That is what I am wondering, do you actually remember it or are you reliant upon what he says in his statement?
A. I actually didn't remember it.
Q. Do you now?
A. And when I read the correspondence to the Tribunal, I remember it, yeah.
Q. Yes. Do you remember it now?
A. I am after telling you, yes.
Q. Just, you seem to be reliant upon what his statement says. I am looking for your recollection.
A. His statement was a reminder to me of the fact that the meeting happened.
Q. Right. In terms of your recollection, Deputy McGuinness, because it is important, if you don't mind me saying --
A. Yes.
Q. -- I take it when you went into the office you raised it reasonably quickly, it being perhaps even more important than thanking him?
A. No, it was important to acknowledge what he had done.
Q. Yeah, you did that --
A. That was extremely -- no, you ask a question. That was extremely important to me, because few people would have supported Sergeant Maurice McCabe in the course of all of this, and for the leader of the Opposition to do it was in my opinion significant. And therefore, it was important for me to say to Micheál Martin that I had met the Commissioner in a car park and that he had accused Maurice McCabe of sexual abuse. That was the extent of it, to my knowledge -- to my memory.
Q. Were you sitting down?
A. I think it was just, $I$ called into the office, I don't
believe it was a sit-down chat. To my knowledge, I could be wrong. But it certainly didn't last long.
Q. To your knowledge, what? Were you sitting down?
A. To my know7edge, I -- I don't know whether I was or not to be honest about it.
Q. Was he sitting down?
A. I have no idea. I remember going in, my presumption would be that he was always very active around the office, you would stand and chat at the door and I think that that is the type of meeting that it was. The important part of the meeting, for me, was to thank him for his bravery in supporting Maurice McCabe and then out of courtesy, while observing the independence of the Public Accounts Committee, to say to him that I had met the commissioner and that that is what was said. Whether I was standing up or sitting down didn't make much of a difference in the context of what was said. And it wasn't a full-blown meeting, to my memory.
262 Q. Can you spell out exactly what you told him about the meeting?
A. I have just told you.

264 Q. I think --
A. And that was the extent of it.

I will just read back to you what the stenographer has noted you said: "That I had met the Commissioner in the car park, that we discussed Maurice McCabe and that he, $I$ think he made an accusation of sexual abuse, that may have been -- that may have been my words."
A. To Micheál Martin.

267 Q. That you think he may have made an allegation of sexual abuse?
A. Let me be clear, Mr. O'Higgins. I met the Commissioner, I met Micheál Martin, I told him I met the Commissioner, and I told him that the Commissioner had said that Maurice McCabe was involved in sexual abuse or some words to that effect on that day with Micheál Martin. I do not believe I went into further detail on that because there is a dividing line between the Public Accounts Committee and its independence and the leader of my own party, and that is how he likes to conduct business and I respect him for that.
268 Q. Did he ask you was anybody else there?
A. I already told you what was said and what transpired, so that question doesn't apply. You have the answer. We11, can we take it from that that he didn't ask you if anybody else was there?
A. I don't believe he did. My memory are of the two important points: My thanks to him for what he just
did and the information regarding the meeting. That is what I felt he should know. I don't believe the conversation went into any further detail. But that is my memory of it.
270 Q.
Did you not tell him about the investigations, investigations plural?
A. Into?

271 Q. That you say -- that you have said elsewhere was said to you by Commissioner Callinan?
A. No, I didn't, no, no. My recollection is that that is what I said to Micheál Martin.
Q. And is it your evidence that you first remembered this meeting when you saw Micheál Martin's statement?
A. I actually hadn't remembered that meeting to the point where I think it was a letter to the Tribunal from Micheál Martin.
Q. But you see, didn't Micheál Martin make his statement on the 22nd December 2017?
A. Yeah.

274 Q. And --
A. I don't know the date, but yes, maybe --
Q. Right. But prior to that, when you came out with your -- when you made your speech in the Dáil in may 2016, didn't you, from different quarters, face a degree of criticism, and I am not going into the rights 11:25 or wrongs of it now, but didn't you face a degree of criticism for not coming out publicly previously about the car park meeting?
A. Yes. Weren't there articles about it, Mary Lou McDonald, other politicians saying why didn't you come out earlier about this information?
A. Possibly, yeah, yeah. There was articles about it, I'm sure, there was public commentary about it, there was individuals that would have said it to me, why didn't I 11:26 go to report it to one place or another, but in the course of my conducting politics, that is what I did, and I don't see anything wrong with it.
A. I was criticised for everything, and during the course of the five years of my chairmanship of the Public Accounts Committee, I just took that criticism as I usually do, and I just let it slide. I don't address everything.
279 Q. Apparently you had told your party in the form of your party leader.
A. I had told my party leader in terms of the caution that he might need should he be asked from any other source
in relation to it. It was no more or no less than that.

280 Q. Moving on a little while from that issue, March 2014, the March after the January of the car park meeting, you recall that then-Minister, now Taoiseach, Mr. Varadkar had made a statement, distinguished not disgusting?
A. Yes.

And again, without going into the rights or wrongs of it or the political manoeuvrings that may or may not have been involved, there was a degree of commentary on politicians getting the right side of the Maurice McCabe debate, I am using colloquial language now; for instance, that remark was said to apply a certain degree of pressure upon then-Commissioner Callinan, isn't that right?
A. I presume so.
Q. Yes. So, and a Fine Gael Minister who wasn't a Minister for Justice at the time had perhaps stolen a march on other politicians and had come out with that comment, isn't that right?
A. I would not, you know, describe that remark as stealing the march. I would describe that remark as a remark coming from, as I did at the time, a brave politician, a member of Cabinet, a senior individual within the political system and it was, in my opinion, a break for Maurice McCabe that someone of that stature was brave enough to come out and call it as it was. Now, whether that stole the march on people, I don't know. It
didn't steal the march on me, if that is what you want to describe. It -- because I had been involved, as the Public Accounts Committee members had, in dealing with this issue.

283 Q.
But you had bigger information which you were keeping quiet?
A. No, I wasn't keeping quiet, Mr. O'Higgins. I hadn't reported on the meeting for all sorts of reasons, and I believe, in hindsight, that those reasons that caused me not to mention this until such time as Sergeant Maurice McCabe came under further pressure in May of 2016, to high1ight it then.
Q. But you see, with Mr. Varadkar --
A. And if you are suggesting that that piece of information might have trumped what the Minister had said, and I would have stolen the march on him, that is not how I do business.

285 Q. I am suggesting to you that had you disclosed in the pub7ic domain that the then-Commissioner had said what he said in the car park to you, that would indeed, that 11:30 would indeed have put other things off centre stage?
A. And why would I do that when what was needed at the time was to keep Sergeant Maurice McCabe and the truth at centre stage? And I was glad that Deputy Varadkar kept it at centre stage by calling out the Commissioner 11:31 on the use of the word disgusting.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. O'Higgins, I see the point that you are making. It may be a good point or a bad point, I will consider it but I think we are getting very political
now about this point, as to whether Mr. Varadkar is a good guy or a bad guy obviously I have no view but I would much prefer witnesses not to express a view on it. But you are leading Deputy McGuinness --
A. Mr. Chairman, I had to respond.

CHAIRMAN: And that is what I am saying to you, you clearly had to respond so I think the topic -- we should move on from the topic. You clearly had to respond to the question. It's not a criticism. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Moving on then, Deputy McGuinness and moving on the time-line if we can do this quickly. The O'Higgins Commission started its hearings I think in May of 2015, 14th of May 2015, and I suggest to you that was a further opportunity to make your disclosure about the car park meeting in some form, but you chose not to take that either, are we agreed about that?
A. We are.

287 Q. All right.
A. And again, you know, whether I did or didn't, there may 11:32 have been, I'm sure, other reasons, it may have caused other difficulties, rather, in the context of intervening at that stage, but at the time I didn't even consider it.
288 Q. Yes. Could I ask you to turn over then to another further one of the articles that were provided to you last night, and that is, I think you have mentioned it already, actually, it is the RTÉ This Week programme, again with Richard Crowley.
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: but I may be mistaken. CHAIRMAN: Yes. So it's the one after you were just 11:33 looking at.
A. Same interview.

CHAIRMAN: It is this typeface if that is the thing you are looking for, it's right at the back. This week programme, Mr. Richard Crowley, that is wrong, it's the 11:33 one after that, is it?

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes, Chairman, it's the one after the May 2016 interview, this one took place on 9th October 2016. Do you have that, Deputy McGuinness?
A. Jonathan Healy?

292 Q. No, no, it's again the This Week programme with Richard Crowley.
CHAIRMAN: It's another Richard Crowley one.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes. It's the second-last -CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have the right one. So it is the second-1ast one. So you would need to go, I would say, about ten pages back from the very end of that.
A. Yes, I have it here, yes.

293 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And this is the October after
the May of the previous Richard Crowley interview, all right?
A. Yes.

And if we look at page 2, again pretty well following the format of the earlier one, Mr. Crowley says in the line 5 towards the top:
"Now, last may on this programme the former Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee --"

At this point you are no longer chair of the PAC, does that accord with your recollection?
A. Yes.

295 Q. "-- John McGuinness revealed details of a secret meeting" is how it is put, and we will come back to that.

CHAIRMAN: I see people believed that it was going to take six weeks, that is a very interesting statement, at the top of page 3. I can see we are now on day 63, so it's a bit more than that. Still there could be light somewhere, you know. There may be a tunne1. I could be in a tunnel, maybe $I$ will come to a tunnel and then there will be light at the end of the tunnel.
MR. MCDOWELL: I just point out, the introduction which
is being quoted from was not said when Deputy

McGuinness was on air. It was said prior -- the first line, or the last line of that introductory paragraph indicates that Mr. McGuinness was not present when these remarks were made.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'hIGGINS: Yes, that's right. Line 22. And I had that highlighted, so in line 22 it says:
"A short time ago I spoke to John McGuinness. He says that if this latest inquiry is to succeed it must look at the treatment of all of the whistleblowers, not just the case of Maurice McCabe."

Do you see that there, Deputy?
A. Yes.

296 Q. Right. So, does this help you -- were you giving this interview but not in studio?
A. I presume I wasn't in studio, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN: Well, you were in your home in kilkenny the last time and I think they possibly had recorded it earlier by telephone.
A. I accept -- I don't know where I was. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Al1 right.
297 Q. And on page 3, halfway down at page 18 you make a reference to your knowledge of what is in the protected ${ }^{11: 36}$ disclosures, do you see that there?
A. What line is that?

298 Q. Halfway down page 3?
CHAIRMAN: It's after the reference to the Tribunal possibly taking two months.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: or three months.
CHAIRMAN: Gosh!
299 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: After that, do you see that deputy?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say:
"It's a matter of weeks and I am saying this because of my knowledge of what is in the protected disclosure."

So you had read the protected disclosure at this point, is that right?
A. Maybe not read the protected disclosure but certainly was aware of the content of the protected disclosures. I am talking about generally about whistleblowers here.

301 Q. So, are we able to infer from that that you had a knowledge of what was in the protected disclosures?
A. Are you reading from line 8? "There are other whistleblowers that $I$ believe need to be considered in the context of the issues that are being raised."

302 Q. Sorry, line 18?
A. Line 18 ?

303 Q. On page 3.
A. Oh, I am being asked about the length of the Tribunal, and Mr. Crowley asks it might take two months or three months.

304 Q. And you make a reference "I am saying this because of my knowledge of what is in the protected disclosures"; what protected disclosures are you referring to there?
A. I was referring to the protected disclosures -- I was referring to the fact that other whistleblowers from the force should be included in the inquiry and that protected disclosures that they had made should be
considered. That is the background to that. I hadn't read the protected disclosures but I had read the detail of the protected disclosures of a number of people, I think, and what they might have said. Yes. Did you include a Keith Harrison, a Garda Keith Harrison in that?
A. Yes. In terms of the Tribunal?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

307 Q. You did. A11 right. And then if we turn to page 6.
A. Yes.

308 Q. In 1ine 8 Mr. Crowley, asks:
"One other question in relation to this: It was in May of this year you were on this programme having spoken in the Dáil about this secret meeting you had in Bewley's car park, on the Naas Road, with the then-Commissioner or the former Commissioner Martin Callinan, just ahead of Maurice McCabe's appearance at the PAC and you had kept quiet about that meeting for some time, do you regret now not having spoken out sooner about that meeting given all that's been revealed since then?"

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

309 Q. And you responded:

[^0]that time it may very well have derailed the Public Accounts Committee hearings. It was a judgment call that I had to make whether or not I was going to believe Maurice McCabe and I had sufficient information about Maurice McCabe and I had put to him the various allegations that were made against him and I was convinced about the story that he was telling, and I saw the evidence around that story."

And then Mr. Crowley asked you about the actual sequence, do you see that, line 27 ?
A. Yes, yes.

310 Q. He asked:
"Can I just check the sequence of events with you there, John McGuinness? You put those allegations to McCabe prior to the meeting with Callinan or after the meeting with Callinan?"

And you responded:
"Both before and after because in Leinster House rumour was circulating. The gossip mill was in full flow and for anyone that wanted to listen, all of the stories were being put out against Maurice McCabe."

Is that reconcilable with what you have told the Tribunal already?
A. Of course it is, yes.

311 Q. Because he asked you then:
"And did you te11 McCabe that this stuff was coming directly from Martin Callinan?

John McGuinness [Line 9]: Yes, he was aware of that and the information in the recent reports of the whistleblower outlines the time-line in relation to that and it confirms that the meeting happened."
A. Yes.

312 Q. "Mr. Crowley: And what did McCabe say to you? what was his response when you told him what Martin Callinan was saying about him?"

And you responded:
"I have to say that he wasn't shocked because he had heard it before and he simply confirmed to me that it was nothing but untruths, that there was no basis for the type -- for the allegations that were made."
A. Yeah, what is happening here in relation to this interview is that there is a before and after. As I said to you earlier on, there is a lead in to this up to 2013 and into 2014 -- early 2014. The rumour and gossip through Leinster House was there, I told you
this already. I then asked Maurice McCabe, at different junctures than this, if this was true in relation to this and we have had an exchange on this already, and the answer to that was that it was untrue.

Then in relation to the -- in relation to the other matter which was in relation to gossip in that, this was at a time when there was considerable discussion in Leinster House around all of these matters and the gossip, if you like, was being added to. So it was -- 11:42 it was -- it was just a fact that that was going on. Is there a possibility, Deputy McGuinness, perhaps a reasonable possibility in the circumstances, that you are confused about what you did or didn't say to people at different times?
A. Oh, I have no confusion at all, Mr. O'Higgins. And I have been exact in what I have said to you. Now, whether -- if there is any point of confusion you might just tell me and I will answer it for you. But as far as I am concerned, as I have said to you earlier on, this dates back to 2011, '12, '13 and '14, and I can remember in general ways and terms how I dealt with Sergeant Maurice McCabe. I can also remember the rumours. So, that is a fact. Those rumours are there. I ignored them. But I always had to check. And one of 11:43 the things that I did check was whether these rumours were false or not. Mr. McCabe said no they are not true. In 26th of -- 26th May 2015, when I put the matter on record in the House, that was in -- that was a reaction to the increased efforts that were being made to discredit Sergeant McCabe.
314 Q. When was that?
A. So I have no confusion.

315 Q. When was that?
A. 26th May 2016.

316 Q. Yes. 2016.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

317 Q. Even in your recital there I suggest to you there appears to be confusion: There is confusion about whether you made a note or didn't make a note; there is confusion about what you told Sergeant McCabe and when you told Sergeant McCabe.
A. We11, can I suggest to you that you are confused, Mr. O'Higgins?
Q. I see.
A. I am not confused. I am absolutely clear in my evidence. And if there is a particular point that you may be confused about I am more than anxious to clear that confusion before you before I leave this Tribunal 11:44 today.

319 Q. Would you mind turning over to the next article, please?
CHAIRMAN: Again, Deputy McGuinness, you are not familiar with the procedure, I am afraid I am after 30 or whatever years; he may or may not be confused, I doubt he is confused but the point is that he is obliged to put questions to you to show that you are confused and don't worry about trying to convince Mr. O'Higgins - you won't - I am the person who has to make my mind up and I am entirely neutral as to who is confused and who is not.
A. No, I understand that fully, Mr. Chairman, but I am not going to allow Mr. O'Higgins to pull me around the
place on minor detail.
CHAIRMAN: That is perfectly legitimate --
A. I know that is his job.

CHAIRMAN: No, it is perfectly legitimate for you equally to make that point.
A. I have a reputation to protect.

CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that. And that is why you are represented and that is why you are here.
A. Thank you.

320 MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Deputy McGuinness, could I ask 11:45 you to turn over to the next article, it's the final one in the bundle?
A. Which one is that?

321 Q. And it's an excerpt from the Marian Finucane programme of Sunday, 18th June 2017. It's a more recent date again. And the presenter, in fact, I think was Brendan o'Connor, he was standing in for Marian Finucane, do you have it there?
A. I have, indeed.

322 Q. And again, the car park meeting was the subject of this 11:46 interview, and this isn't as official a transcript but you might feel free to tell the Tribunal if you think it doesn't faithfully reflect what you believe was said. About a third of the way down, BOC, that is Brendan O'Connor says:
"You met him in -- you met Martin Callinan in a car park?"

And you, it seems to say, interrupts and you say:
"It's known that I did."

And Mr. O'Connor continued:
"And he talked about Maurice McCabe.

Yeah, that's true."

And you said:
"And that's part of the submission to Charleton."

A reference to Judge Charleton.
"Similarly, it's eh the contention of others including --"
CHAIRMAN: I am not going to be insulted, Mr. O'Higgins, don't worry.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And you interrupt -- sorry, he interrupted you:
"What did he te11 you?"

And then you reference the Comptroller \& Auditor General, that this was -- certain things were said to them by Martin Callinan. And then he interrupts again and says:
"What did he say to you, because I think a lot of what was being said has come out now so you could, you could just possibly just say it."

And then you say:
"well clearly it's, I have informed the Charleton inquiry that we did meet and that it was said to me that he was someone that couldn't be trusted, and that 11:47 he had questions. McCabe had questions to answer in relation to sexual abuse and so on. Em... and that to be cautious about how we dealt with matters at the Public Accounts Committee. So that detail is out and has been said and has been reported on."

And then the interviewer says:
"Okay. So he suggested to you that Maurice McCabe was a paedophile, did he?"

And you said "Yes" and the interviewer said "okay" and then you continued:
"And the same was said in another conversation, which I 11:48 have read in the papers also to do with Dave Taylor and the current commissioner --"

Sorry?
A. Sorry, where is that on this?

323 Q. Over to page 2.
A. Yeah, yeah.

324 Q. "-- and a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee." And then this next section $I$ am going to ask you about. 11:48 And Mr. O'Connor says:
"But you met the Commissioner in the car park."

And you say:
"Oh, yeah, yeah."

And the interviewer says:
"And he said, this guy is a paedophile we think."

And you said "Yes". And the interviewer continued:
"And you shouldn't trust him."

And you said "Yeah". And the interviewer continued:
"Now the eh --"

And you said:
"But that's --"

And then the interviewer continued:
"Martin Callinan disputes that account."

All right? So what I am asking you is, and I appreciate there is a degree of intervention from Brendan o'Connor, but insofar as words matter, you are accepting the characterisation that you said that Martin Callinan had said this guy is a paedophile?
A. Yeah, but I accept that Martin Callinan didn't use that 11:49 word. My description of what he accused Sergeant McCabe of could be taken that he was a paedophile. So in this exchange with Brendan O'Connor, it's quite clear that he is trying to get more detail of the meeting and so on. And I am careful about it here because of -- we are now moving into I think, was it in terms of Charleton, Chairman, and what was going on.
325 Q. So you were being careful in your responses?
A. I was trying to be.

326 Q. And the question he asked was:
"And he said --"

That is Martin Callinan.
"He said "this guy is a paedophile we think"."

And you answered "yes".
A. Yes.

Yes. Could I ask you to -- and this is the final article we need trouble ourselves with, unless there is 11:51 anything in particular that you would like to high1ight. The fourth item is an interview with Shane Coleman on the Sunday Show on Newstalk radio on the 29th May 2016.
CHAIRMAN: And that is number what?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And that is number 4, I think, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: Is that Newstalk, 29th May, is it? MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.

330 Q. Deputy McGuinness, do you have that?
A. I am searching for it here.

CHAIRMAN: The Sunday Show with Jonathan Healy, is that it? Shane Coleman.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: That's right.

CHAIRMAN: So that is what it looks like there.
A. okay.
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: So it's shane Coleman is -CHAIRMAN: It is about ten pages in. well, 15.
A. Jonathan Healy, this one? at the top, just to help you, is "The Sunday Show with Jonathan Healy (Shane Coleman) Newstalk, 29th May 2016".
A. Yeah, I have that.

333 Q. It, in fact, is the same day of the first Richard Crowley interview that we have already looked at. Does that help you locate it in time?
A. I have it here.

334 Q. Yes. So just down the bottom of that first page, four entries from the bottom Shane Coleman says:
"You had a meeting in the car park, was it?"

And you respond:
"Yeah, there were certain allegations made against him..."

And Shane Coleman says:
"Did he detail -- and I don't want to you detail them now, but did he detail what those allegations were?"

And you responded:
"Oh, it was suggested what the allegations were, yes. And these were not new allegations, these were allegations that $I$ had heard before..."

Do you see that there?
A. Yes.
Q. And then over the page then on page 2, and again I am skipping through it just for reasons of despatch, a third of the way down Shane Coleman asks:
"I will just ask you about that, and like I understand you don't --"
A. Sorry, is this on the same page?
Q. Page 2.
"I will just ask you about that, and like I understand you don't want to go into too much detail of the conversation, did you have a problem with the Garda
Commissioner approaching you, making such comments? The then-Garda Commissioner I should stress."

And you responded:
"No, no, because I had had discussions with Maurice McCabe and others in relation to all of this, and in relation to bringing forward the evidence that he had, so I didn't think that it was unusual..."
A. We have gone through this before, Mr. O'Higgins. So, in answer to your question again, it's about Maurice McCabe, it's about the rumours from earlier dates, it's about confirmation from Maurice McCabe that the rumours were untrue, and I think that is what he is dealing with. Did I have a problem in the Garda Commissioner coming and telling me this, $I$ think he is referring there, you know --
"...I understand... did you have a problem with the Garda Commissioner approaching you?"

No, I didn't. Because, as I said to you again earlier on, I had met with other whistleblowers, I had met with other witnesses that come before PAC and out of respect for the guards and the Garda Commissioner, yes, I did meet him.

337 Q. The interviewer asked you:
"Did you have a problem with the Garda Commissioner approaching you making such comments?"

And you answered:
"No, no, because I had had discussions with Maurice 11:55 McCabe and others in relation to all of this..."
A. These were the comments about -- the general comments and gossip about sexual abuse. I had cleared that with Maurice McCabe. The Commissioner had now repeated the
elements of those stories, and that part of it, I won't say I didn't have a bother with it but in the context of the meeting with the Commissioner, that was different, it was coming at a -- from it -- from a senior person within the force, the most senior important within the force.

Deputy McGuinness, how is it reconcilable with the evidence you have given to Judge Charleton that you were shocked, disturbed, outraged by the Commissioner making these extremely serious allegations, it was improper, looking to derail the work of the PAC, how can you reconcile with the response you have given to the interviewer in this interview you didn't seem to have a problem, how are those two things reconcilable?
A. Very easily, Mr. O'Higgins: The rumours, and I have dealt with this before with you, the rumours that circulated about Maurice McCabe were horrendous. I had to ask Maurice McCabe at a particular juncture in our dealings were they true or false. All of this was based on gossip, tittle-tattle, stories, that I, by and 11:56 large, ignored completely. when the Commissioner asked me to meet, I met out of respect, and I met because I believe in fairness in dealing with all of the witnesses. Needless to say, there was concern there as well that the Commissioner had asked to meet me. What 11:57 shocked and disturbed me about that meeting was the fact that now, for the first time, these matters were being related to me directly by the Commissioner. So, over a long period of time, $I$ can understand how these
stories and reports would merge and one particular report of a meeting can run into another. But I would ask you to understand that, in dealing with the people that would interview you, those on radio, in particular when you are live on radio, you have to be concerned about the question you are being asked and what is likely to follow. And when you are answering those questions, it's never a case that, well, I only want to ask you this question and I won't pursue it. You no sooner give that answer than the pursuit begins. So you have to be extra cautious about what is going on in the context of an interview. In a tribunal like this, you can be far more specific and you can take far more time to explain and reason out your actions, and that's what I am doing here this morning.
339 Q. Is there a more simple explanation, Deputy McGuinness; the reason you are responding to the interviewer that you didn't have a problem with it is because nothing disturbing had been said by Commissioner Callinan?
A. When I consider what Mr. Callinan said to me and when I $11: 58$ considered -- consider, as a hardened politician, the fact that I had to pull in off that road and take note of the important points that he was making and when I consider the state of mind that I was in when I was driving home, then I think you will understand that
what I took away from that meeting, of the comments that were directly made to me by the Commissioner, that that deeply disturbed me, and, alongside that, there was the workings of the Public Accounts Committee,
which I have told you about before, which concerned me, had I done the wrong thing, had I made the wrong judgement calls, was I wrong about Maurice McCabe after all of those years, and it took me that day and two days more, running these matters through my head, to decide that, as far as I was concerned, Maurice McCabe was an honourable man whose family had been devastated by the accusations made against him and deserved to be defended. Now, interviews before and after events like this, Mr. Chairman, have to be taken in context. This Tribunal has to be taken in context, and it gives me the opportunity to explain clearly and in truth what happened. Yes, you can argue on the pinhead of why that word was used and why this word was used and what was said and done in an interview, but you can't take away from the core issue here which faced me, and that was getting at the truth, allowing someone that had the evidence and the truth to come forward and explain it, and in the context of that and all of the gossip and rumour, I don't know how the man is sitting in this Tribunal today, and that is my firm belief. And I have done nothing in the course of this other than to try and put before the Tribunal the most accurate -- as accurate as I can, the events and the discussions during that time. And it is true to say that there may 12:01 be parts of an interview or parts of commentary that was wrong or forgotten, but I never expected to be here, and I have recorded it as best that I can.

340 Q. Do you -- sorry.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I thought we were coming to an end, but I am not pressing you. we have that --

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: A little bit more. I will try and move it along, Chairman.
341 Q. I want to just deal with the car park meeting and this characterisation that some people - I think you were not, in fairness to you, putting on it as being a secret meeting. You don't -- you don't, as it were, share the view it was a secret meeting, would that be fair?
A. It wasn't a secret meeting.

342 Q. No. And I think there were a number of calls between you and then-Commissioner Callinan to arrange, and I think this is common case, to arrange the meeting on the -- earlier that day?
A. Yes.

343 Q. Right. And from the Commissioner's point of view, it would appear from the statements of others particularly that he had mentioned to other persons his intention -or the fact that he was proposing to meet you down in 12:03 Dublin; he was in Dundalk at the time, and you are aware of that?
A. Yes, I am aware of it.

344 Q. Yes. And he came in his official Garda car, driven by his official Garda driver, isn't that right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

345 Q. And you were both - just, I hope these are things not in dispute between us - you were both figures of -both we11-known figures, and anybody who happened to
have been in the car park that day would have seen, openly, the two of you and possibly recognised the two of you because you are both quite high profile and indeed had been in the news that particular day, isn't that fair?
A. I take that, yeah.
Q. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: well, that is possible, Mr. O'Higgins, but I don't get recognised on the 15A bus, thanks be to God.
A. We were parked against the wall, with the driver facing the wall, I think it was a wet day, and you'd want to have a fairly long neck to look around the car to see who was in it.
CHAIRMAN: The elongated man, maybe.
347 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'hIGGINS: And Commissioner Callinan was 12:04 in his uniform and also with a coat on, is that right?
A. Yes.

348 Q. And you and he chose the car park of Bewley's Hotel because it suited you so you'd be on the road home to Kilkenny and it suited him because he didn't have to go 12:04 into town. For instance, if he had to go in to meet you in Leinster House, that might have -- would have delayed traffic -- delayed matters?
A. I presume so.

349 Q. So the location suited the two of you?
A. It suited me, anyway.

350 Q. Yes. And both of you, would this be fair, were under time constraints?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Well, all of that is absolutely reasonable and understandable, I mean, that a convenient location would be chosen and people would have other business to get back to, which I know Commissioner Callinan did. I suppose the car being in the car park, the only thing that maybe stands out a wee bit, Mr. O'Higgins, is not going into the hotel.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Because I know people in Leinster House, they tend to have meetings in places like Buswells Hote1, which is across the road, and things like that. Now, if there is anything in that, there could be, there may not be, I don't know.
351 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL o'higgins: Yes. well, we might just deal with that then, Deputy McGuinness. I am suggesting to you that it was envisaged by both of you that it would be in the car park.
A. It certainly wasn't envisaged by me that it would be in the car park. And as I said to you in my evidence earlier on, I was in motion to get out of the car when it was clear that Commissioner Callinan was coming to the passenger side of my car. I would have presumed that for two, I suppose me as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and he as Commissioner, that the appropriate thing to do would have been meet in the -to dispute that. He sat into the car and we had our meeting.
352 Q. Yes. And it was raining, was it?
A. I think it was.

353 Q. Yes. And do you remember having a discussion with Seán Fleming, your colleague on the PAC, at any point in relation to the car park meeting?
A. No, I can't say I do, no.
Q. Well, I might just assist you with that. Seán Fleming recalls that shortly after you had your speech in the Dáil in May 2016, that the reason -- that you told him that the reason you and Commissioner Callinan had the meeting in the car park was because it was raining heavily at the time and you would both get wet going into the hotel and then coming back out after the discussion and that's why you had it in the car, that is something you told him; does that help you?
A. Well, it helps to confirm that it was raining. That is 12:07 the only help it is to me. As far as I am concerned, we were getting out of the car -- I was getting out of the car, and the Commissioner, maybe because it was raining, was getting into my car. I don't recall the conversation with Seán Fleming. It may have been -might have page 1444 from Book 6 up, please. CHAIRMAN: Was it anything like this: I suppose you don't have to watch Curaçao films to be familiar with rain, we have had certain7y a great deal of it, but was 12:08 it belting down so much that even to run into the hotel would have left you both drenched, or do you have any recollection of it?
A. My memory of it, Mr. Chairman, is that it was raining
heavy, and then that is really it.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: All right. Do you see there, Seán Fleming's statement is up on the screen there, and he is asked:
"Do you have any other information you can offer in this connection?
A. The only other aspect of the matter that John McGuinness, TD, said to me was that the reason they had the meeting in his car in the car park was because it was raining heavily at the time and they both would have got very wet going into the hotel to have a discussion and then coming back out. I understand the meeting happened in the car because of this reason."
A. He understands the meeting happened in the car because of that reason, and that may very well have been the reason. You asked me in the beginning of this where did I expect to meet, and I would have expected that we would have gone to the hotel. In any event, we didn't go to the hote1. It was raining, we stayed in the car, 12:09 we had this conversation.

357 Q. You see, he obviously -- Seán Fleming wasn't there; he is relying upon you to -- what you told him.
A. Exactly.

CHAIRMAN: Well, at the moment, Mr. O'Higgins, you have 12:09 explained to me that the rain was belting down. I think Deputy McGuinness agrees with that. I see that as a reasonable reason for not going and ordering tea, and probably if you order tea in the hotel 1obby, or
whatever, it could take twenty minutes to arrive. I am not commenting on the particular hote1, I am sure they are much better than that.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: But it would delay people. So I would take the legitimate reason as opposed to the sinister reason, if there is one reasonably available.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Thank you, Chairman. We will move from that.
I want to come to the nub of it in relation to the car park, Deputy McGuinness. Martin Callinan, I suggest to you, when he got into the car, raised concerns about -again raised his concerns around the data protection issue, all right; do you agree or disagree with that?
A. I disagree with that.

359 Q. He made the point that he couldn't see how the PAC could discuss the matter with Sergeant McCabe without members of the pub1ic being identified, he again made that point.
A. I disagree with that, and I point you again to the correspondence from 2013 and '14 which clearly dealt with that. It brought about a difference of legal opinion from both the Oireachtas and from Mr. Callinan and from Mr. Hawkes. We held our position and the meeting proceeded.
360 Q. I see.
A. So therefore, why would I go and discuss all of that again when $I$ was being led by legal opinion and so was he?
Q. Because Commissioner Callinan was seeking to revisit the issue, as is apparent from the comments he made at the PAC when we look at the transcript. He was not happy with the play-out of the correspondence and he was still agitating, particularly now that he had learned it had proposed Sergeant McCabe was due to come in the following Thursday.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. If I could explain to you, Deputy McGuinness, this part of the cross-examination, essentially Mr. O'Higgins is putting his client's case to you, what he says, and you are entitled to say no, that is not correct, and if you want to add a reason, it's fine. But that is what it is. It's usually quite quick.
A. Thank you very much. It's not correct.
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And I am suggesting to you that he put a specific proposal to you that involved a request that the PAC would postpone inviting Sergeant McCabe until the Commissioner's suggested process would be allowed play out?
A. That is not correct.
Q. So he never mentioned any proposal he had, is that your evidence?
A. The only proposal that was put to the Commissioner was the one that I had put the previous day, which was -would be normal practice in business for the employer to discuss the issues with the employee, and I put that to him again and that is how the -- that is how the conversation started.

364 Q. Yes. And Commissioner Callinan - I think we have a degree of, I hope, common ground here - Commissioner Callinan says that on foot of you making that point, and I think you made it at the PAC hearing, isn't that right?
A. That's right.
Q. You did. On foot of that, he was coming to you with a proposal in relation to that and the proposal was the following: He would appoint a chief superintendent to meet with Sergeant McCabe and, thereafter, to provide a 12:12 report to Commissioner Callinan, a report on Sergeant McCabe's concerns about the penalty points issues, all right? And the second part of the proposal was that if -- if Sergeant McCabe wasn't happy with the chief superintendent who Martin Callinan might nominate, that 12:13 Sergeant McCabe would nominate his own preferred chief superintendent, all right? Now, did he mention that proposal to you?
A. The only proposal mentioned was the one that $I$ put to him at the commencement of our conversation, and then, arising from that, he said to me, it's gone way beyond that.

CHAIRMAN: So you are saying, basically, that there was not that conversation, that there was a mention of employment relations perhaps, but the conversation was 12:13 immediately diverted into --
A. Why I shouldn't.

CHAIRMAN: -- why the man shouldn't be trusted?
A. Yes.
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And I am suggesting to you that Sergeant McCabe -- sorry, that it was indicated by Martin Callinan that Sergeant McCabe, under the proposal he was putting to you, would continue to enjoy a11 rights and protections of a confidential reporter under the relevant regulations, that was part of the proposal he was anxious to convey to you in person, all right? Do you have any recollection of that?
A. And I disagree with that.

A11 right. And I am suggesting to you that you are aware that there has been a draft letter opened up by Mr. Marrinan when questioning you, and that letter was never ultimately sent to you, I think you agreed about that?
A. I can't comment on that.

We11, sorry, no, I am just asking you to confirm --
A. I confirm that I have seen a draft letter in the course of this Tribunal.

CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. O'Higgins' point, I anticipate, is that, as the draft letter wasn't sent, that is what was discussed in the car, or certainly quite a big chunk of what was in the draft letter that didn't get to you, that is the point.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Exactly.
369 Q. So, in Dundalk, Martin Callinan arranged to meet you and it was decided, in terms of his position, where he is lobbying for something or seeking for something to be done from the PAC through you, the Chair, he took the reasonable position, I'm suggesting to you, of
coming down to meet with you in person, because it was still live, wasn't it, it was still a live question, yet to be decided by your Committee, whether or not the hearing -- Sergeant McCabe would give his evidence in private or in public, that was -- remained up for grabs, isn't that right?
A. That is a discussion that we had, yes.
Q. Yes. And, in fact, that was -- it was flagged, wasn't it, to Martin Callinan and his colleagues at the PAC that that was going to happen on the Tuesday when the PAC would sit to decide that issue, the following Tuesday after the Thursday?
A. Yes.

371 Q. Are we agreed about that?
A. Yeah, yeah.

372 Q. So, contrary to what you have suggested, I am suggesting to you, that everything had been decided and the correspondence had closed out the issues, they hadn't closed out the issues because Martin Callinan was still very much looking for sergeant McCabe's attendance to be postponed whilst this process would play out and, as a fall-back position, if you were insistent on calling Sergeant McCabe, that at least it would take place in private, do you understand the point I am making?
A. The matter was not closed out -- sorry, I should say that the matter was closed out to the extent that the only matter to be decided was whether this would be in public session or in private session. The other
matters that you refer to had been played out in correspondence between the legal representatives and we had come to our conclusion on that.
373 Q. But this proposal --
A. Therefore -- sorry?

374 Q. Sorry, I didn't mean to cut across you. This proposal was new, he was coming to you with a fresh proposal?
A. It was new if he was proposing it to me, but he didn't propose it to me.

I see. Well, it will be his evidence that that was his purpose in meeting you, to convey this proposal, because he was still anxious, if at all possible -- you see, if you accepted the proposal, it might obviate the necessity for sergeant McCabe to come to give evidence because Sergeant McCabe may ultimately be happy with and the PAC may be happy with the process whereby the chief superintendent's report would be conveyed to the Commissioner once Sergeant McCabe had been heard and his complaints properly dealt with, and then, if it was necessary, after that, to bring it back before the PAC at the conclusion of that suggested process, and nobody had rejected that suggestion because Martin Callinan was coming to you with it for the first time, do you understand?
A. The normal course of events in practice for such suggestions and proposals would be for the Commissioner to contact the clerk of the Committee. That is the normal way you do things.
CHAIRMAN: All right. So your answer is that that
didn't happen --
A. Exactly.

CHAIRMAN: -- and your reason for saying that is, number one, it didn't happen in your presence as far as you remember it, and secondly, that it would not be a normal process.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: It would not, sorry?
CHAIRMAN: It would not be a normal process as 1 see it.
A. Yes.
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: So just dealing with that second reason, I am suggesting to you it was perfectly normal and reasonable for it to be conveyed to you in person because it would be much more likely to be well-received if it was a person-to-person meeting rather than a letter through the clerk, which, in any event, might be too late because you were due to meet -- this was the Friday before a weekend, and you were due to meet to decide the public/private issue the following Tuesday?
A. The Public Accounts Committee meeting is scheduled every Thursday, so if the Commissioner had this proposal to put, it would normally be put directly to the clerk, who would, in turn, put it to the Committee. The Committee could have met on the Tuesday and deliberated on that. The Committee could have suspended the hearing with Maurice McCabe. The Committee could have decided anything. It wasn't for me, Mr. Chairman, to hear the proposal and then to
bring that verbal proposition to a meeting. I would have immediately been told --

CHAIRMAN: No, I understand.
A. -- provide it in writing.

CHAIRMAN: It is a matter of argument. But what you say is, look, that didn't happen?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: You see, the plan was, I am suggesting to you, that if you received well the suggestion, the letter would follow. You never got the letter because ultimately it was no longer necessary to send it, he had conveyed everything in it, isn't that right?
A. No, you see, Mr. O'Higgins, a decision like that would on7y be taken by the Committee itself, and even if I were to be supportive of what he was saying to me, it didn't turn on my decision, and that is why the Commissioner, Mr. Chairman, would be familiar with placing these matters before the clerk. I chair the meeting, I don't make the decisions.

CHAIRMAN: No, I get that. But I think the point Mr. O'Higgins makes, now whether it happened or not, obviously I am going to think about it, but they speak in America about people who are chairs of committees as 12:20 being very powerful, and you are very powerful in terms of that particular Committee and that is the reason being put to you why it was floated to you. Your answer to that is, we11, it never was floated to me,
and secondly, even if I do have influence, well then I'd have to exercise it legitimately.
A. Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And I am suggesting to you that 12:21 it was clear from what you said when this proposal was put that it wasn't going to be accepted, and that obviated the necessity to go down the correspondence road?
A. The proposal was never put to me. I didn't reject the proposal. The proposal was not put in the first place.

Q. A11 right.
A. And the option was always there for Mr. Callinan to write to the clerk. It's not a situation, Mr. Chairman, that I can take the members of that Committee for granted. It's a cross-party make-up, and they have often taken issue on the politics or otherwise of a decision. Mr. Callinan would know that quite well. But as I said to you, the proposition was never put. It wasn't for me to decide anyway. And it 12:22 was always, before and after, if Mr. Callinan wished to have that letter sent to the clerk of the Committee, to do so, and that didn't happen, and there was time to do it.
380 Q. Deputy, just recognising the realities of things, would 12:22 you agree with me that if you weren't going to agree with the proposal, if you weren't going to agree with it, that would mean it wasn't going to carry, bluntly?
A. But how did he know I wasn't going to agree with it
when it wasn't put to me?
CHAIRMAN: No, but at the end of the day, that is very starkly the case, Mr. O'Higgins, and you have
legitimately, and thank you very much, put your client's case in relation to that. Was there anything else about the conversation?

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: There was.
381 Q. And I am suggesting to you that during the course of the conversation you asked why was Sergeant McCabe raising these issues, and I am suggesting to you that you, you asked the Commissioner, not the other way around, you asked the Commissioner was it because of the investigation and the file that went to the DPP?
A. Quite frankly, Mr. O'Higgins, I couldn't have asked the question, $I$ didn't even know about it.
382 Q. Yes. Even though --
A. And remember this: I had already met Maurice McCabe, Sergeant Maurice McCabe.
383 Q. How many times?
A. A number of times since 2011. I can't te11 you right 12:23 now offhand. But I met him sufficiently enough to establish for myself the bona fides of his case and the honesty of the man, so $I$ understood his case. while I didn't know anything about the file -- the file was introduced in the conversation by the Commissioner, presumably to give me the impression that the man would be prosecuted. That is what caused me great concern.
384 Q. I just want to put to you the balance of my instructions and you can say if you agree or disagree,
all right. Commissioner Callinan, I am suggesting to you, is clear in his instructions that you were aware, because you raised it, that Sergeant McCabe had been the subject of an investigation, and you disagree with that?
A. I disagree with that.

385 Q. Mr. Callinan instructs me that he responded that if you knew about the file that went to the DPP, then you knew what the DPP had, in fact, decided?
A. Sure how would I know that?

386 Q. A11 right. And I am suggesting to you that he indicated that to you, that you knew all about it if you were asking that question.
A. And that is untrue.

387 Q. A11 right. And I'm suggesting to that you Mr. Callinan was undoubtedly anxious that you wouldn't call Sergeant McCabe, that is to say he was looking for you to postpone that decision and ultimately he hoped would not call Sergeant McCabe because he felt it wasn't the proper forum, isn't that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And not on7y that, but he felt that there was difficulties from the point of view of a disciplined organisation such as An Garda Síochána in the very notion of a serving garda giving evidence about issues in circumstances where Commissioner Callinan was the accounting person for the purposes of the PAC entire process, he was the accounting person?
A. He was -- he is the accounting person, but he didn't go
into any detail of that with me.
CHAIRMAN: The proposition being put to you in the car, according to Commissioner Callinan's account, was that an individual garda should not be allowed to trump his ultimate superior in terms of accounting, as to the spending of money or, in this instance, the collection of revenue due to people committing road traffic offences and gaining penalties.
A. Well, I don't accept that.

CHAIRMAN: Right.
389 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And I am suggesting to you that, and the Chairman in due course will have an opportunity to read the transcript, we needn't traw1 over it now in the time we have left, but it's apparent from the transcript, I think in more than one section of it, that Commissioner Callinan, and I think some of the PAC members, perhaps even some of them agreed with it, made this point about the difficulties for a disciplined organisation such as An Garda síochána of that occurring.
CHAIRMAN: I think it's actually in the correspondence. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.

ChaIrman: yes. It is there. And it seems to me to be a very reasonable point to make. But you are saying it wasn't made in the car?
A. It wasn't made in the car.

390 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: All right. Can I move then, again for the purpose of putting formally my case, because I think Mr. Marrinan has already done this in 25
large measure so we needn't delay things --

CHAIRMAN: Let's just check because -- how long do you think you will be, Mr. O'Higgins, because it's now half twelve? And I am sorry, I was trying to get you finished by lunchtime, but that just may not be possible.

THE HEARING ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH.

391 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: So, Deputy McGuinness, I wonder could we have page 1353 on the screen, please. This is the PAC transcript. I am not proposing to go through this, because it is there for anybody who needs it, but just one reference I want to ask you to deal with. I think in this section, if I can just find it there, we might just scroll down slightly, do you see there, Deputy McGuinness, it says:
"Chairman --"
which is yourself.
"-- by way of concluding this part of proceedings I wish to state that the Committee of Public Accounts last night agreed to engage with one of the whistleblowers because he asked to come before us. We agreed that we would hear his evidence on Thursday
next. I think the Commissioner should be aware of that. The letter to which I referred earlier, the second whistleblower has stated I'm willing to give evidence to your Committee at the earliest opportunity."

Just pause there, Deputy McGuinness. Is that a reference to John wilson?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Is it the case that John Wilson did or did not give evidence before your Committee?
A. No, he did not. Took evidence from Sergeant McCabe.
Q. John wilson --
A. No, he did not.

13:32
Q. He did not. And John wilson was very much involved in raising the allegations and complaints concerning imperfections in the fixed charge penalty notice system, wasn't he?
A. He was part of it, but Sergeant McCabe was the central figure.
Q. Yes, but he was also very much involved in it, wasn't he?
A. I met him once, but Sergeant McCabe was the central figure.
Q. I know you have mentioned that.
A. I don't know how involved he was beyond that, but he certain7y was high1ighting issues other than that, too, within the Garda force. And on this particular issue, because of the fact that it was the Comptroller and Auditor General's report, because of the evidence that we had received directly from Sergeant Maurice McCabe and, at the meeting, had agreed, on the basis of that evidence given by Sergeant Maurice McCabe, that we should hear from him.
I see. So did you make a positive decision not to call John wilson in circumstances where, according -- from my reading of the transcript --
A. No, we were only dealing with John -- or, sorry,

Sergeant Maurice McCabe. The information came from Sergeant Maurice McCabe.

398 Q. We11, do you see what I am drawing to your attention there, you say:
"In the letter to which I referred earlier, the second whistleblower has stated 'I am willing to give evidence to your Committee at the earliest opportunity'."
A. Yes.

399 Q.
And I think you confirmed that is a reference to John wilson, is that right?
A. I think it is, yes.
Q. I mean, you're the Chair, so you must know.
A. Yes, it is.

401 Q. Right. So the man is offering to give evidence, he has also been, hadn't he, been the subject of a request, of a command by the Commissioner, as it were, a cease and desist from accessing Pulse and sharing it with third parties. He is centrally involved, I am suggesting to you, and I am just wondering why you didn't call him?
A. Because I had engaged directly with Sergeant Maurice McCabe, who was the source of the evidence that was required to match with the Comptroller and Auditor General's report, and the Committee was dealing solely at that stage with Sergeant Maurice McCabe, dating back, as I said, to late December, early January. And would you agree with me, again it arises from this piece of the transcript, you'd agree with me that this appears to be the first indication you're giving that
it's Thursday, so this was Thursday, Thursday the 23rd, it's Thursday the 30th of January 2014 that you were planning to hear the evidence from Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

403 Q. Right. And that would have been something that the Commissioner was, you know, concerned about, because it was now seemingly imminent, isn't that right?
A. Yes, the 30th.

404 Q. All right. Can I move then to the issue of contention between us concerning that day and that is your attribution to my client of a particular remark, all right, at the end of the PAC meeting? Are you with me? we're agreed, aren't we, that in your first statement, which you made for the first time, the 28th march 2017, there is no reference to John wilson, good, bad or indifferent?
A. No, there isn't.

405 Q. Nor is there any reference to any anecdote about a horse?
A. No, there isn't.

406 Q. And am I correct, as well, in your speech to the Dáil on the 26th May 2016, you made no reference to a quotation or the attributing of a remark to Commissioner callinan on that occasion?
A. About what?

407 Q. As to what you say was said, this man fiddles with children?
A. Sorry?

408 Q. As to what was said as to fiddling with children, on
the $23 r d$, after the PAC meeting?
A. No, I described that as a vile remark.

409 Q. Pardon?
A. I described it in my speech as a vile remark. If you look at the speech I gave, 26th/5th. I will just try and get up the page reference, sorry. 1416, please.
A. I refer to:
"The vile stories that circulated about Garda McCabe, which were promoted by senior officers in the Garda," and they "were absolutely appal1ing."
411 Q. Sorry, just Mr. Kavanagh is bringing it up there. So, you say, I think this is the portion on page 1416 where 13:37 you are referencing the car park. You say, in the final paragraph on page 1416:
"I gave an account of when Garda McCabe came before the Committee of Public Accounts. Every effort was made by 13:38 those within An Garda Síochána at senior level to discredit Sergeant McCabe, including the outgoing Garda Commissioner, who confided to me in a car park on the Naas Road that he was not to be trusted and there were serious issues in relation to Garda McCabe."

Just pause there. You'd agree with me that is confined to a reference to the car park and is not referring to the PAC meeting the day before?
A. Yes, it refers to the car park.

412 Q. Yes. And then I'm suggesting to you that you somewhat broaden matters and you move from referencing or name-checking the Garda Commissioner, you put it this way, you say:
"The vile stories that circulated about Garda McCabe, which were promoted by senior officers in the Garda, were absolutely appalling."
A. Yes.

413 Q. And you say:
"Because they attempted to discredit him, he had to bring forward various pieces of strong, firm evidence to protect his integrity."

Can you identify for me anywhere in that passage or in that speech where you referenced the remark you attribute to Commissioner Callinan that you say he made on the 23 rd January after the PAC meeting?
A. I didn't.
Q. Right. So you didn't, in your Dáil speech?
A. In the Dáil speech.

415 Q. No.
A. I was referring in that speech to the, as you say, the car park.

416 Q. I wish to suggest to you that you decided -- we11, first of a11, just deal with the dates of your statements, please. Your first statement was made on
the 28th March 2017, we're agreed about that?
A. Yes.

417 Q. Your second statement was made exactly a year later, on the 28th March 2018?
A. Yeah.

418 Q. Isn't that so?
A. Yes.
Q. By the time -- after you made your statement, my client had provided a statement in which he made reference to a denial of your allegation about his saying fiddling with children, or words to that effect, all right? And in the course of his statement, he attributed to you a less-than-complimentary remark about John wilson, do you understand?
A. Yes.
Q. So I'm suggesting to you that you included the John Wilson detail by way of a reaction to my client bringing up John wilson in his statement?
A. No, it wasn't a -- it was -- I had read the comment that he had made in relation to what he said that I said about John wilson.

421 Q. Yes.
A. And during the discussion with the investigators here, I put the overall commentary in context; in other words, how the matters start, how the conversation started, what was said, how it led into the remarks that were then made about Garda Maurice McCabe.

422 Q. We11, can I ask you about that.
A. And the reason for that was because the words used by
423 Q. Yes.
A. -- were, in fact, the words that he used.
424 Q. You see, what he attributed to you, just to refresh your memory, Deputy McGuinness, Mr. Callinan says that he asked you whether John Wilson would be called, and he says that you said:
"You must be joking, sure he's a fucking header."
A. Correct. But I didn't say that.

425 Q. A11 right. And that was his position on the matters.
A. Yes.

426 Q. And you made a reference to context in relation to my question as to why you didn't mention John wilson and the story about the horse in your first statement. Would you mind just briefly looking, if Mr. Kavanagh might call up page 2199 of Book 8, which is your statement from March 2017.
A. What page is it?

427 Q. It's page -- it's Book 8.
A. Yeah.

428 Q. And it's page 2199. And if we could scroll down a little bit further and find the final paragraph on that page, paragraph 6.
A. Yeah, 2199.

429 Q. Do you see it there on the screen? Look at the hard copy, it would be better. Do you have it?
A. Yes.

430 Q. So 2199, the 1ast paragraph, paragraph 6 in your
numbered paragraphs, this is what you say, and the only thing you say, about the conversation at the end of the PAC meeting, you say:
"At the conclusion of the hearing on the 23rd January 2014, as my usual practice when Chairman of the Committee, I approached Mr. Callinan to thank him for attending at the Committee. Mr. Callinan was with Ms. Nóirín O'Sullivan and David Taylor and he said to me --"

And I am emphasising that.
" -- he said to me 'this man fiddles with children, this is outrageous'. I took the reference to 'this man' to refer to Mr. McCabe."

That is the totality of your description of that conversation in this first statement, is that right?
A. Relative to Maurice McCabe.

431 Q. Pardon?
A. Relative to Maurice McCabe.

432 Q. But, you see --
A. Maurice McCabe was the person appearing at the committee. Maurice McCabe was the individual that we were all talking about and dealing with. And the remarks that I have -- that you have quoted in there and they're contained here in my statement, are the remarks that were relevant to Maurice McCabe. So when

I was asked about that, $I$ put it in context to provide the full conversation that the Commissioner and I had, after that meeting.
433 Q. Te11 us again, please, not the story about the horse, but just tell us again what precisely did he say about 13:44 Maurice McCabe, do you say?
A. What's in my statement?

So insofar as your later statement has different wording, this version is to be preferred, is it?
A. Which part of it? The later statement is a statement given to the investigators here --
Q. Yes.
A. -- in relation to the total conversation that we had. So if I can bring that somewhere on the screen.
437 Q. You see, the later statement on page 2165 in relation to Mr. McCabe, on your case, attributed these words to Martin Callinan, "and the other man fiddles with kids and that is the type of fucking headbangers I'm dealing with." They're different, those two versions are different, you'd agree with me?
A. It's not different.

CHAIRMAN: We11, what you have read out is slightly different as well from, in fact, what the words are. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: We11, sorry, Chairman, I am reading from the witness's statement on page 2165.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. What I was told yesterday was, he took a horse off a, and I'm not going to use the word, member of the Irish traveller community, in Grafton Street, and rode it back, tying it up outside Pearse Street, and the other fella fiddles with kids, these are the kind of, and I'm not going to use the word, headbangers $I$ am dealing with.
438 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: So is that the totality of what was said?
A. Yes.

439 Q. So what was happened to the words "this is outrageous"?
A. At the end of the -- to go back again. After I described the conversation involving the anecdote about John wilson, it followed in to the commentary about Sergeant Maurice McCabe. He then said "this is outrageous", meaning that, $I$ took from it, that it was outrageous that he was dealing with these things. And then he went on to say the rest.
440 Q. Well, do you say it was "and the other fella fiddles with kids, this is outrageous, and that is the type of fucking headbanger I am dealing with", or is the "this is outrage ous" after "fucking headbangers", which is it?
A. He dealt with the John wilson story, he dealt with the Maurice McCabe story, he said "this is outrageous, and these are the kind of headbangers I am dealing with". CHAIRMAN: So "this is outrageous" came after the story about the horse?
A. Yes. And after the story about -- that's why I have it
in here, at the end of the --
CHAIRMAN: The fiddling with children?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
441 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: You see, Judge Charleton has pinpointed on page -- on yesterday's transcript, on page 35 , going on to page 36 , you were asked to recite again, and you did, what you say were the words attributed. And I am just pointing out to you, you don't appear to have made reference to the "this is outrageous" aspect at a11. What you said was --
A. I made reference to it -- sorry.
Q. I will read it out. It's at page 35 of yesterday's transcript.
CHAIRMAN: No, it wasn't mentioned yesterday, you are absolutely right.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: A11 right.
443 Q. I am simply suggesting to you that whether it's what you said yesterday, whether it's what is in your first statement, whether it's what is in your second
statement from 2018, you're offering -- you appear to be offering different accounts of what you say was said?
A. And you're wrong.

444 Q. All right. Can I ask you, I think you've told us you 13:49 didn't react to the remark that you claim to have heard?
A. After the meeting?

445 Q. Yes. It was a pretty stand-out remark, I suggest? And included in the persons you didn't tell was your own party colleague, Séan Fleming, who was on the PAC at the time?
A. I didn't tell any member of the PAC.

451 Q. Right. Did you say it to Sergeant McCabe at any point?
A. Eh... I don't think so, no.

452 Q. What about, had you a meeting with him in May 2016 at the Merrion Hote1, when apparently --
A. Well, that had been a date after everything had been said, so, for clarification, I would have gone through some of the remarks made by Commissioner Callinan in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe.

453 Q. We11, that's what I am asking you: Did you tel1 him
about the remark you attribute at the end of the PAC?
A. I may not have separated out when these remarks were made, and I remind you again that the remarks in terms of Sergeant Maurice McCabe, and the rumours and everything else, were circulating in Leinster House. This was just further evidence that an effort was being made to destroy the man. And when I repeated anything to Maurice McCabe, I didn't specify dates and times.
Right, but I had understood you to indicate that, at some point, you thought it was a good idea to relay to Sergeant McCabe the disgraceful things that the Commissioner had been saying about him?
A. Yes, and I did that.
Q. Right. And we're agreed you didn't -- you didn't, in doing that, mention anything about the 23rd January end of PAC conversation?
A. I may not have had, I may not have had included that as a general comment in anything that $I$ was saying. As I told you already, I did not attribute dates and times to either what $I$ had been hearing in the context of rumours or what was being said by the Commissioner to affect anything that was being undertaken by the Public Accounts Committee.

456 Q. Can I ask you about David Taylor for a moment.
A. Yes.

457 Q. What was your first contact with Superintendent Taylor or Superintendent Taylor's wife?

CHAIRMAN: You mean by phone or text or anything prior to the January 2017 meeting in the skylon, is it?
A. Yes, it was around the 16th.

458 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: The 16th of?
A. Of January '17.

459 Q. of January 2017. So was it telephone contact prior to your meeting --
A. Yes.

460 Q. -- superintendent and Mrs. Taylor. And was the first contact with Mrs. Taylor as opposed to superintendent?
A. Yes.

461 Q. Right. Did you and Mrs. Taylor have mutual friends, or 13:54 what was the connection?
A. I'd have no connection.

462 Q. Pardon?
A. No connection.

463 Q. We11, who put ye in touch?
A. Well, I have noted here a telephone number which is Dave Taylor's wife's telephone number and I contacted her on that. Now, whether I was contacted by her and given the number or whether I telephoned her directly, whether she contacted me first or $I$ her first, I'm not quite sure, but the meeting in the Skylon Hotel took p1ace.

464 Q. Is she in Fianna Fáil?
A. I have no idea.

465 Q. You don't know one way or the other?
A. No, I don't know a lot about the membership of the party, no.

466 Q. Pardon?
A. I don't know a whole lot of the membership of the party
in the context of identifying someone in this room or beyond that might be a member of the party.
467 Q. Is that not exactly the sort of detail you might be across, no?
A. For what? I don't go around asking people what their membership of particular parties are.
468 Q. All right. We11, did Sergeant McCabe have any role in you making contact or ending up -- it ending up that you made contact with Mrs. Taylor?
A. Not that I can remember. But I did have contact with Mrs. Taylor, I did arrange the meeting.

469 Q. Yeah, we know that. And that was in January 2017?
A. Yes.

470 Q. At the skylon Hotel, was it?
A. skylon Hotel, yeah.

471 Q. You're aware, aren't you, that Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure, which is in Book 1, both he and Sergeant McCabe made their protected disclosures to the same protected disclosure manager within the same week; you're, broadly speaking, aware of that, are you?
A. I'm aware that they made a protected disclosure. when they made it, you know, I can't tell you now.
472 Q. Just to assist you, sergeant McCabe, as I read the papers, made his on the 28th September 2016, and Superintendent Taylor made his on the 30th September 2016, right?
A. Okay.

CHAIRMAN: I thought it was the 26th. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Well, Judge, it's on page --
sorry, I'm getting those --
CHAIRMAN: I mean, I have taken it down as -- it doesn't matter. You're absolutely correct to say they are within days of each other, that is all that matters, but I thought it was Maurice McCabe on the 26th September and then Superintendent Taylor on the 30th September.
MR. MÍCHEÁL o'hIGGINS: May it please you, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: But it doesn't matter.
473 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Do you see then -- I wonder if Mr. Kavanagh might bring up page 2 of Book 1.
A. Volume 2, is it?

474 Q. It's volume 1, Deputy.
A. Volume 1, yes. what page?

475 Q. Page 6 of that, page 6 of the papers.
A. Yes.

476 Q. It starts at the top:
"Prior to the appearance of the Commissioner."
A. Yes.

477 Q. So do you see that there in the first three paragraphs within this protected disclosure, which, as I say, carries the date the 30th September 2016, in the first three paragraphs of this, Superintendent Taylor refers to the PAC meeting that took place on the 23rd January 2014, all right?
A. Yes.

478 Q. And he says that:
"Prior to the appearance of the Commissioner at the Dáil Public Accounts Committee (PAC) there were several round-table meetings to discuss strategy and to anticipate and to prepare for lines of questioning/inquiry. Sergeant McCabe featured heavily in the sense of preparing to respond to allegations which had been made. The Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan attended these meetings as well as Assistant Commissioner o'mahony and advisers. I attended at least two of these meetings. I also travelled with the Commissioner to the hearing that morning and was present when he presented at same, as was Deputy Commissioner o'sullivan."

And it says:
"After the PAC hearing, which lasted about five hours, we had a discussion amongst ourselves in the communal area outside the Committee rooms in Dáil Éireann. No issue was raised by anybody present to any concern regarding the use of the word 'disgusting'. We returned to Garda Headquarters and all went back to our respective offices, but I'm aware that the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner o'sullivan went to his office. I did not attend that meeting."

And then it says:
"Over the next few days the entire media focus appeared
to be on the use by the Commissioner of the word 'disgusting'. There was great annoyance and indeed all hell broke loose internally in An Garda Síochána, given the focus on this comment. There was a huge amount of negative commentary on the Commissioner for the use of the word and corresponding positive media coverage of Sergeant McCabe."

A11 right. And what I am going to ask you about that is, does it surprise you that, in this document, does it surprise you to learn that nowhere in this document does Superintendent Taylor claim to have heard any remark from Commissioner Callinan of he fiddles with children?
A. This is Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure?
A. He hasn't mentioned -- yeah, we11 --

480 Q. Even though he has referred to the meeting?
A. But I don't know about that.

CHAIRMAN: He doesn't refer anywhere to actually
meeting the deputy, as such. There seems to have been -- I don't know whether -- could I just clarify that, Mr. O'Higgins, if you don't mind. If you give evidence to a Dái 1 committee, does that take place in the room across the road from Leinster House?
A. No, it takes place in the basement.

CHAIRMAN: Of Leinster House?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Because I am completely unfamiliar.

If a group are coming to give evidence, do you offer them the facility of a room beforehand?
A. No, generally speaking they come to the coffee dock, which is on the next level, and then they come to a lower level, where there is a very large waiting area. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. And then they go in and they attend in one of the committee rooms.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. But there is no -- in some of the courts, certainly in the -- well, there was a big commercial case in the Central Criminal court and the Courts Service was able to offer the parties use of a room each, the use of a room. You don't do that, do you?
A. No, that can be the case. There are other meeting rooms at a higher level.

CHAIRMAN: But did you do it on this occasion?
A. And there are monitors everywhere.

Chairman: No, I get that. But did you offer the Garda delegation --
A. No, no, no, that is not my --

CHAIRMAN: You can't say?
A. I wouldn't ever do that.

ChAIRMAN: All right.
A. That would be a matter for the clerk in arranging that. 14:01 CHAIRMAN: Yes. As to whether he did or not, you don't know?
A. Oh, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN: okay. Sorry, you were on the point that
there was a reference to --
A. Sorry, the area they are speaking about is the -sorry, Chairman, the area I think that they're speaking about is the general area outside of the meeting rooms. That's more or less a public area.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, the point you were on, Mr. O'Higgins, was, isn't it surprising that David Taylor makes no reference apart from "kiddie fiddler".
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Makes no reference at all to "kiddie fiddler".

CHAIRMAN: No, it makes reference to "disgusting" but not to "kiddie fiddler".

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: A11 right. But "disgusting" was on the open airwaves. But I appreciate the point you are making, would you like to -- can you help at all?
A. I don't know how I can help because I'm not privy to what Superintendent Taylor heard.
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Well, if I can ask it this way: Are you or are you not saying that he would have been
A. Yes. He was in -- he was there in that company. whether he heard it or not, $I$ don't know.

CHAIRMAN: We11, we discussed that before, Mr. O'Higgins, and of course you're entitled to examine it, but the evidence was that, look, there was a hubbub, and the deputy can't say for definite if anyone else overheard anything of what he heard.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes. But, in fairness, and so
that the Tribunal has it clear as well, it does appear in a later interview of Superintendent Taylor, he does say he over hears "fiddles with children" remark.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Sorry, Judge, it wasn't an interview; it was a statement made in early March. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: A statement made -MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: It's on page 147. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: On 13th March 2017. MR. MICHAEL O'hIGGINS: 13th March, and it's on 147. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: That's right. MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Not an interview.

482 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: In a statement made by Superintendent Taylor, which you may not be aware of this, but it appears to, in many of the other paragraphs, be somewhat identical to the statement we're looking at on page 6, but there's an extra paragraph added in which he attributes -- in which he states that he overheard "fiddles with children" remark, all right?
A. Yeah.

483 Q. And that statement, as I mention, is dated 13th March, or he appears to have made it on the 13th march 2017, all right?
A. Yeah.

484 Q. And it was confirmed yesterday by Mr. Michae1 instructions were that Superintendent Taylor has no recollection of overhearing any story about a horse, you heard that yesterday?
A. Yes. I also heard what the other legal representatives said about John wilson.
A. Yes.

486 Q. Yes.
CHAIRMAN: We have everything about this horse: 1983, them both serving together, Grafton Street, riding it down. The only thing that is missing is the name of the horse, and I presume it wasn't 'Boomerang', so... MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Well, there is one other thing missing, Judge. Commissioner Callinan's position in relation to that, just so you are aware, is that he transferred from Central Detective Unit to Pearse Street in 1986, and he was not stationed, contrary to what was submitted, he was not stationed in Pearse Street in 1983, as had been stated.
A. I didn't state that.

487 Q. I didn't say you did. It was stated by another, by counse1.
A. Okay. For Mr. Wilison?

488 Q. For Mr. Wilison.
CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I'm not following that point, and I'm sure it's entirely my fault. what is the point? MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: There was a contribution from Mr. Harty yesterday --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: -- in relation to the suggestion that my client was stationed in Pearse Street, I think it was suggested, at the time of the --
what is seemingly the time of the horse incident. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: In point of fact, he was not, on my instructions. I am simply saying that.
CHAIRMAN: In Pearse Street?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: He wasn't in the detective branch?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: He moved from -- transferred to
the Central Detective Unit in Pearse Street in 1986 on
promotion to the rank of sergeant, I am told.
CHAIRMAN: That's fine.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: I don't suggest it's a place determined --
CHAIRMAN: Mr. o'higgins, this must be one of the most famous stories from the 1980s about gardaí and their heroics, so, I mean, wouldn't it have got around? Indeed, I understand, no disrespect, that a middle name appropriate to the activity was then bestowed on John wilson, 'Jockey', was that not so? Are you seriously telling me you didn't hear about that or wouldn't have heard about that, or is that part of the instructions? I don't know. And that is no insult to John wilson. As you know, I have the height of admiration for this escapade.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: May it please you, Chairman. I 14:07 simply thought it was appropriate to, insofar as contrary information had been conveyed, to simply correct the record.
CHAIRMAN: No, that is fine. where was he, in fact, if
this indeed was 1983?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: I must admit I don't have that precisely. I know that -- my instructions are that he transferred --

CHAIRMAN: To Pearse Street?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: -- to Pearse Street in 1986 to the Central Detective Unit, so I imagine it's possible he was there, but I can check that detail.

CHAIRMAN: He was a detective sergeant. But he was presumably serving somewhere -- he could have been anywhere; he could have been in Cavan, he could have been in the city, I have no idea, Mr. O'Higgins. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: We can check that.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks.
489 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Now, can I move to a different area then and we will just quickly now wrap up, Mr. McGuinness, just as best we can. There is a matter dealt with in the papers that have been circulated and it's dealt with at page 1989 and that is --
A. Where is this? Volume?

490 Q. I will try and find it for you now. And it's not necessary for us to go into people's names in relation to this, because, you know, it's potentially sensitive information $I$ am going to be mentioning. It's in Volume 8, just to assist you.
CHAIRMAN: You'd maybe just help us as to what is this on the screen, please, Mr. O'Higgins?

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: We11, at page 1992, Chairman -CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: -- there is a cover report from Chief Superintendent McPolin, John McPolin, regarding an investigation that he had carried out. And you might deal with this reasonably carefully, Deputy McGuinness. The papers - and we can look at it in detail if needed, but, just, I want to give you an opportunity to say yes or no to this - the papers appear to indicate that a particular journalist confirmed to this investigating Chief Superintendent, John McPolin, that that journalist had, some time prior 14:10 to the 22nd March 2014, obtained from you particular Pulse screenshots and other relevant information relating to two particular children from a traveller family. It's not necessary for you to refer now to the name of the journalist or certainly the names of the traveller children. And the report appears to indicate that you had been given this information, this material, by Sergeant McCabe, who had accessed certain private data in November and December of 2012 and you passed it on to the journalist, it is said, and GSOC had to look into this matter, if that helps you.
A. They didn't ask me.

491 Q. Do you know anything I'm talking about?
A. Eh...

492 Q. Or is this completely new to you?
A. It's not completely new to me. Neither is the issue, which I won't go into, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't relate to anything to do with Sergeant McCabe.
CHAIRMAN: what I understand it is, and it may help to
shorten things if I say what my understanding is, and I might get it wrong. Okay. So there was a lady arrested, she was a member of the Irish traveller community, she had two kids with her, but instead of just her name and details being put on Pulse, apparently, the names and details of the two children were also put on pulse.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And there was some disquiet about that, and, in consequence of that, you obtained from Sergeant McCabe some screenshots of Pulse with a view to looking into it and considering that. I think that is a fair summary of it, is it, Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes. I think it occurred just one other sma11 detail, Chairman - it occurred in the context of a particular lady making an application for a passport in the Garda station.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. So she wasn't arrested at all. She was just going down and asking for a passport. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: So the usual way.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: So she'd managed to get on to Pulse and the two children managed to get on to Pulse, for no reason at all, is that the point?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: We11, it wasn't -- sorry, going by the GSOC investigation and taking it at face value --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: -- the particular gardaí who were involved in the transaction, if I can use that shorthand, were cleared of any wrongdoing.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And it was found that they had a good reason in relation to the male of the family for retaining the particular -- making a record on pulse. And there was nothing untoward in that and they were cleared in relation to that, by GSOC --
CHAIRMAN: okay.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: -- it would seem.
CHAIRMAN: Okay. And did the children's details get on to Pulse?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: There were separate entries made in relation to the children and that was the subject of the complaint.
CHAIRMAN: And GSOC said that was wrong?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: I think the report summary, so
that I don't misparaphrase it, Chairman, is -- the conclusion is to be found on page 2003, and we needn't -- I am anxious that the -CHAIRMAN: No, no, I appreciate that, you're coming to a point, but if we have a common understanding we will get to the end of it more easily, perhaps, so... MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And it is not necessary to put 14:14 2004.

CHAIRMAN: All right. They said that the particular garda in question shouldn't have created separate records for the children.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And there were nothing to suggest that they were a flight risk or a crime risk, but as regards the dad, that was different.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And the conclusion, the penultimate paragraph, it is indicated that the particular journalist informed the investigator that she had obtained the Pulse screenshots and information from the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, Mr. John McGuinness.

CHAIRMAN: So that is the point. If you wouldn't mind just -- that is what you are dealing with.
A. Can I just say that I'm aware of that issue and it was described as the profiling of young children on Pulse, children in the travelling community. I do know that I was asked to comment on that story, and I did, because I was aware of it in terms of circulation around Leinster House. As to the Pulse documents, I'm not aware of that.

CHAIRMAN: No, I think the point is --
A. Is that it?

CHAIRMAN: Well, it seems to be, it seems to be the journalist said that her source was you and that you went to Maurice McCabe, got the screenshots with a view to --
A. I don't think -- that's not accurate. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
A. If that is what you are asking.

493 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: And it would seem that whatever detail was provided to the journalist wasn't sufficiently redacted because she was enabled to identify the traveller family the subject of the Pulse records, that was the other relevance of it.
A. We11, I mean, I don't know that, except that the journalist in question, without naming the person, is a celebrated investigative journalist and I can imagine she had many sources, so I don't know.
494 Q. Finally, then, Mr. McGuinness, you're aware, of course, and I needn't laboriously says this, you're aware that former Commissioner Callinan denies the attributed quotation of the 23 rd January and the incendiary remarks you attributed to him in the car park conversation on 24th January, you're aware that he has denied that in his statements to the Tribunal?
A. I accept that, yes.
Q. And finally, can I just ask you to confirm, you made your original statement to the Tribunal, you've told us, in March '17, that was after a point you had spoken to Sergeant McCabe a number of times, isn't that so?
A. Sorry, 2017?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

497 Q. And it was after Superintendent Taylor, you had met Superintendent Taylor and Michelle Taylor in the skylon Hote1, isn't that so?
A. Correct.

498 Q. And it was also subsequent to the Prime Time programme in February 2017 revealing the incorrect Tus7a allegation?
A. I can't recall the Prime Time programme.

499 Q. And this was, again, after a point in time when there had been contact between Sergeant McCabe and Mr. and Mrs. Taylor in 2016, per Michelle Taylor, isn't that so?
A. My statement?

500 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, was after that, yeah.

MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Thanks very much.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Chairman, just before counse1 on behalf of Deputy McGuinness exercises a right to ask any questions, could I ask for the Tribunal's indulgence to deal with one -CHAIRMAN: Please do, Mr. O'Higgins. MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: -- very, very discrete issue, Judge, and it will be three or four questions. CHAIRMAN: Please do. If you wouldn't just mind reminding Deputy McGuinness who you are appearing for.

MR. MCGUINNESS WAS FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINED BY
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS:

501 Q. MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: I'm Michael O'Higgins, and I'm for Superintendent Taylor. There is just one matter $I$ just want to tease out a little bit with you; two or three questions, $I$ think, is the height of it. when my
colleague Mr. -- the other Mr. O'Higgins, he asked you when you met with Sergeant McCabe shortly before, more likely shortly after your Dáil speech, and he asked you did you say to Sergeant McCabe about the "kiddie fiddler" remark, and I don't have a transcript here, but what I took you down to say from my note was that you may not have, was your comment, and you said that you made some general comments to him about what had been said and you did not attribute dates and times to those comments. First of all, have I summarised you correctly in that regard?
A. I think so, yeah.

502 Q. Now, yesterday I asked was it the case that when you made your statement to the Tribunal at the end of March in 2017, was that the first time you had articulated to any persons your account of the conversation at the close of the PAC meeting, do you remember me asking you that question?
A. I do, yeah.

503 Q. And you gave me the answer that that was the first
occasion you had articulated it?
A. Yes.

504 Q. And I'm working on, and concluding from that, and you can tell me whether this is a right or wrong conclusion, that in any conversation you had with Sergeant Maurice McCabe in which you might have said in general terms that Commissioner Callinan spoke of him in derogatory terms, at no stage did you ever say to sergeant McCabe at the end of the PAC meeting there was
a conversation in which Commissioner Callinan referred to you as a "kiddie fiddler", am I correct in that?
A. You are, yes.

505 Q. I am correct in that. Thank you.
A. Can I just say that in approaching -- in discussing this with Sergeant McCabe, while it is my -- the way I do business is to ask them directly. As I said to the opening -- in the opening remarks, I found this very difficult to deal with because $I$ was putting this to him, to someone that I believed was innocent, but, apart from all of that, it was simply the description and the detail I found quite upsetting. So, I mean, that's really all $I$ want to say in relation to it. CHAIRMAN: Sure. Mr. O'Higgins --
A. So going into dates and times wasn't something -CHAIRMAN: It was a general thing.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And that might have amalgamated the two things together for all you know.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Why is that significant, Mr. O'Higgins? I mean, from the point of view of David Taylor or indeed from --
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: It is significant, Chairman, potentially for this reason: that my client gave a he set out his recollection of what he overheard at that conversation, at the conclusion of the PAC meeting.

CHAIRMAN: Right.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: A question arises as to how he might be privy to that, was it because he was present or was it because someone told him about it, and my line of cross-examination is to close down the possibility that he could have heard it from some other source. That is all.

CHAIRMAN: To have heard it from Deputy McGuinness -MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Sergeant McCabe, for instance.
CHAIRMAN: -- or from Sergeant McCabe.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: No, that is fair enough.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: And the temporal significance is, that it is disclosed to the Tribunal prior to Deputy McGuinness making his statement, which he says is the first articulation he made to any person of the conversation.

CHAIRMAN: No, that is fair enough. As I understood it, the whole reference to any such alleged allegation was in very vague terms, with a view essentially to ensuring that Sergeant McCabe's feelings weren't further hurt.

MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: So, Mr. Breen.
MR. LEHANE: Sorry, it's Mr. Lehane, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, well, that is my mistake, I am sorry.

506 Q. MR. LEHANE: Deputy McGuinness, I'm going to ask you some questions arising out of the examination by the various parties today and yesterday in relation to a number of issues. Those are, the circumstances leading up to the meeting in the car park on the 24th January, the purpose of that meeting, the matters discussed at that meeting and certain related matters.

So just in relation to the circumstances leading up to that meeting, it is correct that there was an exchange of correspondence between your Committee and the Garda Commissioner in relation to a data protection issue which culminated in that letter of the 17 th January 2014 from the clerk of your Committee to Mr. Callinan, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

507 Q. And is it correct that, as far as you were concerned, that was the end of the data protection issue for your Committee?
A. Yes, on legal advice.

508 Q. And that decision was never challenged legally in the courts by the Garda Commissioner, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

509 Q. If I can turn now to the issue of rumours. You were asked yesterday by counse 1 for the inquiry, and yesterday by counse1 for Mr. Callinan, a number of questions in relation to rumours in Leinster House,
isn't that right?
A. That's right.

510 Q. And you were probed on what the nature of those rumours were, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

511 Q. Could I ask for page 1690 to be put up on the screen, please.
A. What volume is that?

512 Q. I think it's in volume 6. You will see it on the screen. It's a letter.
A. On page 16 --

513 Q. -- 90. And that's a letter - do you have it, Deputy McGuinness? If you might look at the screen, it's only one letter.
A. Yeah.

514 Q. And that's a letter from Mr. Varadkar, Taoiseach, to the solicitor for the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

515 Q. And you'11 see there in the third paragraph, Mr. Varadkar says:
"while I was aware of innuendo and rumours circulating about Sergeant McCabe, I did not believe them to be true and, in any case, they did not take away from the evidence-based case he was making in relation to penalty points having been squared."

```
Isn't that right?
```

A. Yes.

516 Q. Did you ever discuss these innuendo or rumours with Mr. Varadkar?
A. No, I did not.

517 Q. Can I ask the Tribunal to bring up page 1691 on the screen. It is the next page. Yes. And again, do you have that, Deputy McGuinness?
A. I have, indeed.
Q. And you will see again this is a letter from Mr. Varadkar to the solicitor for the Tribunal, and you will see in the second paragraph he states:
"With regard to the innuendo and rumours, I was informed of these by Mr. Noel Brett, then CEO of the Road Safety Authority, which fell under my remit as Minister for Transport, Tourism and Sport. I don't recall the exact detail of the rumours, but I do recall they related to his character and motivation, that he was untrustworthy and had other grievances unrelated to road safety. I specifically recall a rumour about a computer with evidence of criminality on it being lost by Sergeant McCabe."

Is that right?
A. That's right.

519 Q. That is what the letter says. And you never discussed
A. No.

520 Q. Could I ask for page 166 -- sorry, 1665 to be put up on the screen, please. This is a letter, unfortunately
it's a three-page letter, but from Mr. Pat Rabbitte to the solicitor for the Tribunal, and have you that in front of you, Mr. McGuinness?
A. Yes.

521 Q. Can I ask for the second page, 1666, to be put up on the screen. Is it up? And in the last paragraph on that page --
A. Yes.

522 Q. -- you will see that Mr. Rabbitte writes:
"Some time, I think, in 2014, my encounters in 2007 with Maurice McCabe were ventilated in an RTÉ interview. That same evening, in a prearranged meeting with a friend of mine, who is a former garda, he raised with me the content of the interview as it related to
Sergeant McCabe. He said that he was unaware that I had any involvement with Sergeant McCabe, but I thought that I should be aware of what was being said 'on the grapevine'. I took it that he was referring to the Garda grapevine and the matter that he wanted to warn me about was that there were rumours of alleged child abuse against Sergeant McCabe."

And that, and you've read that, you never discussed that matter with Deputy Rabbitte, did you?
A. No, I did not.

523 Q. Again, you will agree with me that this documentation is evidence of rumours circulating in Leinster House in relation to --
A. As I've said, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lehane, it may help to say that I am aware that there were such rumours from several statements, and indeed statements from journalists also mention the fact that there were general rumours out there circulating around.

MR. LEHANE: Yes, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: God knows what people are saying about other people, I suppose, but there was a fairly consistent thread that it was this kind of thing - grudges, investigation, child sex abuse type stuff. And the problem with a rumour, of course, is, it's like a mist, you never get it to crystallise into something that has a shape.
MR. LEHANE: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. And the only reason I draw attention to these documents is that the issue of rumours was raised yesterday -CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. LEHANE: -- that Deputy McGuinness was probed on his knowledge of rumours, and just to indicate that some of the documentary evidence in relation to -- from other members of Dáil Éireann -CHAIRMAN: Yes, there is loads of it, yes. MR. LEHANE: Yes.

524 Q. Can I now turn, Deputy McGuinness, to the PAC hearing

525
Q. And in answer to a question from Deputy Shane Ross, former Commissioner Callinan used the word "disgusting", isn't that right?
A. Yes.

Yes.
Q. Now, I don't want to beat the horse story to death, but, yesterday, comment was passed by counse 1 for the inquiry that it was of interest that you hadn't mentioned this story in your original statement and that it only came into your -- the statement prepared on foot of the interview with you by the Tribunal
A. That's right.

531 Q. But you did tell the Tribunal in your interview with the investigators about that incident, isn't that
right?
A. I did.

532 Q. Yes. Now, in relation to the comments that you say were expressed by former Commissioner callinan, in particular the reference to "kiddie fiddler", can I ask 14:31 for page - bear with me for a second - 2199 to be brought up on the screen, please. I think this is from -- it's in volume 6, I think, Deputy McGuinness, this is your statement.
CHAIRMAN: This is back to paragraph 6. You have seen it already.
mR. LEHANE: And you will see there -- you have it in front of you?
A. Yes.

533 Q. You'11 see, you say in the second sentence:
"I approached Mr. Callinan to thank him for attending the Committee. Mr. Callinan was with Ms. Nóirín o'Sullivan and David Taylor and he said to me 'this man fiddles with children, this is outrageous'. I took the 14:32 reference to 'this man' to be Mr. McCabe."
A. Yes, that's correct.

534 Q. And then just in relation to the note of the -- or the statement that was prepared on foot of the interview with the Tribunal investigators, can I ask for page
A. Yes.

535 Q. And you'11 see there at line 47 you say that Commissioner Callinan said "and the other fella fiddles
with kids, and that is the type of f-ing headbangers I am dealing with". All right?
A. Yes
Q.

Now, would you agree with me that the expression "fiddles with kids" is -- or "fiddles with kids" or "fiddles with children" is in both statements?
A. Yes.

537 Q. And just finally on this topic, counsel for Mr. Callinan drew your attention to an interview that was conducted with Brendan O'Connor, confusingly presenting the Marian Finucane programme on Sunday, 18th June 2017, and the reference by Brendan O'Connor to saying "and he said 'this guy is a paedophile, we think'". Do you recall that?
A. Yes.

538 Q. Would you agree with me that the expression "kiddie fiddler" or "fiddles with kids", that "paedophile" is another probably more proper way of describing that activity?
A. Yes.

539 Q. It was suggested to you, Deputy McGuinness, by counse1 for Commissioner Callinan, that you included the detail in relation to John wilson in your statement as a reaction to Commissioner Callinan bringing it up in his statement. Is that a correct characterisation of why you included that story in your --
A. No, I included that story to give context to how the conversation started, how it led into the remarks about John wilson and Sergeant Maurice McCabe, and, for
accuracy, that is the way I wanted to present it. Did you make that up for the purpose of discrediting former Commissioner Callinan?
A. No, in hindsight you couldn't make it up.

541 Q. I agree with you. Can I ask you, can I turn now to the 14:35 meeting in Bewley's Hotel, and in relation to arranging the meeting, I think it's common case that Mr. Callinan asked for the meeting, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

542 Q. And I think you'd agree with me that it would not be unusual for a senior politician or a member of the Oireachtas to meet with people off the premises of Leinster House?
A. That is not unusual.

543 Q. Yes. And in relation to An Garda Síochána, you'd agree 14:35 with me that it wouldn't be unusual for senior members of An Garda Síochána to meet with politicians from time to time?
A. Sorry, can you put that question again.

544 Q. That it wouldn't be unusual for senior members of An Garda Síochána to meet with politicians from time to time?
A. I found it unusual.

545 Q. Can I ask for page 1246A to be put up on the screen, please.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lehane, Mr. McGuinness says it is unusual.

MR. LEHANE: Oh, sorry, it is unusual. But I am bringing him to a document, and this is page 1246A.

And this is, Mr. McGuinness, a typewritten note of an interna1 Garda meeting from the 9th January 2014, and you'11 look down the page there and you will see there are a number of points being made. One of them is:
"Action points: Possibly a briefing with Shane Ross, TD, on station closures, amalgamations, etcetera!"

And this again is, you'11 agree with me, the suggestion that the gardaí, or members of the gardaí might meet with a senior politician for the purpose of briefing him on something, in this case in relation to station closures?
A. And you're asking me if that's unusual?

546 Q. We11, I am just drawing your attention to the document. ${ }^{14: 37}$ CHAIRMAN: It seems that different views have been taken about station closures and station openings. MR. LEHANE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: But what you are asked to comment on is, do politicians meet with members of the gardaí in relation 14:37 to, I don't know, gathering information about, you know, crime in an area, whether a station is necessary? Anything that is, in other words, a legitimate aspect of public debate?
A. Well, yes, if it's a legitimate aspect of public
debate. But there's normally the -- the local council has an arrangement with the guards, the Garda Policing Committee, and, generally speaking, at the Garda Policing Committee matters of this kind would be
discussed and information given at those meetings. I think that's mainly where public representatives get their information from.
547 Q. MR. LEHANE: And, Deputy MCGuinness, your attention hasn't been drawn to a document from An Garda Síochána containing a reference to the possibility of a meeting between former Commissioner Callinan and you in Bewley's car park, have you?
A. No.

548 Q. Just in relation to -- turning to the manner in which that meeting was arranged --

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Lehane, I am completely missing that point. What is the point there?
mR. LEHANE: well, the point is that there is no
documentary record, that I am aware of, emanating from
the gardaí --
CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. LEHANE: -- wherein there is a record or an action point in relation to Mr. McGuinness similar to the action point that is there in relation to Deputy Shane Ross. You know, dash, must meet -CHAIRMAN: You say it's not in the papers? MR. LEHANE: We11, that I have seen anyway. CHAIRMAN: Is that correct, Mr. Marrinan? MR. MARRINAN: That is correct.
MR. LEHANE: Yes. Along the lines of must meet Deputy McGuinness to discuss data protection concerns. CHAIRMAN: In other words, like in a schedule of a diary?

MR. LEHANE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Okay. No, I see the point. Thank you.
549 Q. MR. LEHANE: So just in relation to the arranging of that meeting, did you know that -- sorry, did former Commissioner Callinan inform you in the phone calls what the purpose of the meeting was?
A. No.

550 Q. Okay. Did former Commissioner Callinan ask you to come alone?
A. No.

551 Q. Did former Commissioner Callinan indicate that he would be alone?
A. No.

552 Q. Did former Commissioner Callinan tell you that this was a secret meeting?
A. No.

553 Q. okay. Did you -- and I think your evidence to the Chairman is that you thought that the meeting would actually be in the hotel rather than the car park?
A. That was the presumption, yes.

554 Q. And your attention, Deputy McGuinness, has been brought to a statement by your colleague, Séan Fleming, TD, that was provided to the Tribunal on the 13th November 2017, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

555 Q. And can I ask for page 1444 to be put up on the screen. And you will see there, Deputy McGuinness, the point is 4:
"Do you have any other information you can offer in this connection?
A. The only other aspect of the matter that John McGuinness, TD, said to me was that the reason they had 14:40 the meeting in his car, in the car park, was because it was raining heavily at the time and they both would have got very wet going into the hotel to have a discussion and then coming back out. I understand the meeting happened in the car because of this reason."
A. Yes.

556 Q. Would you agree with me that there is nothing in that statement indicating that it was your decision to remain in the car for the purposes of the meeting?
A. No, there's nothing in that statement. As I indicated earlier, $I$ was in the motion of getting out of my car.

557 Q. As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and indeed as Chairman of the Committee that you chair now, do you think that there's anything improper about meeting a witness --
A. No.

558 Q. -- outside -- okay. Now, if I can turn to the actual meeting itself. I think the Chairman is clear at this stage what your account of what was said is, so I would like to just deal briefly with your record of the meeting. Would you agree with me that there's a big difference between making a transcript or taking a detailed note of the meeting, on the one hand, and jotting down a few words as a memo to yourself?
A. A significant difference, yes.

559 Q. And in relation to your note, did you write that note for the purpose of corroborating or adding to the strength of the evidence that you're giving to this Tribunal today?
A. No.

560 Q. Did you --
A. I never envisaged that $I$ would be before a tribunal.

561 Q. Did you fabricate it by writing on a page in the past to create the impression that it was written at that time?
A. No, I did not.

562 Q. Okay.
A. It's clear from how it was written --

563 Q. In relation to --
A. -- that it was written on the day.

564 Q. Sorry, Deputy McGuinness. In relation to telling people about the meeting, yesterday it was put to you that you didn't really tell anybody about your interaction with Commissioner Callinan, but, of course, 14:43 you have given evidence to the Chairman that you told your party leader about it, isn't that right?
A. I told him that the meeting had taken place, yes.
Q. Yes. And did your colleague, Deputy Deasy, tell you back in 2014 that prior to the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, that he had spoken to Mr. Callinan and that Mr. Callinan had referred to Sergeant McCabe as somebody who could not be trusted?
A. No, not that I recall.

CHAIRMAN: We11, nobody is suggesting that, are they, Mr. Lehane?

MR. LEHANE: No, Chairman. The only reason I am asking that is that reference was made yesterday by your counsel in relation to the fact that Deputy McGuinness hadn't told other people about this and there's a Public Accounts Committee composed of a number of different members, and I'm just drawing attention to the fact that he Deputy McGuinness, being the Chairman of the Committee, hadn't heard from another person on that Committee in relation to the subject matter of the question. That is all. Have you provided this Tribunal with a truthful version of your interactions with Mr. Callinan?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Are you part of a conspiracy with others to do down Mr. Callinan?
A. No, I'm not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LEHANE: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Mr. Lehane. Mr. Marrinan, was there anything else?

MR. MARRINAN: Yes, there's just two matters that I would like to deal with with Deputy McGuinness.

MR. MCGUINNESS WAS RE-EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN:

569 Q. MR. MARRINAN: Just, in the first instance, if you could deal with the Public Accounts Committee, in the first instance. It seems to have been a very efficient Committee under your chairmanship, is that right?
A. I hope that it was. And the members were excellent. It wasn't down to me.
Q. I think it is fair to say, without going into the political arena in any shape or form, but it was quite a highly regarded Committee and it was, as I say, regarded as being extremely effective?
A. Yes, the Public Accounts Committee is thought highly of.

571 Q. And the personnel on the Committee, I read out names yesterday in relation to all the personnel on the Committee, they're all very experienced politicians, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

572 Q. And all very independently minded and quite vocal on occasions?
A. Very much so.

573 Q. Insofar as there's been a suggestion made, and I think the suggestion is being made, that perhaps you, as Chairman, would have been capable of leading them by the nose, $I$ assume that that is not so?
A. In the history of the Public Accounts Committee, the chairman is nominated by the Opposition, the leader of the Opposition, and then takes the position of chair. For the first time in the history of the Public Accounts Committee, since its foundation, there was an election to that position, there was a contest. Shane Ross contested the chairmanship against me. So that will tell you the independence of that Committee.
574 Q. Yes. And there was a close working relationship between you, is that right?
A. There would be on issues that were relevant to the Comptroller and Auditor General's report and the achievement of, I suppose, accountability, transparency, matters of governance and spending of public monies.
Q. And when it came to the issue of whether or not -- in the first instance, whether or not Maurice McCabe would be called as a witness, were there dissenters to that?
A. There was.

576 Q. Yes. And are these matters decided by simple majority?
A. By consensus, yes.
Q. Well --
A. So there was worry and concern about, as I said in my evidence previous7y, that matters might get out of hand in the context of a public meeting and what Maurice McCabe might say or do in relation to people, members of the force or indeed members of the general public. A11 of these were thrashed out with the legal in-house representatives, so we arrived at the point where we
agreed to have the private session.
A.
A. No, I can't say that. I can just say that there was concern generally. Whether they were opposed to Sergeant McCabe giving evidence at all, I'm not quite sure, but they certainly wanted to make sure that matters were conducted in a way that was within the remit and that was legally proofed, if you like, by the 14:48 legal people in the Oireachtas.
579 Q. We11, you have cleared up a matter today in relation to your perception of the meeting that you had on the 24th January, and that this, as far as you were concerned, wasn't a secret meeting, even though you hadn't told the clerk of the Committee or other Committee members that you were attending the meeting, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's been put to you on behalf of Mr. Callinan that he brought the three matters that I referred to in the draft letter that I referred to when you were giving your evidence yesterday, that he brought these to the table at the meeting, as it were, and he raised them with you, and you have denied that he did so?
A. Yes.

581 Q. Had he done so, was there any reason why you wouldn't have brought that back to the Committee to be discussed and to tell them that you had met with the Commissioner and that these were his proposals?
A. Well, first of all, just for clarification, there is a clerk to the Committee, that is a civil servant acting in the interests of the Committee. So there is no researcher, there's no, you know, support, as it were, other than that. We rely on the Comptroller and Auditor General's report. So in the context of attending meetings with, whether it was Maurice McCabe or John wilson or indeed the Commissioner or indeed many others that have come before the committee, I would meet them, as Chairman, and I would meet them on my own, because generally it's just on a point of clarification on how the meeting operates. It's pretty daunting for anyone to appear before a committee of politicians, and so on, without firstly knowing what they are getting into. So your question then is?
582 Q. We11, if, as has been suggested to you, that proposals were brought --
A. Sorry, yes.

583 Q. -- to the table with you, was there any reason why you wouldn't have alerted your colleagues on the Committee to those proposals?
A. No, I would have pointed the Commissioner to the standard working practice, that his office would contact the clerk with written confirmation of what was required by him, and then, thereafter, the Committee would have considered that, I'm sure. We consider all of our correspondence prior to meetings. The correspondence, it's either noted or it's put up in terms of the public website for information. Most of
it, during the course of those five years, the correspondence was made public. So the Commissioner was well aware of all of that. I couldn't have taken a verbal instruction from the Commissioner, in spite of the fact that that didn't happen, but if it were to happen, it would have had to happen in writing. Just as much as when Sergeant McCabe wanted to appear before the Committee, that had to be done by way of appropriate correspondence and engagement with the secretariat.
584 Q. Apparently, sergeant McCabe actually sought time from the Committee to get legal advice --
A. He did, yes.

585 Q. -- in relation to whether or not he would give evidence to the Committee?
A. Sorry, that he got legal advice?

586 Q. Yes.
A. I presume that he did, yes.

587 Q. Just to come back to what I was asking you there in relation to why you didn't tell the other Committee members that you had had this meeting with Commissioner Callinan, after the meeting, right? Why didn't you tell them that you'd had the meeting?
A. Because the content of what was being said to me by the Commissioner at that time had absolutely nothing really 14:52 to do with the substance of the investigation by the Public Accounts Committee.

588 Q. And I think you gave evidence yesterday that you didn't want to repeat a rumour again that was already in
circulation about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yeah, the letters that have been brought to my attention today, I wasn't aware of those from other members, so it is quite clear, as you, Chairman, have said, it's a mist that doesn't take a form. This was a 14:53 pretty thick, heavy mist that hung over Leinster House for quite some time.

589 Q. We know that Sergeant McCabe gave evidence in private on 30th January. I think, did you communicate with the Commissioner to advise him --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that a decision had been made that Sergeant McCabe's evidence would be heard --
A. I think that I may have called him to inform him of that, yes. He was informed of it, anyway, at a meeting.

591 Q. And between the 24th January and the 30th January, did the Committee receive any representations at all from Commissioner Callinan?
A. Not that I'm aware of, not that I'm aware of.

592 Q. You referred yesterday to pressure that had been applied to the Committee not to take evidence from Sergeant McCabe other than that what you perceived to be pressure from Commissioner Callinan. I just want to refer you to a series of text messages involving the Equality, Mr. Brian Purcel1. They are at page 1686 of the material. This is in volume 6.
A. 1686?

593 Q. 1686, yes.
A. Yes.

594 Q. You see there, the first one is, it says "me", that is from Commissioner Callinan, and it's dated 22nd January 2014 at nearly five to seven in the evening. It says:
"Brian, the clerk of the PAC was not available, but I spoke to another official of the PAC who is also dealing with the issue. She confirmed that the whistleblower will not be there tomorrow."

And then the response to that, I think, is from Commissioner Callinan, and it says:
"Thanks, Brian."

So, sorry, that "me" is, in fact, from Brian Purcell, all right? And then on the $23 / 1 / 2014$, to Commissioner Callinan from Brian Purcell:
"Well done. Exceptional performance under fire."

I think that may be in relation to the evidence that had been given by Martin Callinan. And then we see the 24th January of 2014 at nearly quarter to six in the evening, from Mr. Purcell:
"Martin, know you are on route to Dundalk. Can you cal1 me, if possible. Just wondering how you got on
with J McG."

I presume that is John McGuinness. And then it is signed off "Brian". So it is quite clear that Mr. Purcell was being kept up-to-date at that stage in relation to whatever --
A. This is the Secretary General of the Department of Justice.
Q. Yes.
A. An interesting relationship.

596 Q. Yes. Did you receive any communication from Mr. Purcell?
A. This is the first time $I$ have seen this, these texts.

597 Q. First time you have seen this. Or did you receive any other communications from the Department of Justice to try and dissuade you from calling Sergeant McCabe to give evidence?
A. No, and they'd know better.
Q. Pardon?
A. They would know better. Because the Public Accounts Committee is an independent Committee and functions in conjunction with the Comptroller and Auditor General. I find these exchange of texts here unusual, and I note there is not a reply from Commissioner Callinan to the last text.

599 Q. Yeah. We11, there's a request for a phone call. Unfortunately, the records that we have don't indicate whether a phone call was, in fact, made?
A. It would be interesting to hear the result of that
telephone call.
CHAIRMAN: Well, I think if you phone from the Department of Justice, what happens is you are actually phoning from a generic number, so we can't say who phoned who at any particular time.
A. Mr. Purce11 might enlighten us as to what the Commissioner had to say about that -CHAIRMAN: Sure. Yes. MR. MARRINAN: Thank you very much, Deputy.

MR. MCGUINNESS WAS QUESTIONED BY THE CHAIRMAN:

600 Q. CHAIRMAN: Deputy, I'm entitled to ask you some questions, and I am sure you are relieved to know that I don't really have any, apart from asking, if you wouldn't mind, and it literally goes in one eye and goes out the other, I would just like to have a look at the famous notebook, if you wouldn't mind, from 2014, if you have it there. Do you have it?
A. Certainly, yes.

601 Q. CHAIRMAN: Would you mind if I have a look, please? (Notebook handed to Chairman.)

And do you mind if I just flick through it?
A. Oh, no, work away.

602 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Obvious7y, as I say, I don't tend to remember these things. I'm not going to...
A. It's interesting to see what you have to do to get elected.

603 Q. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon?
A. It might be interesting for you to see what we have to do to get elected.
Q. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm sure you do everything that is legitimate to get elected.
A. Only what is legitimate. people to the contrary, as you know. I don't mean in this country. So, basically, your methodology seems to be you go down to your local shop and you just buy a hard copy and that's your vade mecum. Do you bring this around with you all the time, is that the idea?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAIRMAN: Like, it goes in the car, it's in the constituency office, it goes into the Dáil. Presumably there would have to have been occasions where you've left it behind and -- like forgetting your keys, or whatever?
A. I might have done that on occasion. But the book is important from the point of view of following up on your constituency notes and taking notes as you go from 14:59 either meeting to meeting or in the car as you meet people.
607 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes. You use a range of different pens, which is kind of understandable; they're all biros?
A. Sorry?

608 Q. CHAIRMAN: You use biros and you use a range --
A. I just use a biro, I use a fountain pen.

609 Q. CHAIRMAN: Do you?
A. Also.

610 Q. CHAIRMAN: Really? what's the --
A. It controls my handwriting.

611 Q. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, yes. What is the significance of, I know you have said it already, but it's just odd, if you just take any particular page, the ticks, the circles?
A. The ticks are constituency work that has been completed, on your left-hand page as you look down on it.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. There isn't a tick on that particular page that you just showed me and that is probably relevant to some other issue.
613 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. And you will see on some of the pages that are marked, that on those pages they refer to other accounts from whistleblowers and they are marked with, I think, brackets, so that if I were to be flicking through it at any time, I would see the different markings.
614 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Is your memory very good? I mean, it's very hard to remember people's names, phone numbers, what you're supposed to inquire of in relation to on their behalf, etcetera, but, in general, do you have a good memory?
A. Oh, I'd remember.

615 Q. CHAIRMAN: what?
A. I remember.

616 Q. CHAIRMAN: Are you like the world famous politician from America who remembers 50,000 names?
A. I remember names and I remember people.

617 Q. CHAIRMAN: I think it's 5,000 names.
A. I also remember the issues.

618 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes. But in order to make sure you have done it, just the whole point of it is to use this thing?
A. Yes, and to ensure that the 11,900 will remember me the next time.

619 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes. And I am failing to find the right page. Mr. Kavanagh, would you mind?
A. I think it is marked with a green tab.

620 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes, there is a few things marked. Is there any significance to the tabs? I mean, you put them on for the purpose of the Tribunal?
A. No, no, I had them on before that because they referred to matters that were not constituency matters and refer to whistleblowers.

621 Q. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
A. I think that is what you see.

622 Q. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, Mr. Kavanagh will give it back 15:02 to you. Would you mind opening it at the page that everyone has been talking about for the last two days. It's a blue sticker. The other individual who is mentioned there, with a mobile phone number, name John, I won't mention the second name, is that anything to do 15:03 with anything? It comes close to the reference to dog food. If you wouldn't mind having a quick look.
A. Possibly the supplier's address -- or phone number. It's nothing to do with the note. CHAIRMAN: No, it's in a different pen. Just, if you wouldn't mind looking at it. Well, it's a pretty -well, it's not a common name. Do you see actually within the circle, there's a reference to dog food and then --
A. Oh, yes, yeah.
Q. CHAIRMAN: Matter?
A. Yeah.

626 Q. CHAIRMAN: And the reference to dog food is there presumably because you keep dogs?
A. I do. German Shepherds.

627 Q. CHAIRMAN: And you breed them?
A. I do, yeah. They keep me sane.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, I won't say anything about that. Thank you, Deputy.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Chairman, I wonder could I have legal indulgence, if you don't mind? I omitted to ask two things.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: I will be very -- they are not enormous matters, but just in case they were felt to be important.

MR. MCGUINNESS WAS FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINED BY
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS:

628 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Can I just mention this, Deputy

McGuinness, before you disappear. I had been putting the account of former Commissioner Callinan to you in relation to the car park meeting, and you had given evidence, $I$ think, or certainly in your statement there was a suggestion that, at the end of it, he put, I think you said, his hand on your shoulder or on your arm and made some remark, do you remember that?
A. Yes.

629 Q.
Right. I just want to suggest to you that, in fact, the sign-off, the end of the meeting, in fact, was my client indicating to you, requesting that you keep him informed on the issue as to whether it's going to be -Sergeant McCabe's evidence will be held in private or in public, and that was the sign-off of the meeting, a11 right?
A. No. The sign-off of the meeting was, when he began to exit the passenger side, he reached back in and caught me by the arm and he told me I was in real trouble and so was PAC.

630 Q. Just for the record, I want you to be aware he denies that, all right?
A. Fine.

631 Q. And the other matter is, I should have mentioned this to you earlier, when he initially got into the car, my client's recollection is, in fact, that you had moved papers from the front passenger seat and put them into the back, which he took to be an indication he should sit into the car. It was his intention to sit into the car, but, in any event, that was his recollection that
is something you did. Do you recall that?
A. I do. As he approached the passenger side, the car was full of papers and files, and I simply moved them to the back seat to allow him to sit in, because it was clear that is what he was going to do. this, and it arises from what you said to Mr. Marrinan there a few moments ago: The reference to certain things not being followed up on to the PAC after this meeting in the car park, and I should have done this earlier, but would you mind just briefly looking at page 683 of the materials, which does actually have a document that bears on that issue.
A. which volume is that?

633 Q. Sorry, it's volume 2, Deputy McGuinness.
A. Yes. what page?

634 Q. Page 683.
A. Yeah.
Q. It's a little bit indistinct on the screen, but what this is, is a press release issued by An Garda Síochána 15:06 regarding the Public Accounts Committee, and it was released on -- it was issued on the 29th January 2014, which is the day before Sergeant McCabe was due to give his evidence and it had been announced he was going to give his evidence, because it had been decided on, just 15:07 to give you the time line, and you might indicate if you disagree with any of this; the PAC met on Tuesday 28th January 2014 and decided that he would give his evidence in private, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

636 Q. That was the 28 th, it was a Tuesday. That was communicated to my client. And then on Wednesday the 29th, An Garda Síochána issued this press release having been now told he was going to give his evidence in private to their relief, all right. And $I$ just want to direct your attention to it, so you have an opportunity of dealing with it, there's a reference to certain issues in the first three paragraphs and then in the second-last paragraph he says the following:
"I am aware that the Public Accounts Committee has decided to invite a serving member of the force before it tomorrow. while I continue to have reservations about this matter, $I$ note that the meeting will be held 15:08 in private. I note, too, that it appears to be the intention to confine the questioning of the person concerned and, in particular, that person will not be able to make allegations against his colleagues or members of the public."

And then the following is said:
"Despite my reservations, $I$ believe that in all circumstances it would not be in the public interest for An Garda Síochána to pursue the question of legal proceedings against an Oireachtas committee. Were such an action to succeed, it would have consequences that extend we11 beyond the present case. I have every
respect for the role of the Public Accounts Committee and have no doubt too that it will act strictly in accordance with the legal advice it has received in dealing with this matter. Ultimately, I believe the investigation that the Minister for Justice, Equality and Defence has asked the Garda Síochána Ombudsman Commission to undertake is the proper manner in which to investigate the allegation that has been made and the circumstances surrounding it. An Garda Síochána will of course cooperate fully with that investigation and will learn any lessons that are to be learned when that investigation is concluded. Finally, I wish to thank the Chairman of the Committee, Deputy John McGuinness, for the courtesy he has shown me in dealing with the difficult matter."

Do you see that there?
A. Yeah.

637 Q. And really, the point I'm directing your attention to is that there is reference to the issue of bringing
proceedings against the PAC and this press release is making it clear that it is, however undesirable that might have been, it's been decided not to do that now that it has been indicated to hold Sergeant McCabe's evidence in private. Do you understand the point I'm making?
A. That he wasn't going to contest in court --

638 Q. Yes.
A. -- the decision that we had made.
Q. Because his lobbying on the point, his correspondence on the point and his meeting with you in part succeeded and he believes resulted in ultimately the PAC deciding not to call the evidence in public?
A. He didn't part succeed with me in anything. It was the 15:10 Committee that decided.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Thanks very much.

MR. MCGUINNESS WAS FURTHER QUESTIONED BY THE CHAIRMAN:
Q. CHAIRMAN: Just by way of a matter of interest, after the meeting in the car park, did you contact Commissioner Callinan, I mean within -- prior to Maurice McCabe giving evidence?
A. I think he was told that it would be in private session.
Q. CHAIRMAN: He was told by whom, do you think?
A. By me.

642 Q. CHAIRMAN: You think you rang him?
A. I think there was a phone call afterwards, which -- he asked me -- no, sorry, after the decision was made.
A. Because the previous week it had been said that we were hearing this and that we would decide -- next Thursday, and that there would be a decision taken in private or public session.
Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. And I think either I or the clerk informed him it was private session.

645 Q. CHAIRMAN: And there's been a couple of dates mentioned, but is the date when Sergeant McCabe gave evidence, in fact, Thursday the 30th?
A. Of January?

646 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes. It is?
A. Yes, I'm sure of that.

647 Q. CHAIRMAN: And did somebody phone Commissioner Callinan that morning to say --
A. I can't tell you that. No, I would imagine that after the meeting on the Tuesday, where the decision was formally taken --

648 Q. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. -- if that was the date, that after that he would have been informed.
649 Q. CHAIRMAN: Do you think you rang?
A. Either I or the clerk would have rang him, yes. I'm sure, I'm reasonably sure of that.
650 Q. CHAIRMAN: But you have no recollection of any --
A. No, I do know that he was informed.

651 Q. CHAIRMAN: Did you have his mobile telephone number? 15:11
A. That is how I contacted him. CHAIRMAN: That is fine.
A. I had it from the previous -- the meeting for the 24th. CHAIRMAN: A11 right. Thank you, Deputy McGuinness. That is it. It's been a long couple of days, but there 15:11 it is.
A. Thanks be to God.

MR. MCENROY: Judge, I wonder could I raise a small procedural matter, if possible?

CHAIRMAN: We11, can Deputy McGuinness go?
MR. MCENROY: Oh, absolutely. I apologise.
A. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MCENROY: I hope to give you good news, which is that I have extremely limited representation here. My role is very minor. I am for Mrs. Taylor. I have been present for Mr. McGuinness. I had intended to ask the permission to leave the Tribunal and only to come back when my client and her husband were giving evidence, for that purpose alone. I was quite surprised that Mr. McGuinness, for former Commissioner Callinan, made a reference directly to my client. I'm not going to get involved in that today, but if there is any question that former Commissioner Callinan is giving evidence about my client, I would like notice of the fact to decide whether or not I should reapply to you to come in to be here for that. I want to indicate that I would prefer not to be here.
CHAIRMAN: No, no, that is perfectly reasonable. And indeed people are not attending unless it relates to their client. The sum now, as this has started, that it actually does relate to their client, but, as I say, yours is very peripheral.
MR. MCENROY: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN: And so that's fine. And Ms. Ní Gabhann and Ms. Herlihy will keep an eye on that just to see if you are mentioned in any way.

MR. MCENROY: I am very grateful to the Tribunal, especially to the solicitor, and $I$ can say she gave us
great help. And with your permission, we will leave, if that is okay?
CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms. Mullan will be informed, and she will give you a call, I am sure, if anything comes up. But if it just something terribly small or petty, you will appreciate that, I don't know, the colour of somebody's car or whatever, if it's in any way something that would impact on your reputation, yes, we will contact you.
MR. MCENROY: Can I just indicate, in her statement at 15:13 page 24 and 25 , she had already provided an answer to the question Mr. o'Higgins raised, but it will come up in due course when she gives her own evidence.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is fine.
MR. MCENROY: Judge, I am very grateful. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: Was there something else?
A. No, no, am I free to go?

CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, definitely.
A. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

MS. LEADER: The next witness, sir, is Garda Paul Hynes. His statement is at page 1423, Volume 6 of the materials. MS. LEADER AS FOLLOWS:

652 Q. MS. LEADER: Garda Hynes, if you would outline your career in An Garda Síochána to date, please?
A. I joined the force on the 28th February 1984, and after my training in Templemore I was stationed in Donnybrook Garda Station, which I stayed for about seven years. Then I moved on to the Traffic Corps, for seven years. Then I moved onto the ministerial pool, based in the Phoenix Park.

CHAIRMAN: So you're here in Dublin Castle?
A. I was here in Dublin Castle in the Traffic Corps and then I moved to the Phoenix Park, which would house the ministerial fleet. I was in the pool for about a year or so, and then -- about maybe a year-and-a-half, and then I took up with then-Minister Brian Cowen, I was seven years as his driver, and I was back into the pool for about a year or so and then I started to drive Commissioner Fachtna Murphy and then Commissioner Callinan and then Commissioner Nóirín o'sullivan, and now I'm with Deputy Commissioner Ó Cualáin -- sorry, Interim or Acting Commissioner Ó Cualáin.
653 Q. MS. LEADER: And if you would tell us about your tour of duty on the 24th January 2014, please?
A. Yes. On the 24th January 2014 I went to the then-Commissioner Martin Callinan's house and picked him up at about approximately 7:20 and I conveyed him to the Garda HQ. We arrived in Garda HQ in around the
eight o'clock mark and he went to his office, and then at approximately $2: 15$-- I knew, I conveyed him to Dundalk Garda Station.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Can I just stop you there. Possibly Ms. Leader has mentioned this to you already, but we don't want to upset the family by mentioning any names.
A. I understand, Chairman. There was a press conference, I think, scheduled for that morning in Dundalk, and it was a little bit delayed, but it took place - I think there might have been -- after the press conference, there might have been a little meeting with the Commissioner and one or two maybe chiefs, or whatever, and then I conveyed him then to Bewley's Hotel in Dublin, in the car park in Dublin, and we -- it took us about an hour and fifteen minutes, or so, to get there. The traffic was a little bit heavy. As I pulled into the car park, I parked off to the -- as I went through the entrance, there is a railing on the right-hand side of the car park and I faced the car into the railing with the back of the car -- the hote1, the hotel entrance was behind me. After a short period of time, I noticed the car with Deputy McGuinness arriving into the car park. At that stage, Deputy Commissioner -or, sorry, Deputy McGuinness parked his car behind ours. That was about maybe in another kind of section of the car park, so his car would be between our car and the entrance to the hote1. At that stage, the then-Commissioner said to me, I'll be back in a few minutes. He left the car, went over to Deputy

McGuinness's car and got into the car. The meeting lasted for approximately twenty minutes or so, and then he came back into the car I was driving and said "let's go". We left the car park then and proceeded back towards Dundalk, as there was another -- there was another thing I had to do in Dundalk on that evening in around the 7:30 mark.
Q. MS. LEADER: And just in relation to times of your trip back to Dublin to meet Deputy McGuinness, what time do you think you arrived back to Dublin, to Bewley's?
A. I'd say approximately in around the 5:00pm, possibly before, maybe.
Q. Okay. And insofar as you arrived back to Dundalk, do you have any time in your mind for that?
A. Back to Dundalk, we had to be there before half seven, so in or around quarter past seven, give or take, Chairman.

656 Q. And the travelling time between the two locations, do you have any estimate?
A. It's always roughly around, depending on traffic, obviously, between an hour and a quarter or an hour and a half, in or about.

657 Q. Now, Garda Hynes, I'm not aware of whether you would know on a day-to-day basis where you'd be conveying a Commissioner to, but as far as you were concerned, was this a scheduled meeting or a scheduled journey to Dublin on the 24th January?
A. A schedule to Bewley's?

658 Q. Yes.
A. No, it wasn't a scheduled. We get a schedule, if I could explain, Chairman, possibly at the start of the week, where certain meetings or functions are marked in on the diary of the Commissioner and we kind of work off that. But that particular one wasn't on the -- as far as I'm aware, wasn't on the schedule for that day. 659 Q. And do you know when you became aware that you would have to travel back to Dublin from Dundalk?
A. As far as I'm aware, I knew we were coming back to Dublin, but I was informed -- to my recollection, I was 15:21 informed by the then-Commissioner on the way back to Dub7in, I don't know exactly where, but that we had to go to Bewley's Hotel.
660 Q. okay. And when did you know that you had to go back to Dublin? Was it -- were you in Dundalk at that stage or 15:21 was it at the beginning of your day's work?
A. Em...

661 Q. Or can you remember?
A. I can't really remember. It's when the press conference was over, and possibly, as I said, there might have been a meeting for a few minutes after the press conference, but usually we go back to base at that stage, unless we have another function pending in Dundalk, which we didn't have that day.
662 Q. Right. And insofar as it's relevant, can you remember whether it was raining or not when you got back to Dublin and were parked in Bewley's?
A. Yeah, I remember it was a showery day and the showers were heavy, but in between it was sunshine. So it was
kind of a showery sunshine day.
A. I think for the press conference he was, but on the way back to Dublin he had put, you know, a jacket, he had taken off the tunic and the hat and had possibly a dark-coloured jacket. I could be wrong, but I think that's what he had, what he was wearing. And insofar as it is suggested by people that it was a secret meeting, from your vantage point in the car park 15:22 in Bewley's was there any element of subterfuge about the meeting?
A. I don't think so. The car park was quiet. There was people coming and going to the hotel, but from my estimation, I'm not really sure, but I wouldn't put it down as being a secret meeting.

665 Q. Everybody acted totally normally?
A. As far as I was concerned, it was just another meeting.
Q. Did you notice was Commissioner Callinan on the phone at any time on the trips to and from Dublin?
A. I'm a bit hazy on that. There's a possibility he was, but I can't be sure.

667 Q. And can you comment in any way who he was on the phone to, if you're not sure or --
A. No.

668 Q. Or do you have any recollection at a11?
A. I have no recollection of -- I have no recollection of whether the phone calls took place, or, if they did take place, who he was on to.

669 Q. Did he have any conversation with you in relation to what had transpired between himself and Deputy McGuinness?
A. No. The Commissioner was always quiet, he never discussed anything bar, we'11 say, sport, or something, 15:23 with me in the car. So when he arrived back to the car, it was "let's go", or words to that effect, and, as I said, we made our way back towards Dundalk. The day before, he had been in Leinster House. Had you driven him on that day?
A. Yes.

671 Q. Did he at any time pass any comment on the day he had spent before the Public Accounts Committee?
A. No, as I say, he keeps his own counse1. I just drive, and he keeps his thoughts to himself.
672 Q. A11 right. Now, you're based in Garda Headquarters, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

673 Q. Now, a former witness to the Tribunal has suggested that the rumour mill was in full flow in Garda
Headquarters in 2014 - that's Superintendent Frank Walsh - in relation to Sergeant McCabe. Did you hear any of those rumours?
A. No, Judge -- sorry, Chairman. I'm usually -- I work an awful lot by myself and I have my own way of doing
things. I don't get involved with chat, either on my week on or on my week off. I just go in and do my work, get away from it, as soon as I can. That's the way I operate. So I don't listen or I don't partake in
any chat in relation to rumours or anything like that. I just -- I just don't.
674 Q. And were you aware yourself that there had been an allegation made in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. only what I --
Q. of criminal misconduct?
A. No, no, I did not.
Q. No ?
A. No.

677 Q. You weren't aware of that?
A. No, I wasn't aware, no.

678 Q. All right. Are you familiar with Superintendent Taylor? Do you know him?
A. I know Superintendent Taylor, yes, Dave Taylor.

679 Q. And did you have any discussions with
Superintendent Taylor in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, absolutely not.

680 Q. And were you privy to my conversations that the former Commissioner may have had with Superintendent Taylor in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No. On a few occasions Superintendent Taylor would have been with us in the car, travelling to, we'll say, functions or press conferences or such, but I can't recall any conversations with that name being mentioned.
MS. LEADER: All right. Thank you very much, Garda Hynes. If you would answer any questions anybody else might have.
A. Absolutely, absolutely.

## GARDA HYNES WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MS. BURNS:

681 Q. MS. BURNS: Yes, Garda Hynes, on behalf of Superintendent Taylor my name is Tara Burns and I have a few short questions for you. As you began your evidence to Ms. Leader, you referred to the fact that you had a recollection that the conference, the press conference that was to be held was postponed for a period of time?
A. Yes, for a couple of minutes. That's my recollection now. I mean, the day that was in it, it's four years ago, it was a day like any other day for me, and nothing really stood out on that particular day. So, my times, I used the word "approximately", and I am not one hundred percent sure on the times, but I know there was a slight delay for a couple of minutes. I vaguely remember that.
682 Q. In fairness to you, your role is obviously to drive the Commissioner --
A. Correct.

683 Q. -- and to get him to wherever he needs to be, and I assume whatever he is doing there, you don't really have an interest or a role in relation to that?
A. Well, no, I wouldn't be -- I'd be a little bit away, if 15:27 you can understand. If he was in the next room, I wouldn't be too far away, that's my job. And if he was moving around, I'd be a bit of a distance away, but not too far away, if you kind of -- it's not -- I wouldn't
be real close protection as such, but I wouldn't be too far away if something happened.
684 Q. In terms of the day in question, you have referred to Ms. Leader that, on occasion, Superintendent Taylor would have travelled with you?
A. Correct.

685 Q. Can you recollect whether he travelled on that day in question?
A. I don't think so. My recollection of that day was that he had gone to Dundalk previous to us.
686 Q. That accords with my instructions, that is what you recollect?
A. Yes, that would be my recollection. I'm nearly one hundred percent sure that he wasn't in the car with us travelling up, but he had travelled, obviously, ahead of us to talk to the press or whatever happens before the press conference.
687 Q. That accords with my instructions. Now, in your statement that you provided to the Tribunal, you refer to, in your recollection, and obviously it's a number of years that you're providing this statement and thinking back on the day in question, the statement was provided on the 26th September 2017, but you refer to collecting Mr. Callinan at about quarter past two with an anticipated time of arrival at Dundalk for half three?
A. That would be the case, yeah.

688 Q. That's what you have set out in your statement?
A. Yes, in my statement. But as I said, those times now
are an approximate.
689 Q. I see.
A. I wouldn't be one hundred percent sure on exactly the correct time.
Q. And that is what I wanted to ask you about, because the information appears to be that the press conference in fact had been scheduled for earlier in the day, not that much earlier, but it had been scheduled for three o'clock. Having informed you of that, does that ring any bells?
A. No.
A. No, three o'clock, no. Well, if we had left in around the two o'clock mark and it was scheduled for three o'clock, maybe that is possibly why the little bit of a delay was, maybe we could have been late getting there, I'm not sure. As I said, nothing really stands out to --

692 Q. Well, I assume in terms of driving from Dublin the plan would have been to have been in time for the press conference?
A. Yes, it would, yeah.

693 Q. And certainly Superintendent Taylor has a note in his diary that refers to the conference being scheduled for 3:00pm?
A. Yes.

694 Q. And Mr. Andrew McLindon, I assume you know who I am speaking about, he refers in his statement to the Tribunal that the conference was to be held at three?
A. Yes.

695 Q. So is it likely that you would have left Dublin late?
A. Late, as in?

696 Q. At quarter past two, as you've indicated, to arrive for half three?
A. Possibility we left earlier.

697 Q. You may not be right in times at all in relation to this?
A. I may not be right on -- I might be -- yes, exactly, I mightn't be exactly right on the time.

698 Q. I suppose to cut to the chase in terms of what my interest is in relation to this --
A. Okay.

699 Q. -- is that Superintendent Taylor has a recollection of the conference having been postponed prior to you going to Dublin with the Commissioner and the conference then having taken place after you returned back from Dublin. Do you have any comment to make in relation to that?
A. Well, my recollection of us coming back to Dundalk that evening was that we went directly to the place where -- 15:31 not back to the station for a press conference. As far as I was aware, the press conference had taken place on that afternoon.

700 Q. I see.
A. Rather than, what was it, seven o'clock in the evening, 15:31 I don't think it -- from my recollection, I don't think -- as I said, it occurred, as far as I was aware, in the afternoon rather than at night. That is my recollection.

701 Q. Are you basing that on an assumption that you got back in time for the scheduled requirement of half seven for the event that you had to --
A. Yes, as far as I can remember, we went directly back to that location without stopping off at any other location. That is my recollection.
Q. Is there a possibility that Superintendent Taylor could be right about this, that there was a press conference and then the event that you attended?
A. Well, that is my recollection.

703 Q. I see. Do you recollect going anywhere else in Dundalk that day in relation to the events that you were attending Dundalk for?
A. My recollection, again, is that we drove straight to Dundalk Garda Station and that was where we had -that's where the event happened, and we left from Dundalk Station. That's my recollection.

704 Q. And do you have any recollection of having any interaction with Mrs. Callinan, whether she attended the event that you needed to be back in Dundalk for half seven?
A. There is, there is a possibility -- I'm trying to think now.

705 Q. I realise that --
A. Yeah.

706 Q. -- it's a long time to think back to.
A. As far as I'm aware, Mrs. Callinan was at that function in the evening. Now, whether she travelled with us from Dublin to that function or travelled with somebody
Q. You've no recollection of --
A. I don't have a recollection of her being in the car and me travelling back, no. There is a possibility, but I'm hazy on it. As I said, it's four years ago, it's difficult.

MR. BURNS: I see. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you. MR. DIGNAM: Chairman, $I$ just have a few brief questions.

## GARDA HYNES WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. DIGNAM:

708
Q. MR. DIGNAM: Garda Hynes, just in relation to your role as Garda driver, you're an official Garda driver for the Commissioner, isn't that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And as I understand it, and you might correct me if I am wrong for the benefit of the Tribunal, there are two assigned drivers, is that right?
A. Yes.

710 Q. And you work week on/week off?
A. That's correct.

711 Q. So this week just happened to be your week on duty driving the Commissioner, is that right?
A. No, I am actually off this week.

712 Q. No, no, sorry, it's the week in question? Sorry.
A. The week in question, yes, I was, yes, sorry.

713 Q. And in the event that either you or the other assigned
driver happened to be on leave, how is that vacancy filled?
A. Yeah. We11, the system that we have is that we have two units, two units, and we work week on/week off. So
when I'm on the week I was assigned or I would be assigned to the Commissioner, but there is a pool of about six to eight drivers that fill in for -- if the President's driver was sick or if he was on leave, the people would be drawn from that pool. So there's a pool on either side, on either week, a pool of six on one week and a pool of six on the other week. And as I said, if people are sick or on leave, the replacement for me would be drawn from that pool.
714 Q. But in any event, you were working that week?
A. I was working that week, yes.

715 Q. And you brought the Commissioner to Dundalk and back from Dundalk. Just when travel1ing back from Dundalk to Dublin, did the Commissioner -- I presume the Commissioner told you where you had to go, where he wanted you to go?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And did he tell you who he was going to meet there?
A. Yes. He told me that he was going to Bewley's Hotel to meet Deputy John McGuinness.
717 Q. Now, you described that, I think in response to Dublin, or specifically the trip to Bewley's Hotel for this meeting as not a scheduled event?
A. Correct.

718 Q. Am I correct in my understanding that there are times when you travelled out of Dublin, for example, and you may do [inaudible] there, visit local stations, for example, that aren't a scheduled event?
A. That would be normal enough if we were in Mayo, or something like that, or going to the main station in sligo, there's a possibility we may visit outlying stations, you know, just for a couple of minutes to go in and see the local sergeant or guard or -- that can happen, yeah.
A. No, no, Chairman.
Q. MR. DIGNAM: Just then in relation to your timings, you very fairly in your answers to Ms. Burns said that you're hazy on the timings. Is it fair to say, you might correct me if I am wrong, Garda Hynes, is it fair to say that you are trying to reconstruct the timings working backwards from when you believe you arrived back in Dundalk?
A. Yeah, it would be fair enough to say that because, as I 15:36 said, it's difficult to pick out a particular day, you know, four years ago. But I know that, as I said, that function at 7:30 in the evening was a definite. We had to be there and we were there, and I think we were
there, as I said, about ten or fifteen minutes
beforehand. So kind of working a little bit back from that in relation to times and travel times from Dublin to Dundalk.

721 Q.
when you were travelling either from Dundalk to Dublin or back from Dublin to Dundalk, did you listen to the radio?
A. Well, the Commissioner, as far as I'm aware, turned the radio on and listened to whatever, RTÉ One or the news or whatever was coming on at four, I think.
well, I think from that qualification, I think you may not be able to answer my next question, Garda Hynes, but do you remember hearing anything of relevance to the events that we're discussing here on the radio?
A. No.

723 Q. On either the leg down or the leg back?
A. No, I have no recollection.

MR. DIGNAM: Thank you, Garda Hynes.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
A. Thank you, Chairman.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

MR. MCGUINNESS: Chairman, the next witness is Mr. John Deasy, Teachta Dála.
Chairman: Yes. Mr. Deasy is not a long witness, I don't think, Mr. McGuinness?

MR. MCGUINNESS: Pardon?
CHAIRMAN: He is not a long witness?

MR. MCGUINNESS: I wouldn't anticipate. CHAIRMAN: No, no.

MR. JOHN DEASY, HAVING BEEN SWORN, WAS EXAMINED BY MR. MCGUINNESS:

MR. McGUINNESS: Just for the benefit of my colleagues and you, Chairman, Mr. Deasy made a statement to the Tribunal on 10th March 2017. That is to be found at Volume 6, page 1503. And he was also interviewed by the Tribunal investigators, and his statement to the investigators is to be found at Volume 6 at page 1490.

Mr. Deasy, you probably have a copy of the statements yourself, but I will be asking you some questions about 15:39 them and if you wish to refer to any of the other paper volumes in due course --
A. I just have my own statement.

724 Q. -- you can take the documents from your left if need be or watch any documents on screen.
A. Okay.

725 Q. Mr. Deasy, I think you have been a Teachta Dála for a number of years, and in the period we are concerned about, you were a member of the Public Accounts Committee between 2011 and 2016, is that correct?
A. Yes.

726 Q. And I think immediately prior to the establishment of the Tribunal you gave an interview to Prime Time which was broadcast on RTÉ on the evening of Tuesday, 14th

February 2017, do you recal1 that?
A. Yes.

727 Q. And that was broadcast, and RTÉ have provided us with a copy of the broadcast on a DVD, but I'm going to refer you to a transcript of the audio of that broadcast, and 15:40 I don't know if you have that, but, if not, it's to be found in volume 6 at page 1456, commencing there. So if you would care to take the volume from your left-hand side, that might assist you.
A. What is the reference again?

728 Q. 1456.
A. Okay, thanks.
Q. Now, on the first page of that, at the top, the broadcast showed a very short clip of you doing a piece to camera as an introduction by Miriam O'Callaghan there, do you see that?
A. Yeah, I see the reference, yeah.

730 Q. The interview with you, in fact, commences slightly later. If we go to page 1470 , I think Ms. Hannon was the interviewer, and your piece starts towards the bottom of the page there in 1470. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

731 Q. And you say in reference to this PAC meeting:
"Before the meeting, I was approached by a very senior guard and he proceeded to make some very derogatory comments about Maurice McCabe, the nature of which, you know, were, you know, Maurice McCabe couldn't be believed or couldn't be trusted on anything. They were
very, very derogatory. It was, you know, a serious attack and strongly worded. Maurice McCabe was in the Public Accounts Committee the following Thursday and I thought that he was credible and I made that judgment."

Just, I think the senior guard you're referring to there was Commissioner Callinan at the time?
A. Correct.

732 Q. And you identified in your statement to the Tribunal, given on the 10th March, that he was that senior guard?
A. Correct.

733 Q. And could you just describe how he approached you?
A. The guards were already in the coffee dock and I was on my way to Committee, I stopped off to get a coffee, and he was standing, I believe, with Nóirín O'Sullivan, former Commissioner, and --
Q. Had you met him before?
A. Yeah, I had, maybe once, you know, once or twice. But I knew Nóirín better, former Commissioner O'Sullivan. She tapped him on the arm and I think he just turned around and put his hand out.

735 Q. Okay. And just, as I understand it, the coffee dock is in the new committee wing on the left side of Leinster House, it's down on the -- you go down one set of stairs into the committee building and it's a public space where there is room to congregate and have a coffee?
A. Yes. It would have been quite normal for the gardaí to assemble there --
Q. Or any of them?
A. It, very typically, you know, whether it's the

Secretary General or whoever, you would meet them before going into the committee rooms - in other words, there or below.

739 Q. Yes. And it's your recollection that Deputy Commissioner tapped him on the --
A. Yeah, I think Nóirín O'Sullivan, former Commissioner, she tapped him. I was on my way to them, I suppose I knew former Commissioner O'Sullivan, and I think it was 15:43 me approaching them and him turning around and just we shook hands. It was just a meeting like that.
Q. Yes.
A. -- before a committee meeting.
Q. And you hadn't been scheduled to meet him, is that right?
A. No, not at all.
Q. Or any of them?

Q. Yes, yes. And did you introduce yourself or did you need to introduce yourself?
A. I think -- my recollection is that Nóirín O'Sullivan probably introduced me and -- yeah.
Q. A11 right. And did you have any conversation with him, the Commissioner, about the issues that you were going to be focusing on?
A. Em, I can't really -- it was a very short conversation. 15:44 Yes.
A. I think you need to understand the environment or the room.
Q. Yes.
A. A very public place, very noisy, people milling about. It wasn't a place where -- it wasn't a car park or a corridor. It was a public area. A very short conversation. He turned to me and we spoke. I read his statement and, in that statement, he details issues 15:44 that he says we spoke about. I can't remember that, to be very frank.

744 Q. Yes.
A. They're the nuts and bolts of, I suppose, what the Public Accounts Committee meeting was intended to talk about or deliberate on.

745 Q. Yes.
A. The only part that $I$ do remember is him saying that Maurice McCabe was not to be believed or trusted with anything. And the reason I think I remember that is because it surprised me, I have to say.

746 Q. Okay.
A. And it stuck in my mind. okay. You've made reference there to Mr. Callinan's statement and he provided a statement to the Tribunal
on the 13th March 2017 in advance of having seen your statement, and perhaps we will just look at what he says about the meeting. It's at page 643 of our volumes, which is in volume 2.
A. Okay.

748 Q. It's perhaps open underneath that one.
A. Okay.

749 Q. And in the middle of that page, 643 --
A. Give me the reference again, will you, please.

750 Q. Yes. Page 643 in Volume 2. And he says here -- just when you get that.
A. okay.

751 Q. He says:
"I am aware that Deputy John Deasy, in an interview with Prime Time, RTÉ One, on the 15th February 2017 --" that is perhaps erroneous "-- made mention of a conversation he had with a senior garda in January 2014, who told him that Sergeant McCabe was not to be trusted. I recall that prior to my appearance before the Pub7ic Accounts Committee on the 23rd January 2014, I spoke with Deputy John Deasy, who was a member of that committee. He indicated that the areas he intended to address with me at the meeting, service of summonses, registration of company cars, interaction with other departments and the Courts Service in the context of a more effective way of collecting fines."

Can I just stop there now. Are those topics that you had taken an interest in in considering the fixed penalty charge notice issue, the collectability of --
A. I really can't remember that exchange and, you know, obviously the investigators asked me this as well.
752 Q. Yes.
A. And I don't remember that exchange.
Q. You don't remember. Okay. All right. It's possible then and you're not contesting it as such?
A. I'm not.

```
754 Q. Al1 right. Okay.
    A. Yeah.
    Q. He says:
        "He also asked me my views on whistleblowers appearing 15:47
        before the Committee."
        Now, do you recollect asking him that?
        A. No, but I may have.
        Q. Yes.
A. And I think it is probably something I would have asked him.
757 Q. Yes. It was still then a live issue?
A. Absolutely, it was very live, yeah.
758 Q. And I will come back to that in another context, but you're not -- you think it is likely you would have asked him that?
A. Yeah, yeah.
759 Q. okay.
"I indicated to him that you have my views on this subject as I have written to the Committee about it."
And can I just ask you there, is that something that you recollect --
A. No.
760 Q. -- him saying? Okay. Had you seen any correspondence from the Commissioner to the Committee at that stage, expressing his views on the issue?
```

A. No, I don't remember any such correspondence. It may have been sent to the Committee. But the Committee received plenty of correspondence about a lot of things.
761 Q. Yes, yes.
A. And they went to the clerk. They were circulated to the members. But remembering one is --
Q. Yes. But what was the practice at that time? would you get correspondence which had been addressed to the Committee in advance of meetings or --
A. Yeah, it would be sent --

763 Q. -- on the morning of the Committee --
A. Oh, no, before that. It would be sent to the clerk and then the clerk would circulate the papers.
764 Q. Yes. But can I take it that you were aware that he had 15:48 expressed strong views about the appearance of whistleblowers?
A. I'd put it differently. I think that it was common knowledge that the Gardaí at senior levels didn't want the whistleblowers appearing at the Public Accounts Committee.

765 Q. Yes.
A. I didn't need to read a letter in that sense.

766 Q. okay. We11, can you take it that -- can the Tribunal take it you were aware of his views about the issue?
A. Yeah, yeah. I think that's fair to say, yeah.

767 Q. He then says, continuing the statement:

[^1]of the information being imparted, bearing in mind the inaccuracies of some of the allegations as highlighted in Assistant Commissioner o'mahony's report that was at the time available to the Committee."
Q. Do you recollect --
A. If somebody spoke to me in legalese like that, I would probably remark on it and would have remembered it.
769 Q. Yes.
A. I certainly do not remember that being imparted to me --

770 Q. Okay.
A. -- in those terms.
Q. Well, just one factual issue: Do you recollect Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony's report being available to and being in front of the Committee, as it were, in connection with the issue?
A. Sure.

772 Q. Yes. And he appears there perhaps to have been drawing attention to possible discrepancies between what the whistleblowers were saying and what the assistant commissioner had found; in other words, that they weren't accurate?
A. Em, yeah. Sorry, can I --

773 Q. Yes.
A. I think the relevance is, do I remember him saying this, no.

```
774 Q. Al1 right. points issue?
A. Em --
781 Q. Or did it go further in your mind?
A. In my mind, it went further. And I suppose maybe I'm putting this together after the fact.
782 Q. Yes.
```

A. You know, I might be. I think at that point it was to do with the penalty points issue.
Q. Okay. Did you think he was trying to influence you adversely in relation to Sergeant McCabe's evidence on the penalty points issue?
A. Yes.

784 Q. Okay. There's been reference made obviously to Deputy McGuinness's conversation with the Commissioner after the meeting. You obviously weren't privy to or in proximity to that?
A. No.

785 Q. Was there anyone else in proximity, in your recollection, to when the Commissioner was speaking to you at this point?
A. The only person I remember being in proximity would have been former Commissioner o'Sullivan, but I really would not be able to tell you if any part of our conversation was overheard by former Commissioner o'sullivan.

786 Q. Yes, yes. There is, and I'm not criticising your statement that you gave to the Tribunal, it's welcome to get any information, and the Chairman is still anxious to get all relevant information from parties, but in the transcript, if we could go back to that at page 1471.
A. Okay. This is volume?

787 Q. Yes, it's volume 6 that you had open a moment ago.
A. okay. 1471, yeah.

788 Q. 1471. You seem to be suggesting in the first part of
your interview broadcast on Prime Time that he was saying that Maurice McCabe couldn't be believed or couldn't be trusted on anything. Is that something that rings a bell with you?
A. Yeah. I think those words were used, yeah. okay. And you go on to say there, obviously:
"They were very, very derogatory. It was, you know, a serious attack and very strongly worded."

But as I understand your evidence, you're not suggesting he said anything beyond that?
A. No, I'm not.

790 Q. A11 right. The Commissioner was interviewed by the investigators in relation to your statement, and that is contained in volume 2 from page 617 onwards. Could I ask you to go to page 618 in Volume 2.
A. Sure. 61 --
A. Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Deputy, at any stage you didn't describe what was said to you as vile, did you? was that someone else's interpretation?
A. I think someone else's. I think derogatory.

CHAIRMAN: Derogatory was what you called it.
A. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN: A11 right. Well, that is fine. It's a subtle difference.

792 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: And this is at a stage where

Mr. Callinan is being interviewed by the investigators, having been provided with a copy of your statement for the first time, and in his answer at the top of page 618 here, he says, line 489:
"Again, I refer to my original statement, MC1, where I outline my conversation with Deputy John Deasy and where he asked me about my views about whistleblowers appearing before the Committee and I had indicated that the Committee would need to be mindful of the fact that not all of the allegations that Sergeant McCabe was making was correct as high1ighted in the O'Mahony investigation and that the Committee had a copy of that report to rely on."

It's expressed in slightly different terms there by him, that all of the allegations weren't correct?
A. Yeah. I mean, when I --

793 Q. Does that phrase ring --
A. Not really. I mean, when I finally got a chance to actually question Sergeant McCabe, I think the first question I asked him, I said how do you square the O'Mahony report with what you're alleging yourself? And, you know, I've always said, and even publicly, that I think maybe Sergeant McCabe didn't get see what the -- you know, there was a big question-mark with regard to -- every member of the Committee, with regard to where the truth lay with regard to the
seriousness, the scale of the penalty point issue.
A. you know, there were people on the Committee who had reservations about creating a precedent, an important precedent with regard to a serving member of the force coming into the Oireachtas, to the Public Accounts Committee. And we had never really got to the end of the debate with regard to a private or public meeting. The expectation was that we would have dealt with that on the Thursday morning in a private session. We never got to that point, because my understanding is the clerk informed some of us that Sergeant McCabe himself would have preferred, or did prefer, to have the meeting in private session for his own legal reasons. 797 Q. Are you talking about the Thursday that he actually came to give evidence?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. So with regard to, you know, myself -- sorry, I'm cutting across you.
799 Q. Well no, it's interesting, but your colleague, Mr. Murphy, in his statement to the Tribunal makes reference to you and he did say that you seem to be uncomfortable at the direction the Committee was taking at the stage before you had got to Sergeant McCabe's evidence. But I perhaps ought to just open that portion of what he had said. It's at page 1452 in volume 6 if you wish to look at the paper version. CHAIRMAN: But I mean, Mr. McGuinness, I'm wondering does it really matter in the sense that it was certainly a point where there could be a legitimate debate and I think any position taken up on either side would have been based on reasonable sound considerations, it's a matter of balance really. Certainly there couldn't be any comment made by me against anyone who had any such concerns.
MR. McGUINNESS: Yes. It's really just a question, Chairman, of where matters stood at a particular time, it may be relevant to the rationale for Commissioner Callinan seeking to meet the Chairman. CHAIRMAN: A11 right. There certainly was a debate and 15:59 it was finely balanced. Yes.
MR. McGUINNESS: It's just in that context. I'm not sure, have you got that, deputy?
A. Could you give me the reference again.

800 Q. I'm sorry, 1452.
A. Okay. Yeah.

801 Q. And he is answering a question there posed by the Tribunal but he says in the second sentence:
"At this time --"

This is paragraph 5.
"At this time $I$ was concerned as to the direction the Committee were taking generally in terms of potentially acting outside of its remit. The concerns were raised publicly by me around the time in relation to another matter."

Which obviously doesn't concern us.
"I did not believe that we should be taking evidence from Mr. McCabe and that his was a matter more appropriate to the Justice Committee. At some time it was made known to us that the Justice Committee would not accommodate a hearing from Sergeant McCabe and I think also that it would not be pursuing the report on the management of the fixed charge notice system completed by the C\&AG but I can't be certain of this." 16:00 He goes on to say on the next page:
"while this particular issue was unfolding I remember

John Deasy being uncomfortable in relation to our investigations into the C\&AG's report on the management of fixed charge notice system. What made him uncomfortable I do not know and I did not press him on the matter. I believed at the time we had similar concerns about the direction the Committee was taking generally and so I honestly cannot say now if his discomfort was anything more than the same concern I felt. But at the time I had no reason to believe it was anything more than that."

Perhaps you would --
A. Okay, I wasn't uncomfortable with the C\&AG's report into the management of the fixed charge notice. was there some discomfortable with regard to the way the Committee was operating? Over the four years there was a constant discomfort over the way that Committee operated with regard to its remit. There's a pending Supreme Court case, you know, relevant to that particular issue. It certainly was a live issue when
it came to the whistleblowers coming into the Committee. And it had nothing to do with the substance of the fixed notice penalty report by the C\&AG. There were political considerations here. Members of the Committee wanted the whistleblowers to come into the Committee for their own reasons.
802 Q. Okay. Can we leave those aside?
A. Sure.

803 Q. I think you had a concern that the committee wouldn't
be engaging in any sort of judicial findings as against individuals?
A. Yes.

And you were obviously conscious of the Abbeylara decision, I take it?
A. Yeah. Look, I think I said publicly that I didn't think politicians were capable of, you know, making quasi judicial decisions, which is the direction $I$ thought the committee was headed in.
Q. Yes?
A. And there was an issue with regard to how to deal with this, whether in public and private, like, I say, which was refer resolved. It was resolved by Sergeant McCabe in the end. So we never really got to the bottom of that.
All right. But we have already opened obviously the portion of the transcript of the hearing of the 24th where the Chairman announced the intention to take Sergeant McCabe's evidence?
A. Yes.

807 Q. And is it correct that at that stage the issue of public/private as a decision by the Committee hadn't been taken?
A. Not at all. No.

808 Q. Okay. And you mentioned Sergeant McCabe there, and is it correct that he indicated whether himself or through his solicitors that he wanted to take legal advice about giving evidence to the Committee?
A. Yeah. And I think he let us know what that decision
was later in the week, later in the following week. 809 Q. And did that enable then the Committee to decide that they should take his evidence and that it was taken in private for that reason?
A. I think it goes like this: If we had actually assembled on the Thursday that Maurice McCabe was meant to come into the Committee and he hadn't had that legal advice, if there had been a vote to let Maurice McCabe come into the Committee in public session it would have been won. So for that reason, his decision or his desire to come in in public session cut that off at the pass. We never got to have that debate.
810 Q. All right. In any event, he gave his evidence in private. You personally found him to be credible. And I think did that persuade you to speak to the Taoiseach 16:03 in relation to the matter?
A. Two things happened that persuaded me to speak to the Taoiseach. The comment by Commissioner Callinan and the Committee appearance by Sergeant McCabe, in conjunction. And I didn't speak really -- I didn't speak to anyone. I made my own mind up. And I think after listening to his evidence $I$ felt he was completely genuine, completely credible and on the level. Like I said, I don't think he got everything right, but I thought we were dealing with somebody who was an honest actor, and who was really just trying to do his job. So some time after that I contacted the Taoiseach of the day and there was a meeting in Government Buildings, there was some representatives
from Waterford, dealing with Waterford issues, I asked to speak to him privately after the meeting and I told him that in my opinion that Sergeant McCabe would be vindicated and that the way this was being dealt with was completely wrong. I'm not sure, at that point whether Leo Varadkar had weighed in or not. CHAIRMAN: Again, I'm becoming uncomfortable, Mr. McGuinness. I mean, I have got a remit, and you wi11 forgive me, deputy, but I fee1 you're doing your very best to help us with what you are saying, there may be issues in relation to whether you're correct or not, $I$ don't know, but going into political matters, $I$ would prefer to stay away.
A. That is fine, okay.

811 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes. But in terms of a negative briefing, apart from what Commissioner Callinan said to you prior to the PAC meeting, had you heard any negative briefing from any member of An Garda Síochána or the Press Officer or any indirect evidence of Garda briefing from journalists?
A. I think Deputy McGuinness alluded to something earlier, in my opinion, $95 \%$ plus of what you are hearing in Leinster House is nonsense and gossip. And yes, were there people saying or alluding to things with regard to Maurice McCabe, his character, I believe there were. If you are asking me to point to a specific line of communication or information $I$ wouldn't be able to tell you that.
812 Q. All right. You did say in your Prime Time interview
that you spoke to Enda Kenny and you recorded at page 1471 as saying:
"At the meeting I said to him that I believed that Maurice McCabe would be vindicated, that he was being treated extremely badly."

But you don't expressly say that you told Enda Kenny about the comment made by the Commissioner, do you recal1 --
A. No, I don't think I think.

813 Q. -- informing him of the Commissioner's comment?
A. No, I don't think I did. You have limited time. I think that is maybe one consideration. I was very matter of fact with Enda Kenny. You know, I was a
colleague of the former Taoiseach's, we were not close politically.
814 Q. Yes?
A. So I think my discussion with him would have been very matter of fact. I probably wouldn't have got into he said this or she said that.
Q. All right. I thought you had said a minute ago that you had informed Enda Kenny of the Commissioner's comment, am I wrong in that?
A. I'm not so sure I did.

CHAIRMAN: No, I don't think you did.
MR. MCGUINNESS: That is my mistake.
CHAIRMAN: And you might forgive me for cutting that off at the pass, $I$ hope for proper reasons. matter you have direct evidence of, Commissioner Callinan's comment?
CHAIRMAN: You were going to ask I think, Mr. McGuinness, as well about how bad the rumours were or what the nature of them was. MR. McGUINNESS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I suppose everyone else has been asked, it would be no harm to get it out in the -MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes.
817 Q. We11, had you heard of any allegation against Sergeant McCabe in relation to a sexual assault case or a DPP file pending or completed?
A. You know, I wish I was more definite about this. I have a vague recollection of somebody saying something to me and I cannot tell you who it was or what the content of that conversation was. I have a vague recollection, yes.
818 Q. Yes. And are you able to place that in time?
A. I cannot.

819 Q. A11 right. Okay. Thank you Mr. Deasy. CHAIRMAN: Is there much contest about this? It's probably only you, Mr. O'Higgins, really. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: I have one or two questions.
CHAIRMAN: You do? In relation to Superintendent Taylor? How does he come into it? MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: It's purely down to the conversation that occurred between himself and

Commissioner Callinan, nothing -- it's confined to that.

CHAIRMAN: No, I appreciate, Mr. O'Higgins, but there's -- I can't see how it impacts in any way. MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Only insofar as my client has given a narrative to the Tribunal about the forming of negative briefing.
CHAIRMAN: If you want to ask about that, certainly, yeah. Do.

MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: It seems to be three questions. 16:08 CHAIRMAN: Mr. O'Higgins, I beg your pardon, I didn't see Mr. McDowe11.
MR. MCDOWELL: I have one question.
CHAIRMAN: Please go ahead.

WITNESS WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL AS FOLLOWS:
820 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Can I bring you to page 1472, Deputy Deasy? I appear for Sergeant McCabe I should point out.
A. Yeah.

821 Q. You were asked by Ms. Hannon in this radio interview:
"Do you believe that the campaign against Maurice McCabe?"

Then:

> "The mud has stuck basically politically?"

And you answered:
"Massively. I think the campaign against Maurice McCabe was extremely effective in hardening opinions with regard to his character and I think that really is 16:09 what we were coming up against. It's only when the inspector's report came out later that month --"

And I think that is the Garda inspector's report in February on the issue of penalty points.
"-- and confirmed pretty much everything he was saying or at least the premise of it, and when Leo Varadkar made his public assertion that their actions were distinguished, and things began to change."

Just I want to ask you about your statement, that the mud had stuck basically politically and you said "massively, I think the campaign against Maurice McCabe was extremely effective in hardening opinion with
regard to his character." Do you want to comment on that?
A. I don't know if I can give my subjective view with regard to what -- I couldn't believe that a serving Commissioner would say that about a serving officer. You know, someone was asking well, me what did he say, was it derogatory, was it very derogatory as you described it -- my own grandfather was a garda sergeant and I think that if a serving Commissioner had said
something about, you know, my grandfather in those terms I would definitely think of it as being utterly derogatory, yes. I couldn't believe it. And it took my breath away I have to say. So does that answer your question?
MR. MCDOWELL: It does, yes, thank.
CHAIRMAN: All right Mr. O'Higgins.

WITNESS WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS AS FOLLOWS:

822 Q. MR. MICHAEL O'HIGGINS: Deputy Deasy, just two or three questions for you. It's really, if you can, you may not at this remove, try and recollect for us -- I appear for Superintendent Taylor, by the way.
A. Sure.

823 Q. Michael O'Higgins is my name -- if you could try and remember what the words actually used were, because I do note in your Prime Time interview you described them as very derogatory and also as being very strongly worded and a very serious attack, but yet it's clear you were saying the nature of what he said was he couldn't be believed or trusted on anything, that is a summary. Do the words spring to mind at all, actually used?
A. Those are the words used. Those were the words he used.

824 Q. He can't be believed or trusted on anything?
A. Yeah, yeah.

825 Q. I mean, again you yourself have used the term
subjective assessment, but appraising it objectively if it was communicated to you in terms he wasn't to be believed or trusted on anything, is that what you meant simply by strongly worded? Was it because it was unequivocal or what?
A. No, there's more to it than that. Basically you have to -- and I think I have got to fill this in a small bit, fair enough, hopefully you will allow me Chairman, maybe I should say this. In my opinion, I mean, and I was one of the people maybe to the forefront with regard to not hearing Maurice McCabe's evidence at that point, and then when the Commissioner said what he said to me I was very, very surprised. My opinion, my opinion is this: That they had lost the narrative by the time they came into the Public Accounts Committee on that Thursday. And they had lost control of the events and the decision had already really been made within the Committee to allow Maurice McCabe come in. And I think they knew it. And it was kind of a last gasp to actually prevent him from challenging their authority directly. And I think that is what happened. And that is my opinion. And I think that is when -- I think they actually lost control of their own behaviour in some ways, by actually addressing people like me, Committee members, before the Public Accounts Committee, I think that is what happened.
826 Q. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Right, Mr. O'Higgins, do you want to ask --

I know there is a contradiction.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Well, I had anticipated actually asking no or one question, but I think just arising from the slight change in tempo --
CHAIRMAN: I know, there is a change of tempo, but you know the fact that Mr. Deasy has an opinion, I mean that is fine, it's legitimate, it's grand, but it's not an expert opinion on the growth of crystals.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: AND that's the way that it is. I use that simply by saying the usual exception to the rule in evidence does not apply. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Although it is interesting and helpful.

WITNESS WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS AS FOLLOWS:

827 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Micheá 1 O'Higgins, Deputy Deasy, for certain members of An Garda Síochána and I am asking these questions on behalf of former Commissioner Martin Callinan.
A. Yeah.

828 Q. Just for your assistance, I wonder could page 1503 be called up, which is I think your initial statement to the Tribunal and it's dated 10th March 2017 and I think 16:14 it's a response to the Chairman's request for, I won't say a call to arms, but his request generally for people to provide any information they might provide?
A. Yeah.

829 Q. And I think this is a very short statement, it's five lines and then a two-1ine concluding paragraph, and what you say, what you attribute to Martin Callinan is that he made reference to Sergeant McCabe and then you say:

> "He referred to Sergeant McCabe as being someone who could not be believed or trusted."

A11 right? And you say --
A. Yeah.

830 Q. -- "that is my best recollection."

Wouldn't it follow from that, and in fairness to you, you are only giving your best recollection, that is
your best recollection of what was said?
A. That is what I believe was said, yes.

831 Q. Yes. I don't mean to be nit-picking here, because I appreciate you are giving your best recollection and it is quite a while ago, in your first statement you
haven't included the words, for what it is worth you haven't included the words "on anything"?
A. Yeah.

832 Q. So it would seem that in your first statement, the height of what you attributed to the former
Commissioner was "he was someone who could not be believed or trusted", is that fair?
A. Yeah.

833 Q. Right. And in that context I had understood you to not
demure or not take issue with the matters that were put to you by Mr. McGuinness for the Tribunal when he brought you through your evidence, that is to say you didn't take tremendous issue with the suggestion made by Martin Callinan that insofar as you formed that view he was saying someone who could not be believed or trusted, my client was offering -- that was in the context of my client saying there were questions and inaccuracies over his allegations, all right, in relation to the penalty points?
CHAIRMAN: A misconstruction of words.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: In other words, that you turned in your mind, and look, it does happen, somebody saying something to the effect that look, there's issues over your accuracy of what's being put forward in relation to penalty points, loss of revenue and not everything he says is correct, that the question put to you is that you have turned that into this is a man who can't be believed or trusted on anything, so that is the question by Mr. O'Higgins. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes.
A. Are we asking about believed or trusted and believed or trusted on anything? Is that what we are getting at here?

CHAIRMAN: No, we're not, no, no.
A. Or something else?

CHAIRMAN: No, what is being put to you is that you misconstrued Commissioner Callinan's statement --
A. No, I did not.

CHAIRMAN: -- which was, let us say --
A. Okay.

CHAIRMAN: -- a cool and rational statement to the effect that one has to be careful.
A. I think you've got to go back to what I said with regard to -- you know, I kind of went along with me having asked about the whistleblowers and I certain7y would have remembered his response and I think that I didn't misconstrue or mix it up with regard the minutiae of the detail of the issues that he says he referred to me. And I frankly have no memory of that. I am very clear about one thing, that when he says believed or trusted he was referring to Maurice McCabe and his character.

834 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: I think you were brought through page 643 which was Martin Callinan's, former Commissioner Callinan's response in substance to your position --
A. Yeah.

835 Q. -- as promoted by you on the Prime Time programme on the 15th February 2017. Just so we might do this as quickly as we can, because $I$ appreciate it's late in the day, he acknowledges that he spoke to you, so there's common ground on that; and he said that you indicated a number of areas, in fairness to you, you were tipping him off what you proposed to cover?
A. And I may have. I may have. Yeah.

836 Q. So that is potential common ground?
837 Q. You may have, al1 right. He says that you asked him your views on whistleblowers appearing before the Committee and he indicated that he had made his views known on that, is that fair?
A. Well, that's --

Might he have said it?
A. Well, that is what he is saying. I mean, I don't remember him saying anything other than what I've said in my statement.

839 Q. In fairness you're not disputing it, it may have been said by him --
A. Yes.

840 Q. -- is that fair?
A. I'm not disputing that.

841 Q. Right. You see his position is that he has never made any bones about his fundamental objection to a serving memory going onto the PAC, he respects your position on that and you made it clear I think in the transcript but he has always made clear his position on it. Just lifting it out of Sergeant McCabe for a moment, just at a level of principle, that was his position. And you agree to differ on that?
A. We11, I differ with your interpretation of what he said or how he said it and the import that was intended when 16:20 he said what he said.
Q. Well, I haven't come to that.
A. Okay.

843 Q. But I'm suggesting to you that -- and I understand you
not to be demurring from it, that he indicated you have my views on that, that is to say on serving members coming before the Committee?
A. Again, I don't remember him saying that.

844 Q. And any reference to his views as to privacy?
A. No.

845 Q. All right. And in addition to that, he indicated -sorry, he says by way of response to your position that he cautioned on the need to be aware of the correctness of the information being imparted by Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yeah, I think I have answered this already, I have no recollection of that being said.
846 Q. But again, you don't dispute he may have said that?
A. I'm not. No.

847 Q. Right.
A. No. I certainly don't remember it.

848 Q. And if you accepted that may have been said, and I appreciate you're not positively confirming it, you're not disputing it, would you agree with me there's not a million miles between the -- well, it's a matter for the chair really, but insofar as he is offering the view he accepts he cautioned on the need to be aware of the correctness of the information, it's not a giant leap from that?
A. There is a big leap involved here. I mean, it was very clear to me what he meant by what he said, and referred to Maurice McCabe's character and not what you are referring to or suggesting.
849 Q. And where did he use the word character?
A. I am using the word character. I'm not saying it's anywhere here.
850 Q. You're using the word character?
A. Yes. It is my interpretation, yeah.

851 Q. Am I correct, he never used the word character?
A. Not that I can remember, no.

852 Q. Or certainly that word doesn't appear in any of your statement?
A. That is my interpretation, yeah.

853 Q. Right. And the conversation from beginning to end lasted how long?
A. Less than a minute in my opinion.

854 Q. And I think you acknowledged there was a degree of to-ing and fro-ing in the coffee dock area?
A. Yeah, it's a public area, yeah.

855 Q. And a degree of hubbub with noise and so on, would that be fair?
A. Yes, there is some noise there, yeah.
Q. Right. Just one other thing that arose out of somebody else's questions of you: You mentioned this issue as to the decision, separate question now, Deputy Deasy, the decision to ultimately hold Sergeant McCabe's evidence, take that in private. Insofar as it appeared to have been Deputy McGuinness's evidence that the decision to hold it in private was communicated to Martin Callinan on the Tuesday, was (a) made on the Tuesday and likely to have been made on the Tuesday either by the clerk or by him, you don't -- had you heard that before?
A. Em, no.

857 Q. Is it possible, therefore, that that was not a decision taken by the Committee sitting as a unit if you yourself, as a member of the Committee, hadn't heard it?
CHAIRMAN: Well, that was the following Tuesday as I understand it and it was my question to Deputy McGuinness I think, Mr. O'Higgins. I think it was the following Tuesday, the 28th, no?
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: Yes, the 28th before the
Thursday.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: The 30th.
CHAIRMAN: which is the 30th.
MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: when he gave the evidence.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. So your question is: Do you remember a Committee meeting actually making a formal decision on that, is that right?
A. No, there was none.

CHAIRMAN: There was none. It was what, a show, people counting heads and --
A. I think Deputy McGuinness alluded to this in his -- I think you might have been asking the question and I was here listening to him, and he talked about after the meeting with former Commissioner callinan in the car park, he said the only decision that had to be taken at that point was whether it was going to be in private or in public.
858 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: We11, it's that decision I'm
talking about.
A. Yes.
Q. So if that was communicated, if that was made on the 28th, the Tuesday, it was a decision made other than by the full Committee, correct?
A. How this worked was, the clerk would have informed members of the Committee, this is how I think it worked, that Maurice McCabe would prefer to come in, in private. I seem to remember a conversation with the clerk and sometimes things, the way I put it to you, happen naturally, nobody was really looking forward to a fight on Thursday morning with regard to public or private, and when members like myself, who had some reservations were told that this was going to happen in private, we went along with it. And for the reason I mentioned earlier, if there had been a vote in the Committee for this to have occurred in public we would have lost the vote. So, to actually be assessed of Maurice McCabe's legal concerns and have it relayed to us that he'd prefer it in private, it sorted everything 16:25 out and suited everybody.
CHAIRMAN: All right. So the fight had gone away.
A. Exactly, yeah.
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: I had understood John McGuinness, Deputy McGuinness to indicate the decision was to be made on the Tuesday and was made on the Tuesday and I think he indicated communicated to my client on the Tuesday.
CHAIRMAN: There's various bits of evidence on that.
A. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN: He also said look, there wasn't a formal decision, it was consensus. Now I didn't know what that means. But again, I wasn't going to pursue that. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: I will leave it.

CHAIRMAN: But he did say either he or the clerk phoned Martin Callinan on his mobile to tell him that. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: On the Tuesday I think. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think it was, yes.
861 Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: So if that be established, that 16:26 it was -- or if that evidence were given, that it was communicated to Martin Callinan on the Tuesday it follows logically, doesn't it, that the decision had been made at that point?
A. It does.

862 Q. And you're not aware of any vote taking place to formally make that decision, one way or the other?
A. We never got to that point in that week. And I think that it was, maybe it was -- I won't call it a unilateral decision, but it was a decision where frankly everybody said okay, fine, there's the middle ground. And you know, I don't think -- certain1y the way I put it to you is: Nobody objected at that point to Maurice McCabe coming in, in private session.
863 Q. Right. Well, if it was a unilateral decision it would have been a decision made unilaterally by John McGuinness?
CHAIRMAN: I don't think anybody is saying it's a unilateral --
A. No, I don't. I'm not.

CHAIRMAN: The evidence so far has been that it was a consensus. I mean, it happens almost organically I suppose.
A. The way I put it to you is, if I can answer this: The clerk would contact someone like myself and, you know, he'd suss me out. He would kind of say, well, this is probably going to end up in private decision, McCabe wants to come in, in private session, it suits him legally, and he took soundings with regard to Committee 16:27 members. You know, somebody could have objected to that on the Thursday, but nobody did. We didn't get to that point.
Q. MR. MÍCHEÁL O'HIGGINS: But I will leave it at this: On the Thursday, the 30 th, was it your understanding the issue remained on the table on the 30th?
A. No. The decision was made then to actually bring Maurice McCabe in, in private.
Q. Right. And had been made?
A. Made by osmosis, consensus, however you want to call it.

866 Q. Thank you.
A. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Do you want to ask any further questions? No. I wouldn't be anticipating that there is going to be a whole load more questions, Ms. Leader, I think that is it, isn't it? Oh I'm sorry, Mr. McGuinness.

WITNESS WAS RE-EXAMINED BY MR. MCGUINNESS AS FOLLOWS:
MR. MCGUINNESS: Just one matter. The Irish Times were reporting both on the 28 th and the 29th that Garda McCabe had requested it be heard in private, and would you have been aware of that or is it very likely that you would have been made aware of that?
A. Yeah. I think the clerk did make us aware of that.
Q. Then just one other matter: You have been asked obviously about the remark made by Commissioner Callinan, but can you say anything about whether Deputy 16:28 Commissioner O'Sullivan remained in company with either you or Commissioner Callinan when the remark was made, whether she was in a position to hear it or likely to have heard it?
A. You know, I will give you the dynamics of the room. He 16:28 turned to me and was speaking directly to me, anybody who knew the dynamic of the senior Gardaí at that time, she was always fairly close to the Commissioner. But if you are asking me was she able to hear what was being said in a busy room with his back to her, I doubt 16:28 it. okay.

869 Q. And is it correct to say that the first time you recorded what was said was in your statement that you gave the Tribunal in 2017 as to what was said?
A. Say that again, sorry.

You didn't note it on any earlier occasion than in your statement to the Tribunal in 2017, the remark?
A. I'm sorry, I'm confused.

871 Q. Did you make a note of it?

CHAIRMAN: In other words, you're being asked did you do anything like, it is -- and again of course this is contested as we11, Deputy John McGuinness did pull in at a lay-by and put something in a notebook, it doesn't have to be in a lay-by, for all I know you could have noted it in your study or --
A. Did I make notes? No. CHAIRMAN: A11 right.
Q. MR. McGUINNESS: So the first time you put it in writing then is correct on the 10th March 2017 when you 16:29 furnished your statement to the Tribunal?
A. The only time I put anything else in writing with regard to this is the email which I sent to the Taoiseach, which followed on from the meeting I had with him.
Q. Yes?
A. Which I reminded him of what I had said in the meeting to the effect that I thought Maurice McCabe would be vindicated and was being treated badly. That is the only record I believe I ever made of this.

874 Q. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Deasy. CHAIRMAN: I have no questions thank you very much deputy.
A. Thank you.
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| 171:9, 180:8, | 182:3 | deliberately [2] - | $187: 23,187: 24$ | 20:6 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { differ [2] - } \\ \text { 232:23, } 23 \end{array}$ |
| 181:4, 181:14, | decision [36] - | demarcation [1] | 187:29, 188:9, | $13: 25,17: 28$ | difference [9] - |
| $220: 25,221: 1$ | 12:7, 110:15, | $-65: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:2, 199:24, } \\ & 205: 11.207: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 18:6, 20:21, | 11:25, 49:16, |
| dealings [1] - | 110:18, 111:18, | demeanour [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 205:11, 207:6, } \\ & \text { 207:13, 212:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 21:29, 30:4, 37:8, | 51:13, 70:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95:19 } \\ & \text { dealt [16] - 9:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:18, 117:26, } \\ & \text { 150:23, 162:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 65:11, 155:13 | 213:21, 214:7, | $37: 10,37: 11$ | 103:22, 162:27, |
| 41:20, 46:6, | 170:12, 181:29, | $230: 1$ | $221: 21,224: 17$ | $41: 4,41: 5,41: 6$ | 213:28 |
| 60:21, 63:24, | 182:21, 182:25, | demurring [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 234:24, 235:7, } \\ & \text { 235:22, 236:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 41:7, 41:9, 41:11, | different [34] - |
| 84:17, 88:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 183:10, 219:5, } \\ & \text { 219:22. 219:29. } \end{aligned}$ | 233:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 235: 22,236: 25 \\ & 240: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $42: 12,42: 28$ | 11:29, 12:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 95: 16,103: 21, \\ & 108: 19,126: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 220:10, 227:17, | denial [1] - | deputy [16] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:23, 46:7, 46:9, } \\ & \text { 46:12, 46:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 17,30: 10, \\ & 30: 27,31: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| 140:18, 140:19, | 234:21, 234:22, | 122:10 | $12: 9,23: 16$ | 47:18, 47:23, | $37: 8,37: 21,$ |
| 215:22, 221:4 | 234:25, 235:2, | 38:7, 39:26, | $33: 15,73: 19,$ | 48:6, 48:21, | $38: 14,38: 15$ |
| Deasy [17] - 163.24, 201.25 | 235:17, 235:26, <br> 235.29, 236:4 | 145:17, 167:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 24,79: 29 \\ & 134: 21,136: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $48: 22,48: 23$ | 39:13, 39:15, |
| 163:24, 201:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 235: 29,236: 4 \\ & 236: 25,237: \end{aligned}$ | denies [2] - | $173: 13,216: 28$ | $49: 7,52: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 28,44: 13, \\ & 44: 16,72: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 202:14, 202:22, | 237:13, 237:17, | 145:13, 178:20 | 221:9, 226:11 | 64:25, 65:21, <br> $71: 19,72: 3,73: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 16,72: 24 \\ & 3: 27,84: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 207:6, 207:13, | 237:20, 237:25, |  | 228:18, 234:21, | 81:3, 86:1, 88:14 | 95:4, |
| 214:7, 218:1, | 237:26, 238:8, |  | 239:10, 240:23 | 90:14, 92:27, | 125:23, 125:24, |
| 223:21, 224:18, | 238:17 | departments [1] | derail [1] - 95:11 <br> derailed [1] - |  | 125:25, 125:27, |




| extra [2] - 96:11, | 176:9 | 196:27, 197:4, | 112:22 | 111:11, 118:29, | 205:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 137:16 | fair [19]-42:11, | 197:27, 201:8, | fifteen [2] - | 119:13, 119:14, | follow [7] - |
| extremely [8] - | 61:12, 98:10, | 238:2 | 187:15, 201:1 | 121:28, 121:29, | 27:29, 28:22, |
| 69:19, 69:20, | 99:5, 99:27, | fault [1] - 138:23 | fifth [1] - 67:22 | 123:15, 124:19, | 31:26, 64:7, 96:7, |
| 95:10, 165:15, | 142:12, 149:12, | fear [2]-9:14, | fight [2] - | 127:19, 129:26, | 110:11, 229:14 |
| 184:5, 222:6, | 149:18, 165:12, | 14:16 | 236:12, 236:22 | 130:7, 130:20, | followed [3] - |
| 225:4, 225:20 | 167:2, 200:20, | fearful [1] - | figure [2] - | 132:21, 132:23, | 126:14, 179:9, |
| eye [2]-173:16, | 200:21, 200:25, | 10:19 | 117:11, 117:15 | 147:10, 147:15, | $240: 14$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:26, 227:8, } \\ & 229: 27,232: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { featured [1] - } \\ & \text { 133:5 } \end{aligned}$ | figures [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:20, 149:16, } \\ & \text { 165:6, 165:8, } \end{aligned}$ | following [27] - |
| F | $\begin{gathered} \text { 232:14, 234:17 } \\ \text { fairlv [6] - 17:3. } \end{gathered}$ | February [10]- 19:26, $61 \cdot 28$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { file }[10]-37: 20, \\ 27 \cdot 22,38 \cdot 0-30 \cdot 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:4, 166:17, } \\ & \text { 167:3, 168:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $17: 7,20: 17$ |
| f-ing [1] - 157:1 | 99:12, 154:9, <br> 154:26, 200:19 | 62:3, 62:7, 146:2 | $112: 13,112: 24$ | 171:3, 172:13, | 28:19, 52:10, |
| fabricate [1] - | 154:26, 200:19 239:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:6, 203:1, } \\ & \text { 207:7, 225:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:8, 223:13 } \\ & \text { files [2] - 179:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 203:13, 212:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 16,58: 12, \\ & 58: 13,63: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 163: 9 \\ & \text { face }[4]-32: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { fairness [11] - } \\ 42: 9,43: 25,63: \end{gathered}$ | 231:22 | 211:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 214:3, 214:21, } \\ & \text { 215:11, 229:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:13, 78:4, } \\ & \text { 104:7, 105:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 72:24, 72:26, | $95: 23,98: 7,$ | 149:21 | 227:7 | 229:24, 239:22, | 107:11, 109:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 142: 27 \\ & \text { faced [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:29, 193:19, } \\ & \text { 215:7, 229:14, } \end{aligned}$ | FELIX [1] - 3:1 | filled [1] - 199:2 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 240:9 } \\ \text { first } \end{array}$ | 128:7, 138:22, |
| 97:16, 187:19 | 231:26, 232:11 | fella [3] - 126:5, | 101:24 | 16:25, 55:18, | 180:22, 204:3, |
| Fachtna [1] - | faithfully [1] - | 126:19, 156:29 | final [4]-86:11, | $168: 14$ | $220: 1,235: 6$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:20 } \\ & \text { facility [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:23 } \\ & \text { fall }[2]-13: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fellow [1] - } \\ & \text { 128:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 14,120: 17 \\ & 123: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { fit }[3]-25: 8 \text {, } \\ 25: 9,25: 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 235: 9 \\ & \text { follows [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 135: 2 \\ & \text { facing }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 107:22 <br> fall-back [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { felt }[15]-10: 15, \\ 19: 5,29: 19,32: 7, \end{gathered}$ | finally [5] 145:11, 145 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fitted }[1]-25: 14 \\ & \text { five }[8]-47: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $237: 13$ <br> FOLLOWS [7] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 99: 10 \\ & \text { fact }[59]-13: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:22 } \\ & \text { fallout [2]-61 } \end{aligned}$ | 41:16, 41:23, | 157:8, 181:12, | $48: 9,48: 24$ | $5: 1,116: 1,186: 2$ |
| 14:14, 20:8, | 61:27 | 64:3, 72:2, | findings [1] - | 169:1, 171:5, | $228: 17,239: 1$ |
| 29:10, 38:8, | false [8]-26:15, | 113:19, 113:22, | $219: 1$ | 229:1 | food [4]-26:4, |
| 38:10, 38:14, | 26:16, 34:3, | 177:23, 218:9, | fine [12]-24:17, | fixed [6] - 117:8, | 176:27, 177:4, |
| 38:21, 39:7, | 41:15, 41:18, | 220:22 | 104:13, 139:11, | 207:21, 217:24, | 177:11 |
| 39:12, 41:26, | 43:8, 84:22, | few [13]-35:4, | 139:29, 178:22, | 218:3, 218:14, | foot [6]-13:21, |
| 43:2, 48:18, | 95:19 | 69:20, 133:29, | 183:22, 184:25, | 218:23 | 51:6, 105:3, |
| 50:12, 53:27, | familiar [5] - | 162:29, 164:15, | 185:14, 213:27, | flagged [2] - | 105:7, 155:25, |
| 56:26, 61:19, | 27:11, 85:20, | 176:12, 179:8, | $221: 14,228: 7$ | 18:3, 107:8 | 156:24 |
| 63:18, 64:26, | 101:24, 110:19, | 187:28, 189:21, | 237:21 | fleet [1] - 186:15 | FOR [5] - 3:1, |
| 67:7, 67:14, 69:8, | 192:12 | 192:21, 193:6, | Fine [1]-74:18 | Fleming [6] - | 3:4, 3:8, 3:12, |
| 80:27, 84:6, | families [1] - | 198:9, $215: 5$ | finely | 101:3, 101:6, | 115:8 |
| 84:19, 86:16, | 45:2 | Fianna [2] - | 216:26 | 101:20, 102:22, | force [11]-14:5, |
| 91:1, 91:4, 92:11, | family [15] - | $36: 14,130: 23$ | fines [1] - | $128: 18,161: 22$ | $23: 8,60: 29,$ |
| 95:27, 96:22, | $14: 6,19: 27$ | fiddler [5] - | $207: 18$ | Fleming's [1] - | 80:28, 95:5, 95:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:20, 107:8, } \\ & \text { 113:9. 117:20. } \end{aligned}$ | $26: 16,37: 19$ | 12:15, 147:5, | finish [2] - | 102:3 | 117:19, 166:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 113: 9,117: 20 \\ & 123: 3,125: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $37: 28,38: 11,$ | 148:2, 156:5, | $60: 22,68: 3$ | flesh [1] - 91:11 | 180:13, 186:6, |
| 139:3, 139:29, | $41: 25,44: 25$, $45: 2,97 \cdot 7$ | 157:17 | finished [2] - | flick [1] - 173:23 | 215:18 |
| 154:5, 164:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:2, 97:7, } \\ & \text { 141:14, 143:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { fiddler" [3] - } \\ \text { 136:8, } 136: 10 \end{array}$ | $9: 6,115: 5$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { flicking [2] - } \\ 30: 25,175: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { forefront [1] - } \\ & \text { 227:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 164:9, 169:5, | $145: 5,187: 6$ | 136:12 | Finucane [3] - 86:14, 86:17, | flight [1] - 144:3 | forget [4]-9:15, |
| 171:17, 172:28, | famous [3] - | fiddles [15] - | $157: 11$ | floated [2] - | 48:14, 48:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:9, 178:10, } \\ & 178: 25,183: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 139:15, 173:18, | 119:26, 124:14, | fire [1] - 171:21 | 110:28, 110:29 | $65: 27$ |
| 184:16, 193:7, | 175:28 | 125:10, 125:21, | firm [2]-97:21, | FLOOR [1] - 3:6 | forgetting [1] - |
| 195:7, 203:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { far [23]-12:29, } \\ & 68: 23,84: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:5, 126:19, } \\ & \text { 134:13, 137:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $121: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { floor [2] - 66:23 } \\ & \text { flow [2] - 82:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 174:16 <br> forgive [2] - |
| 211:28, 214:10, | 96:13, 97:6, | 137:18, 156:20, | FIRST [1] - 3:6 <br> first [52]-10:2 | 191:20 | 221:9, 222:28 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 222:15, 222:20, } \\ & 228 \cdot 6 \end{aligned}$ | 101:16, 109:4, | 156:29, 157:5, | $14: 22,17: 8,20: 5$ | focus [3] - | forgot [1] - |
|  | 150:19, 167:14, | $157: 6,157: 17$ | 27:9, 27:16, | 16:25, 133:29, | 48:13 |
| facts [1] - 43:1 <br> factual [2] - | 188:25, 189:6, 189:9, 190:18. | fiddling [3] - | $47: 21,56: 21$ | 134:4 | forgotten [3] - |
| 20:19, 210:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:9, 190:18, } \\ & \text { 193:27, 193:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:29, 122:10, } \\ & \text { 127:2 } \end{aligned}$ | 72:12, 78:26, $92 \cdot 11 \cdot 92 \cdot 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { focused [1] - } \\ & 59: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 24,49: 26, \\ & 97: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| Fail [1] - 36:14 failing [1] - | 194:2, 196:21, | fides [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:11, 92:15, } \\ & 95: 27,108: 23, \end{aligned}$ | focusing [1] - | form [6] - 39:14, |




| $\text { INDEX }_{[1]}-4: 1$ | $65: 2,65: 20$ | $166: 17,167: 3$ | interests [1] - | 96:17, 203:20 | 126:13, 170:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in | 66:19, 66:27, | - | $16$ | interviews [4]- | Irish [3]-126:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 67: 25,129: 9 \\ & \text { 141:8, 141:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 1,73: 12,75: 5, \\ & 75: 15,82: 4,83: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6:15, 31:23 } \\ \text { instead [1] } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { interfere [1] - } \\ & 59: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 13,34: 16 \\ & 49: 13,97: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 142:3, 239:2 |
| 154:20, 161:11, | 102:6, 118:1, | 142:4 | Interim [1] - | introduce [3] - | $9: 11,11: 28,$ |
| 172:27, 179:26, | 139:27, 140:24, | instinct [1] | 186:23 | 14:29, 205:18, | 59:12, 63:23, |
| 184:17, 185:10, | 141:12, 141:17, | 10:2 | internal [1] - | 205:19 | 63:28, 64:29, |
| 236:25 | 144:10, 159:21, | INSTRUCTED | 159:2 | introduced [2] - | 66:3, 74:3, 75:4, |
| indicated [20] - | 160:1, 160:3, | [4] - 3:2, 3:5, 3:9, | internally [1] - | 112:25, 205:21 | 97:16, 103:14, |
| 9:13, 19:13, 33:3, | 162:1, 168:29, | 3:12 | 134:3 | introducing [1] - | 104:2, 107:11, |
| 38:23, 39:7, | 195:6, 210:1, | instruction [1] - | interpretation | 36:6 | 109:19, 111:17, |
| 106:2, 113:12, | 212:22, 212:23, | 169:4 | [4] - 213:23, | introduction [2] | 117:19, 119:9, |
| 144:8, 162:15, | 221:27, 228:28, | instructions [8] | 232:24, 234:4, | - 78:24, 203:15 | 133:20, 141:26, |
| 181:24, 196:4, | 233:10, 233:23 | - 112:29, 113:2, | 234:9 | introductory [1] | 144:15, 146:18, |
| 207:14, 208:21, | informed [17] - | 137:27, 139:4, | interrupt [1] - | - 78:27 | 150:14, 150:20, |
| 214:9, 219:26, | 17:19, 68:16, | 139:21, 140:3, | 87:21 | investigate [1] - | 150:26, 154:17, |
| 231:26, 232:4, | 88:8, 144:9, | 194:11, 194:18 | interrupted [1] - | 181:8 | 166:16, 171:9, |
| 233:1, 233:7, | 152:13, 170:15, | instructs [1] - | 87:22 | investigating [1] | 175:13, 178:12, |
| $236: 27$ | 178:12, 182:28, 183:14. 183:19. | 113:7 | interrupts [2] - | - 141:9 | 179:13, 181:20, $207 \cdot 22.208: 13$ |
| indicates [2] - $36: 14,78: 28$ | 183:14, 183:19, 185:3, 189:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { insult [1] - } \\ & 139 \cdot 27 \end{aligned}$ | $87: 1,87: 28$ | investigation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 207:22, 208:13, } \\ & \text { 208:29, 209:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 36:14, 78:28 indicating [3] - | 189:11, 195:9, | 139:22 <br> insulted | $\begin{aligned} & \text { intervened [1] - } \\ & 60: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[16]-21: 10} \\ & 42: 29,43: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 210:16, 210:19, |
| 64:17, 162:13, | 215:25, 222:23, | 87:19 | intervening [1] - | 43:19, 43:23, | 211:24, 212:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:11 } \\ & \text { indication [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 236:6 } \\ & \text { informing [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | integrity [1] - | $76: 23$ | $45: 12,112: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 212: 5,215: 1, \\ & 215: 8,215: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 118:29, 178:27 <br> indifferent ${ }^{11]}$ - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 40:27, 222:12 } \\ \text { ing [3]-157:1, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { intend [1] - } \\ & \text { 62:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $-14: 28,90: 6$ | 142:27, 154:11, 169:26. 181:5. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 217:29, 218:20, } \\ & \text { 219:11. 219:21. } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { indifferent }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 119:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ing [3] - 157:1, } \\ & \text { 234:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 62:18 | interview [50] $35.4,35 \cdot 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:26, 181:5, } \\ & \text { 181:10, 181:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 219:11, 219:21, } \\ & \text { 225:10, 230:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 119:16 <br> indirect [1] - | initial [1] | $\begin{gathered} \text { intended [6] - } \\ 9: 20,49: 2,184: 7, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 4,35: 19, \\ & 35: 26,45: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:10, 181:12, } \\ & 214: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $230: 4,234: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 221:19 } \\ & \text { indistinct [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 228:24 } \\ & \text { innocent }[1] . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:10, 207:15, } \\ & 232: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 1,47: 15 \\ & 47: 17,48: 1,48: 2 \end{aligned}$ | investigations <br> [5] - 26:20, 56:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 238:16 } \\ & \text { issued [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:19 } \\ & \text { individual }[8] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:10 } \\ & \text { innuendo [3] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { intention [13]- } \\ 8: 20,8: 21,21: 22, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 18,49: 16 \\ & 49: 25,49: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $72: 5,72: 6,218: 2$ <br> investigative [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:20, 179:22, } \\ & 180: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 26:3, 26:4, 26:5, | 151:22, 152:1, | 67:26, 67:29, | 50:14, 51:4, 52:9, | - 145:9 | issues [35] - |
| 41:19, 74:25, | 152:12 | 68:4, 68:5, 68:8, | 53:17, 53:23, | investigator [1] | $5: 28,14: 3,15: 26$ |
| 114:4, 124:25, | inquire [1] | 73:5, 98:19, | 53:25, 55:7, 56:8, | - 144:9 | 21:11, 22:29, |
| 176:23 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 175:22 } \\ \text { Inquir } \end{gathered}$ | $178: 28,180: 17$ | $77: 12,77: 18$ $78: 1,79: 12$ | investigators [12] - 122:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:23, 26:26, } \\ & \text { 26:29, 27:3, 29:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $26: 15,55: 23$ | 164:16 | 219:18 <br> interaction [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 1,79: 12 \\ & 83: 22,86: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[12]-122: 23} \\ & 125: 15,155: \end{aligned}$ | 39:4, 39:17, 46:7, |
| 73:15, 219:2 | inquiry [5] - | 163:20, 197:19, | 91:17, 92:12 | 155:29, 156:25, | $60: 19,80: 16$ <br> 104:27, 105:12 |
| indulgence [2] - | 79:5, 80:28, 88:9, | 207:16 | 95:13, 96:4, | 202:11, 202:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:27, 105:12, } \\ & \text { 107:18. 107:19 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 146:16, 177:19 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 150:27, 155:22 } \\ \text { insisted [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | interactions [2] | $96: 12,97: 15$ $97: 26.137: 2$ | 207:24, 211:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:18, 107:19, } \\ & \text { 112:10, 113:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| infer [1] - 80:12 <br> influence [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { insisted [1] - } \\ & 63: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $-164: 14,164: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:26, 137:2, } \\ & \text { 137:5, 137:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 211:20, 213:15, } \\ & \text { 214:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 117:18, 120:25, |
| 56:16, 111:1, | insistent [1] | 11:27, 14:4, 14:5, | 153:13, 153:15, | invite [1] - | 150:6, 166:11, |
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| 108:25, 108:28 | 24:22, 24:27 | numbered [2] | $4: 20,4: 21,5: 7$ | 228:18, 230:1 |  |
| 109 | 28 | 26: | $5: 10,5: 11,16: 2$ | 2 |  |
| 109:13, 200:5 | , 173:2 | numbers [1] | 16:17, 17:7, | 235:10, 235:13, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:28 } \\ & \text { normally [3]- } \\ & \text { 109:23, 159:26, } \\ & \text { 190:17 } \end{aligned}$ | noted [6] - | numerous [1] -12:23 | $24: 19,28: 5$ | $236: 24.237: 5$ |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 23,29: 14 \\ & 31: 28,34: 12 \\ & 45: 4,52: 2,76: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 236:24, 237:5, |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:23, 12:25, } \\ & 71: 6,130: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $12: 23$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 237:8, 237:10, } \\ & 238: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | $\text { Ní }[1]-184: 25$ |  |  |  |
| NORTHUMB | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 6,130: 16 \\ & 168: 28,240: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 4,52: 2,76: 10 \\ & 77: 8,77: 17 \end{aligned}$ | O'Higgins' [1] - |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 6,26: 1,27: 21 \\ & 28: 22,30: 3,30: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Nóirín [7]- } \\ \text { 124:9, 156:18 } \end{gathered}$ | $77: 24,77: 29$ $79: 1,79: 18$ | 106:19 <br> O'Mahony [3] - |  |
| 165 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:21, 204:15, } \\ & 204: 19,205: 13, \\ & 205: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 26,79: 28, \\ & 86: 10,87: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 133:9, 214:12, |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 22,30: 3,30: 4, \\ & 31: 1,32: 21, \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 9,214: 12, \\ & 214: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 5:20, 5:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 23,46: 21, \\ & 46: 27,47: 10 \\ & 48: 7,48: 8,48: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  | 91:29, 92:3, 92:6, | O'Mahony's [3] -210:3, 210:17, | 223:29, 236:17 |
| $7: 2,7: 9,7: 19$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 8,8: 9,8: 19 \\ & 8: 25,8: 27,9: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 7,48: 8,48: 20 \\ & 50: 3,50: 8,50: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | 98:3, 99:15, <br> 100:8, 100:14, <br> 102:2, 103:4 | 211:4 <br> O'MARA ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { occurring [1] - } \\ & \text { 114:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 50:12, 50:16, |  | 102:2, 103:4, | O'REILLY [1] - | October [5] - |
| 9:2 | 50:17, 50:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O'Callaghan [1] } \\ & -203: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 103:8, 104:16, <br> 106:1, 106:24 | 3:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 26,35: 29 \\ & 77: 2,77: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 9:13, 9:17, 9 | nothing [18] |  |  | 124:9, 133:8, |  |
| 9:19, 9:22, |  | o'clock | 109:7, 109:11, |  | 77:29 |
| 9:26, 10:8, 10 | 10:11, 23:27, | 187:1, 195:9 | 110:9, 111:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:9, 133:8, } \\ & \text { 133:13, 133:24, } \end{aligned}$ | odd [1] - 175:4 offences [1] - |
| 10:13, 10:16 | $45: 24,83: 19$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:7, 114:11, } \\ & \text { 114:22, 114:27, } \end{aligned}$ | 156:19, 186:21, |  |
| 11:6, 11:7, 11: | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 18,97: 22, \\ & 143.8144 \cdot 2 \end{aligned}$ | O'Connor [9] - | 116:3, 125:28, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:8 } \\ & \text { offer [5] - 102:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11:16, 11:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:8, 144:2, } \\ & \text { 162:12, 162:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:17, 86:25, } \\ & \text { 87:5, 89:6, 90:7, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $205: 20,212: 16$ | 135:1, 135:12, |
| 11:19, 20:25, |  |  | 131:29, 132:8, | objected [2] - | $135: 19,162: 1$ |
| 21:24, 22:6, 22 | 169:25, 176:29, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90:13, 91:5, } \\ & \text { 157:10, 157:12 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | offering [6] - |
| 22:16, 22:18, | 193:14, 195:17, | O'Higgins [60] - | 136:13, 136:19, | objection [2] | 127:21, 127:22, |
| 23:10, 23:11 |  | 11:11, 17:6, 18:16, 22:28, | 137:6, 137:7, | 13:6, 232:17 objectively [1] - | 230:7, 233:21 offhand [1] - |
| 23:12, 23:13 | 68:1, 68:6, 117:8, 184:15, 190:19 | 18:16, 22:28, |  |  |  |
| 24:6, 24:20 |  |  | 137:8, 137:9, | $227: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:21 } \\ & \text { office [11] - 66:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 24:23, $26: 9$ | 207:22, 217: | 34:20, 40:25, | 137:10, 137:11, | oblig |  |
| 26:24, 27:1, | 218:23 | $49: 20,50: 12$ | 138:24, 138:27, | 85:23 <br> observing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 25,67: 26, \\ & 69: 14,69: 29, \end{aligned}$ |
| 28:6, 29:16, 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $30: 13,31: 3$, $33: 3,33: 7,33$ | noticed [1] | 60:27, 68:3 | 139:3, 139:6, | 70:13 | $70: 9,133: 24$ |
| 33:10, 33:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:22 } \\ & \text { notion [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $75: 27,76: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 139: 8,139: 12 \\ & 139: 25,140: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | $187: 1,200: 16$ |
| 33:13, 34:19 | 36:20, 113:25 |  | 140:6, 140:13, | 144:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Officer [1] - } \\ & \text { 221:19 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 35:21, 47:2, |  | 84:11, 85:10 | 140:15, 140:28, | obviate [1] |  |
| 47:19, 47:25, | $141: 19,161: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 25,85: 29 \\ & 87: 20,94: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 141:1, 142:14, <br> 142:20, 142:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:13 } \\ & \text { obviated }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $48: 29,49: 1,49: 7$ $49.20,49 \cdot 21$ | nowhere [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:20, 94:1, } \\ & 95: 15,99: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:20, 142:22, } \\ & \text { 142:26, 143:1, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $20: 11,225: 25$ |
| $49: 20,49: 21$ $49 \cdot 22,49 \cdot 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:11 } \\ & \text { nub }[2]-28: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 95:15, 99:8, 100:6, 102:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:26, 143:1, } \\ & \text { 143:5, 143:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 111:8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { officers [2] - } \\ \text { 120:12, 121:8 } \end{gathered}$ |
| $49: 22,49: 26$, $49: 27,49: 28$, |  | 104:10, 110:15, | 143:14, 143:18, |  |  |
| 51:6, 51:9, 51:11 | number [28] - | 110:23, 112:3, | 143:25, 144:1, | obviously [20] - | offices [1] - |
| 51:21, 52:6, | 10:20, 31:7 | 112:14, 115: | 144:5, 144:7, | 6:4, 8:28, 27:12, <br> 54:11, 76:2, | official [6] - |
| 52:12, 52:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 11,34: 12, \\ & 58: 9,60: 7,77: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:23, 136:6, } \\ & \text { 136:25, 137:26, } \end{aligned}$ | 146:13. 146:18 | 173:25, 188:21, | 12:11, 86:21, |
| 52:16, 53:19, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:25, 137:26, } \\ & 139: 14,140: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:13, 146:18, } \\ & \text { 146:24, 146:26, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 85:6, 96:22, 147.6, 156.23, | 81:3, 91:20, | 140:27, 142:13, | 146:24, 146:26, <br> $148 \cdot 24,149 \cdot 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:19, 194:15, } \\ & \text { 194:20, 207:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 171:8, 198:15 |
| 147:6, 156:23 | 91:21, 98:12, | 146:17, 146:26, | 149:9, 149:11, |  |  |
| 163:2, 172:2 | 130:16, 130:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:1, 148:14, } \\ & \text { 148:21, 185:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 149:13, 149:23, | 213:6, 217:16, | 12:27 <br> often [4] - 12:3, |
| 176:29, 180:15, | 130:19, 145:22, |  |  | 219:4, 219:16, | $67: 16,111: 17$ |
| 180:16, 195:23, | 159:4, 164:7 | $223: 23,224: 3,$ | 177:27, 177:29, | 239:9 | Oireachtas [5] - |
| 226:18, 239:26, 239 |  | $224: 11,226: 7,$ | 182:7, 223:24, 223:25, 223:28, | occasion [7] - |  |
| 239:29 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 173:4, 176:24, } \\ & \text { 176:28, 183:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 228:18, 230:21, } \\ & 235: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 223:25, 223:28, } \\ & \text { 224:5, 224:10, } \end{aligned}$226:9, 226:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:4, 119:24, } \\ & \text { 135:17, 147:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:11, 180:27, } \\ & 215: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| note' [1] - 52:13 |  |  |  |  |  |




| 120:15, 216:11, | 21:4, 31:11, | pressing [1] - | 215:23, 215:27, | 231:21 | prove [1]-42:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 219:17 posed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:26, 108:25, } \\ & \text { 124:6, 168:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 98:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 219: 12,220: 4 \\ & 220: 14.234: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { promotion [1] - } \\ & \text { - } 20 \cdot 10 \end{aligned}$ | proven [3] 57.2257 .23 |
| 217:3 | 209:8 | 61:12, 74:15, | 234:25, 235:27, | proof [1] - 56:27 | provide [6] - |
| position [34] - | prearranged [1] | 75:11, 170:21, | 236:9, 236:13, | proofed [1] - | 47:14, 105:10, |
| 7:23, 7:27, 8:4, | - 153:13 | 170:24 | 236:15, 236:20, | 167:10 | 110:4, 125:1, |
| 8:12, 8:15, 9:22, | precedent [2] - | presumably [9] - | 237:24, 238:8, | proper [4] - | 228:28 |
| 12:20, 14:10, | 215:17, 215:18 | 39:8, 40:24, 42:9, | 238:9, 238:18, | 113:20, 157:18, | provided [13] - |
| 14:12, 14:14, | precise [2] - | 42:22, 65:15, | 239:4 | 181:7, 222:29 | 35:12, 56:8, |
| 19:27, 24:20, | 47:23 | 112:26, 140:10, | privately [1] - | properly [2] - | 76:26, 122:9, |
| 34:27, 37:14, | precisely [2] - | $174: 14,177: 12$ | 221:2 | $67: 20,108: 19$ | 145:3, 161:23, |
| 44:20, 45:9, | 125:5, 140:3 | presume [8] - | privy [4] - | proposal [22] - | 164:21, 185:11, |
| 49:17, 51:5, | prefer [6]-76:3, | 65:23, 74:17, | 136:17, 149:3, | 104:17, 104:22, | 194:19, 194:23, |
| 103:24, 106:26, | 184:18, 215:26, | 79:13, 99:24, | 192:18, 212:9 | 104:24, 105:8, | 203:3, 206:20, |
| 106:29, 107:22, | 221:13, 236:8, | 138:9, 169:18, | probe [1]-41:2 | 105:13, 105:18, | 214:2 |
| 123:11, 138:11, | 236:20 | 172:3, 199:18 | probed [2] - | 105:19, 106:4, | providing [1] - |
| 166:3, 166:6, | preferred [3] - | presumed [1] - | 151:3, 154:19 | 106:7, 108:4, | 194:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 216:16, 231:19, } \\ & \text { 232:16, 232:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:16, 125:13, } \\ & 215: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 100:22 | probing [1] - <br> $14 \cdot 11$ | 108:6, 108:7, | proximity [3] - |
| 232:20, 232:22, | premise [1] | $-70: 7,161: 20$ | problem [7] - | 109:23, 109:29, | 212:15 |
| 233:8, 239:13 | 225:13 | pretty [7] - | 93:20, 94:6, | 111:6, 111:10, | public [46] - |
| positive [2] - | premises [1] - | 21:12, 78:4, | 94:10, 94:20, | 111:11, 111:27 | 28:29, 32:22, |
| $117: 26,134: 6$ | 158:12 | 127:29, 168:12, | $95: 14,96: 18$ | proposals [4]- | $34: 14,36: 14$ |
| positively [1] - | prepare [1] - | 170:6, 177:2, | $154: 12$ | 108:26, 167:29, | $44: 17,56: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 233:18 } \\ & \text { possibility [12] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:4 } \\ & \text { prepared [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 225: 12 \\ \text { prevent }[3]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { procedural [1] - } \\ & \text { 183:29 } \end{aligned}$ | 168:16, 168:21 <br> propose [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 25,59: 6 \\ & 59: 18,59: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 57:21, 84:7, 84:8, | 39:8, 57:17, | 10:12, 18:20, | procedure [1] - | 108:9 | 60:10, 60:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:6, 160:6, } \\ & \text { 190:21, 196:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $155: 24,156: 24$ | 227:20 | 85:20 | proposed [2] 104:6, 231:27 | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 13,61: 19 \\ & 73: 14,75: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 197:7, 197:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { preparing [1] - } \\ & \text { 133:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $15: 2$ | 14:28 | proposing | $103: 18,107: 5,$ |
| 198:1, 198:4, | presence [1] - | prevention [2] - | proceeded [3] - | 98:20, 108:8, | 107:29, 136:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 200:7 } \\ & \text { possible [10] - } \end{aligned}$ | 109:4 <br> present ${ }^{[9]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 15,57: 29 \\ & \text { previous [9] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:25, 188:4, } \\ & 203: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 116:5 <br> proposition [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:24, 159:25, } \\ & \text { 160:2, 166:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 42:13, 99:8, | 23:19, 49:14, | 14:1, 27:18, | proceeding [1] - | 110:1, 111:19, | 166:25, 166:27, |
| 108:12, 115:6, | 78:28, 133:12, | 28:21, 53:27, | 15:2 | 114:2 | 168:29, 169:2, |
| 140:7, 171:29, | 133:20, 149:3, | 78:1, 104:25, | proceedings [4] | prosecuted [1] - | 178:14, 180:20, |
| 183:29, 207:27, | 158:1, 180:29, | 182:23, 183:23, | $-57: 6,116: 16$ | 112:27 | 180:25, 182:4, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 210:22, 235:2 } \\ \text { possibly [14] }- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 184:7 } \\ & \text { presented [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $194: 10$ <br> previously [5] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 180:27, 181:21 } \\ \text { process [8] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { prosecution [5] } \\ & -38: 9,39: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 182:26, 200:16, } \\ & \text { 204:25, 206:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 8:16, 73:13, | 39:12, 62:22, | 36:28, 37:17, | 29:21, 104:19, | 43:29, 44:1, | 206:3, 215:21, |
| 79:15, 79:25, | 133:12 | 54:2, 72:27, | 107:21, 108:16, | 45:13 | 219:12, 220:9, |
| 88:4, 99:2, 159:6, | presenter [3]- | 166:24 | 108:21, 109:6, | prosecutions | $220: 11,225: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:28, 187:4, } \\ & \text { 188:11, 189:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 36:5, 51:4, 86:16 | Prime [8] - | 109:8, 113:28 | [1] - 37:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 234:15, 235:28, } \\ & \text { 236:12, 236:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 189:20, 190:6, | $157: 11$ | 202:28, 207:7, | $-31: 4,32: 29$ | $86: 6,121: 15$ | Public [61] - 7:7, |
| 195:15 | President's [1] - | 213:1, 221:29, | profile [1] - 99:3 | protected [18] - | $8: 13,8: 19,9: 5 \text {, }$ |
| postpone [2] 104:18, 113:18 | 199:8 | $226: 18,231: 21$ | profiling [1] - | $79: 20,80: 5,80: 7,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:26, 16:6, } \\ & \text { 16:10, 17:1, 20:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| postponed [3] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { press [19] - } \\ 42: 25,179: 20, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { principle [1] - } \\ & \text { 232:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 144:16 <br> programme [14] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:9, 80:10 } \\ & \text { 80:13, 80:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $21: 8,23: 2,30: 22$ |
| 107:21, 193:9, | 180:4, 181:21, | privacy [1] | $-35: 6,36: 3,36: 6$ | $80: 25,80: 26$ | 39:24, 40:28, |
| 196:15 | 187:7, 187:10, | 233:5 | 36:8, 76:28, | 80:29, 81:2, 81:3, | 41:27, 57:8, |
| potential [1] - | 189:19, 189:22, | private [33] - | 77:15, 77:21, | 131:17, 131:18, | 57:16, 57:19, |
| 231:29 | 190:4, 192:23, | 59:3, 107:5, | 78:8, 81:15, | 131:19, 131:21, | 59:15, 63:8, |
| potentially $[7]$ - | 193:8, 194:16, | 107:24, 107:29, | $86: 14,146: 1,$ | 132:22, 134:15 | 63:12, 64:2, |
| 7:8, 61:17, 61:23, | 194:17, 195:6, | 141:19, 167:1, | $146: 4,157: 11$ | protection [5] - | 64:27, 70:14, |
| 63:25, 140:23, | 195:20, 196:21, | 170:8, 178:13, | 231:21 | 103:13, 150:14 | 71:20, 73:22, |
| 148:25, 217:11 | 196:22, 197:8, | 179:29, 180:6, | progress [1] - | 150:20, 160:27, | 75:3, 78:9, 82:1, |
| powerful [2] - | 218:4 | 180:16, 181:25, | 155:15 | 194:1 | 88:14, 89:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:26 } \\ & \text { practice }[7] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Press [1] - } \\ & \text { 221:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 182:15, 182:25, } \\ & \text { 182:29, 215:21, } \end{aligned}$ | promoted [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { protections [1] - } \\ & \text { 106:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 29,100: 23, \\ & \text { 109:21, 116:17, } \end{aligned}$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 120:20, 129:22, | 163:3, 164:16, | - 2 | 165:23, 167:7, | rang [4]-12:18, | 193:23, 195:17, |
| 133:2, 144:11, 162:17, 163:25, | 176:14, 184:10 | quarter [5] - <br> 171:25, 188: | 170:4, 170:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 182:19, 183:15, } \\ & 183: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $205: 25,207: 23$ |
| 164:7, 164:20, | 6:8, 6:14, 17:5, | 188:21, 194:24, | 204:28, 229:20 | range [2] | 215:20, 216:14, |
| 165:7, 165:16, | 33:3, 113:27 | 196:4 | quiz [1]-62:18 | 174:23, 174:26 | 216:18, 216:2 |
| 166:1, 166:4, | 162:14 | uarters [1] | quotation [2] | rank [1] - 139:10 | 219:14, 220:20, |
| 169:27, 172:20, | pursue [4] | 72:2 | 119:23, 145:14 | rather [9] | 220:26, 223:23, |
| 179:21, 180:12, | 55:27, 96:9 | quasi [1] - 219:8 | quoted [2] | 29:16, 29:22 | 225:5, 226:12, |
| 181:1, 191:13, | 180:26, 237: | QUAY [1]-3:10 | 78:25, 124:27 | 39:16, 67:20 | 227:17, 233:21 |
| 202:24, 204:3, | pursuing [2] | queries [1] | quotes [1] - 36:8 | 76:22, 109:16 | 236:11 |
| 206:10, 207:12, | 67:12, 217:23 | 30:18 | quoting [2]- | 161:19, 196:25, | reapply [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:20, 215:19, } \\ & 227: 15.227: 25 \end{aligned}$ | pursuit [1] | question-mark | 9:14, 36:7 | 196:28 | 184:16 |
| public/private [2] - 109:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 10 \\ & \text { put }[73]-8: 14, \end{aligned}$ | [1] - 214:27 <br> questioned [2] - <br> 15.25,52.18 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 231:4 } \\ & \text { rationale [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 17,18: 12,19: 1, \\ & 19: 2,19: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| 219:22 <br> publicity [6] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:16, 26:25, } \\ & \text { 28:6, 31:3, 31:15, } \end{aligned}$ | QUESTIONED | Rabbitte [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 216:23 } \\ & \text { RE }_{[4]}-4: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 10,44: 9,49: 9 \\ & 55: 10,56: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| 18:10, 33:20, | 31:25, 39:19, | $173: 11,182: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 153: 1,153: 9, \\ & 153 \cdot 25 \end{aligned}$ | 4:22, 165:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 11,57: 25 \\ & 57: 26,58: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 61:8, 62:27, | 39:22, 56:25, |  | 153:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 239:1 } \\ & \text { RE-EXAMINED } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 62:28, 63:1 } \\ \text { publicly }[6] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | 75:21, 78:15, | 180:17 | $34: 13,34: 16$ 34:17, 91:18 |  | 96:17, 101:8, |
| 57:27, 66:12, | 82:5, 82:16, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 17,91: 18 \\ & 96: 4,96: 5,201: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $165: 4,239: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:9, 102:9, } \\ & \text { 102:14, 102:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 72: 27,214: 24, \\ & 217: 13.219: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $82: 25,84: 23$ | inquiry [1] - 133:5 |  | reached [1] - | 102:17, 102:28, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 217:13, 219:6 } \\ \text { published [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 23,97: 23, \\ & \text { 104:17, 104:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { questions [31] - } \\ \text { 24:6, 28:3, 35:11, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 224:21 } \\ & \text { raibh [1] - } 5: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 178:17 <br> reaching [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:17, 102:28, } \\ & \text { 103:6, 103:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 215:9 } \\ & \text { pull }[3]-85: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 104: 25,104: 27 \\ & \text { 105:19, 109:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 24.6, 28.3, 35.11, | raibh [1]-5:7 <br> railing [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:7 } \\ & \text { react }[2]-73: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:12, 109:3, } \\ & \text { 109:12, 110:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 96: 22,240: 3 \\ & \text { pulled [2] - } 35: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:24, 110:28, } \\ & \text { 111:7, 111:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:11, } 96: 8, \\ & \text { 146:15, 146:19, } \end{aligned}$ | rain [2] - 101:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:26 } \\ & \text { reaction }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 143:6, 148:25, |
| 187:16 Pulse [13] - | 111:11, 111:20, | $146: 29,150: 4$ | 102:26 | $\begin{aligned} & 84: 25,122: 17, \\ & 157: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 154:16, 162:5, } \\ & \text { 162:10, 164:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Pulse [13] - <br> 118:18, 141:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 112: 1,112: 4 \\ & 112: 28,114: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:29, 164:15, } \\ & \text { 173:14, 192:27, } \end{aligned}$ | 100:29, 101:10, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:10, 164:3, } \\ & \text { 167:26, 168:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:18, 141:12, } \\ & \text { 142:5, 142:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:28, 114:2, } \\ & 121: 4,122: 24, \end{aligned}$ |  | 101:15, 101:19, | read [23]-20:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 206: 15,218: 9 \\ & 220: 4,220: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 142:11, 142:23, | 125:1, 130:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:26, 202:15, } \\ & \text { 223:25, 224:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:15, 101:19, } \\ & \text { 101:29, 102:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 33:21, 33:24, | 220:4, 220:10, |
| 142:24, 143:7, | 142:5, 142:7 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:20, 162:7, } \\ & \text { 189:26 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 16,49: 21 \\ & 69: 2,71: 5,80: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $236: 15$ |
| 143:13, 144:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:25, 151:6, } \\ & \text { 152:28. 153:5. } \end{aligned}$ | 226:12, 228:20, |  |  | $84: 8,100: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:16, 144:20, } \\ & 145: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 152: 28,153: 5 \\ & \text { 156:26, 158:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 230:8, 234:20, | 61:28, 62:2, | 80:9, 81:2, 88:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:8, 100:1, } \\ & \text { 102:28, 106:29, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Purcell [7] | 158:24, 161:26, | 240:22 | 63:28, 67:3, | 125:26, 127:13 | 109:13, 114:24, |
| 170:27, 171:17, | 163:18, 167:19, | quick [3] | 128:6, 183:28 | 131:23, 153:24, | 184:19, 216:17 |
| 171:19, 171:26, | 168:28, 176:13, | 23:17, 104:14 | raised [18] | $165: 18,206: 4$ | reasonably [5] - |
| 172:5, 172:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:5, 178:26, } \\ & \text { 190:5. 190:15 } \end{aligned}$ | 176:27 | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 3,54: 12 \\ & 60: 25,62: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 209:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:10, 69:15, } \\ & \text { 103:7, 141:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| purely [1] - | 204:21, 209:18, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { quickly [4] - } \\ 69: 15,76: 12, \end{array}$ | 63:19, 64:9, <br> 66:11, 69:14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { reading [3] - } \\ \text { 80:14, 117:28, } \end{gathered}$ | 183:17 |
| 223:28 <br> purpose [39] - | $\begin{aligned} & 230: 1,230: 16 \\ & 230: 18,230: 28 \end{aligned}$ | quiet [5] - 75:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 16,103: 12, \\ & \text { 103:13, 113:3, } \end{aligned}$ | real [2] - 178:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:10 } \\ & \text { reasons [8] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 5:25, 6:8, 6:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 236: 10,237: 23 \text {, } \\ & 238 \cdot 5240 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ | $190: 13,191: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:13, 113:3, } \\ & \text { 133:20, 153:14, } \end{aligned}$ | realise [1] - | $45: 13,75: 8,75: 9$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:23, 6:27, 7:1, } \\ & 7: 4,8: 9,8: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 238: 5,240: 4 \\ & 240: 9,240: 12 \end{aligned}$ |  | 154:17, 167:23, |  | $45: 13,75: 8,75: 9,$ 76:21, 93:10, |
| 9:2, 9:20, 9:22, | puts [1] - 45:4 <br> putting [10] - | 8:2, 10:14, 14:9, | raising [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { realities [1] } \\ & \text { 111:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 76:21, 93:10, <br> 215:27, 218:26 |
| $15: 1,18: 19,20: 1$ | 29:23, 31:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:8, 18:3, 18:27, } \\ & \text { 23:12, 29:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 66:3, 66:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:25 } \\ & \text { reality [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 222:29 } \\ & \text { recalled [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 29:2, 30:17, 34:2, | $60: 10,98: 7$ | 39:14, 39:15, | 66:26, 67:10, $68: 5,68: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:20 } \\ & \text { really [32] - 7:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:6 } \\ & \text { receive [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 42:6, 59:26, $61: 22,66: 21$, | 114:28, 148:9, | 41:11, 52:13, | 112:10, 117:7 |  | receive [3] - 170:18, 172:11, |
| 66:25, 66:27, |  | 52:14, 60:29, <br> 66:23, 90:13, <br> 99:3, 104:13, <br> 106:21, 111:19, <br> 112:14, 130:21, <br> 148:12, 165:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { random }[4] \text { - } \\ & 26: 1,28: 21,30: 8, \\ & 32: 28 \\ & \text { randomly }[1] \text { - } \\ & 30: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:27, 68:22, } \\ & \text { 102:1, 148:13, } \\ & \text { 163:19, 169:25, } \\ & \text { 173:15, 175:1, } \\ & \text { 181:19, 189:19, } \\ & \text { 190:15, 193:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 172: 14 \\ & \quad \text { received }[9] \text { - } \\ & 51: 5,51: 7,57: 18, \\ & 62: 20,109: 15 \\ & 110: 10,117: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| 67:8, 67:10, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 108:11, 114:28, | Q |  |  |  |  |
| 159:11, 161:6, | qualification [1] |  |  |  |  |





| simply [20]-6:5, | solicitor [5] | 168:18, 169:16, | 121:25, 147:3 | 195:17 | 234:8, 239: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:22, 7:21, 17:11, | 44:24, 151:17, | 171:17, 174:25, | [1] - 70:20 | g | 239:27, 240:1 |
| 31:16, 47:25, | 152:9, 153:2, | 176:20, 179:15, | spend [1] | 44:1 | statements [7] - |
| 49:6, 50:3, 60:19, | 184:29 | 182:21, 186:22, | 211:15 | starkly [1] - | 98:18, 121:29, |
| 66:13, 83:18, | SOLICITORS [3] | 187:24, 191:24, | spending [2] - | 112:3 | 145:17, 154:4, |
| 127:18, 139:4, | - 3:5, 3:9, 3:12 | 198:27, 198:28, | 114:6, 166:14 | start [3]-60:21, | 157:6, 202:14 |
| 139:26, 139:27, | solicitors [1] - | 210:26, 213:21, | spent [1] - | 122:25, 189:2 | states [2] |
| 148:11, 179:3, | 219:27 | 216:3, 217:1, | 191:13 | started [7] | 137:18, 152:10 |
| 211:20, 227:4, | meone [25] | 233:8, 238:27 | spite [1] - 169:4 | 28:14, 76:12, | Station [4] - |
| 228:11 | 20:7, 39:21, 40:1, <br> $40 \cdot 5,40 \cdot 7,40 \cdot 29$ | 239:25, 239:28 | spoken [6] - | 104:29, 122:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:8, 187:3, } \\ & 10715 \quad 107 \end{aligned}$ |
| 47:14, 51:23 | 43:5, 43:6, 67:19, | 67:21, 131:3, | $\text { 81:21, } 81:$ | 186:19 | station [9] |
| sinister [1] - | 74:27, 88:10, | 219:1 | 145:21, 163:26 | starts [2] - | 44:19, 142:17, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 103:6 } \\ \text { sit }[7] \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 17,131: 1, \\ & \text { 148:10, 149:4 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sorted [1] } \\ & \text { 236:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sport [1] - } \\ 152: 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 132:17, 203:20 } \\ \text { state }[6]-10: 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:7, 159:12, } \\ & \text { 159:17, 159:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 51:22, 70:1, | 211:21, 213:23, | sorts [2]-55:22, | sport [1] - 191:5 | 10:24, 29:28, | 196:21, 200:6 |
| 107:11, 178:28, | 213:24, 225:26, | 75:8 | spot [1]-25:25 | 96:24, 116:17, | stationed [4] - |
| 179:4 | 229:7, 229:26, | sought [1] - | spread [1] - | 138:17 | 138:14, 138:15, |
| sit-down [1] - | 230:6, 238:6 | 169:11 | 59:22 | State [4]-41:20, | $138: 28,186: 7$ |
| 70:1 | sometimes [1] - | sound [1] | spring [1] - | 42:5, 44:23, | stations [2] - |
| sitting [7]- | 236:10 | 216:17 | 226:23 | 55:24 | 200:3, 200:8 |
| 29:28, 69:28 | somewhat [6] | soundings [1] - | spur [1]-7:21 | statement [84] - | statistically [1] - |
| 70:3, 70:6, 70:16, | 15:29, 21:14, | 238:10 | square [2] - | 33:4, 68:28, 69:6, | 214:26 |
| 97:20, 235:3 | 25:13, 121:2, | source [4] | 31:4, 214:22 | 69:8, 72:13, | stature [1] - |
| situation [2] - | 128:2, 137:15 | 73:29, 118:22 | SQUARE [1] - | 72:17, 74:6, | 74:27 |
| $\begin{gathered} 22: 22,111: 14 \\ \operatorname{six}[6]-59: 2, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { somewhere [3] - } \\ & 78: 21,125: 18 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $144: 25,149: 7$ <br> sources [1] - | 3:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 18,102: 3 \\ & \text { 119:13, 121:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { stay }[3]-36: 21, \\ 59: 12,221: 13 \end{gathered}$ |
| 78:18, 171:25, | 140:10 | 145:10 | 151:26 | 122:3, 122:8, | stayed [2] - |
| 199:7, 199:10, | soon [2]-17:21, | space [3]-10:4, | squeeze [1] - | 122:9, 122:12, | 102:20, 186:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:11 } \\ & \text { sixth [2] - 67:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 191:28 <br> sooner [2] | $25: 7,204: 26$ <br> speaking [12] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:7 } \\ & \text { squeezed [2] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 18,123: 15 \\ & \text { 123:18, 124:19, } \end{aligned}$ | steal [1] - 75:1 stealing [1] - |
| 77:6 | 81:22, 96:10 | 36:15, 36:16, | 25:7, 25:13 | 124:28, 125:7, | 74:22 |
| skilled [1] - 51:3 | sorry [77]-16:7, | 48:19, 53:7 | stage [22] | 125:12, 125:14, | steering [2] - |
| skipping [1] - | 20:27, 23:22, | 131:20, 135:3, | 11:27, 30:14, | 125:19, 125:29, | 29:15, 29:23 |
| 93:10 | 24:9, 27:28, 28:2, | 136:2, 136:3, | 40:19, 57:21 | 127:20, 127:21, | stenographer |
| Skylon [5] - | 28:8, 28:17, | 159:28, 195:28, | 60:17, 75:21, | 137:5, 137:6, | [1] - 71:5 |
| 129:29, 130:21, | 30:24, 31:28, | 212:13, 239:16 | 75:24, 75:25, | 137:12, 137:15, | step [2]-21:23, |
| 131:14, 131:15, | 38:18, 51:18, | specific [8] | 76:23, 118:25, | 137:21, 145:20, | 60:1 |
| 145:27 | 52:4, 54:15, | 15:13, 31:2, | 147:28, 162:24 | 146:9, 147:14, | sticker [1] - |
| slide [1] - 73:24 | 58:26, 62:1 | 45:22, 46:17 | 172:5, 187:23 | 148:26, 149:15, | 176:23 |
| slight [2] - | 62:17, 64:29, | 55:8, 96:13, | 187:27, 189:15, | 155:23, 155:24, | still [9]-54:16, |
| 193:17, 228:4 | 73:9, 80:17, | 104:17, 221:26 | 189:23, 208:28, | 156:9, 156:24, | 78:20, 104:5, |
| slightly [6] - | 87:21, 88:29, | specifically [3] - | 213:21, 213:29, | 157:23, 157:25, | 107:2, 107:20, |
| 5:14, 16:23, | 89:1, 93:15, | 35:20, 152:19, | 216:9, 219:21 | 161:22, 162:13, | 108:12, 208:13, |
| 116:9, 125:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:29, 98:1, } \\ & \text { 106:2, 106:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 199:27 | stairs [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:15, 178:4, } \\ & \text { 185:10, 185:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 212:22 |
| 203:18, 214:16 | 106:2, 106:16, | specify [1] | 204:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 185:10, 185:24, } \\ & \text { 194:19, 194:21. } \end{aligned}$ | stole [1] - 74:29 |
| Sligo [1] - 200:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:26, 108:5, } \\ & \text { 108:6, 109:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 129:8 | stand [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 194:19, 194:21, } \\ & \text { 194:22, 194:28, } \end{aligned}$ | stolen [2] - |
| small [4] - | 108:6, 109:7, 115:4, 117:29, | speculation [1] $128 \cdot 16$ | 64:29, 70:9, | 194:29, 195:28, | $74: 19,75: 16$ |
| 142:15, 183:28, $185: 5,227: 7$ | 119:28, 120:7, | speech [23] | 127:29 | 202:8, 202:11, | $\begin{gathered} \text { stood [3] - } \\ 34: 25,193: 14 . \end{gathered}$ |
| smear [1] - | 120:14, 125:28, | 17:23, 21:2, 21:6, | 64:29 | 202:18, 204:9, | $216: 22$ |
| 20:16 | 127:12, 132:1, | 21:19, 21:26, | stand-out [1] - | 206:5, 206:20, | stop [6] - 13:28, |
| SMITHFIELD [1] | 135:29, 136:2, | 21:27, 21:28, | 127:29 | 206:22, 209:27, | $30: 28,35: 1 \text {, }$ |
| - $3: 13$ | 136:3, 136:6, | 33:15, 33:18, | standard [1] - | 211:19, 212:21, | 187:4, 200:14, |
| snappy [1] - | 137:4, 138:22, | 33:28, 35:5, | 168:23 | 213:15, 214:2, | 207:20 |
| 48:20 | 142:26, 145:23, | 35:20, 36:8, | standing [4] - | 214:6, 216:6, | stopped [2] - |
| so.. [3]-34:11, | 149:25, 149:26, | 72:23, 101:7, | 47:29, 70:16, | 225:17, 228:24, | 10:16, 204:14 |
| 138:9, 143:24 | 152:28, 158:19, | 119:21, 120:4, | 86:17, 204:15 | 229:1, 229:20 | stopping [1] - |
| solely [1] - | 158:28, 160:12, | $120: 5,121: 18$ | stands [3] - | 229:24, 230:29, | 197:5 |
| 118:24 | 161:4, 1 | 121:22, 121:23, | 34:25, 100:6, | 231:4, | stories [8] - |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:17, 82:24, } \\ & 95: 1,95: 20,96: 1, \end{aligned}$ | [1] - 54:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { suggestions [1] } \\ & -108: 26 \end{aligned}$ | suppose [21]- | T | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tea }[2]-102: 28, \\ & 102: 29 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 120:11, 121:7 | 169:26, 218:22 | ted | :29, 34: |  | Teachta [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 139: 15 \\ & \text { story }[19]-20: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $231: 18$ <br> subterfuge [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 19,99: 20 \\ & 99: 25,99: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 6,39: 13 \\ & 44: 11,50: 2 \end{aligned}$ | tab [1] - 176:11 <br> table [4]-133:3, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 201:25, 202:22 } \\ \text { tease [1] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 7,26: 20 \\ & 38: 26,60: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 190:11 subtl | 236:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:5, 100:23, } \\ & \text { 101:23, 154:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:23, 168:19, } \\ & 238: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 146:28 |
| 82 | 213:28 | [ [1] - 184:21 | 166:13, 196:11 | tabs [1] - 176:13 | 30:19, 79:16 |
| 123:15, 125 | succeed | ummarised [1] | 200:16, 205:14 | Taoiseach [11] - | 130:4, 130:16 |
| 126:24, 126:25, | 79:5, 180:28 | - 147:10 | 206:9, 211:27 | 62:9, 62:22, 65:2, | 130:17, 173:1 |
| 126:27, 126:29, | 182:5 | mmary [3] | 223:8, $238: 4$ | 66:11, 74:5, | 183:20 |
| 137:28, 144:18, | succeeded [1] - | 142:13, 143:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { supposed [1] - } \\ & 175 \cdot ? ? \end{aligned}$ | 151:16, 220:15, | telephoned [1] - |
| 155:20, 155:23, | 182:2 | 226:23 | 175:22 | 220:18, 220:28, | 130:19 |
| straight [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { suffering }[3] \\ 42: 14,42: 15, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { summer [1] } \\ & 15: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Supreme [1] - } \\ & \text { 218:19 } \end{aligned}$ | Taoiseach's [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Templemore [1] } \\ & -186: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $9: 26,197: 14$ strategy [1] - | 42:18 | summon [1] - | surely [7] - $11 \cdot 22,22 \cdot 13$ | $-222: 16$ tape $[8]-48$ | tempo [2] - |
| 133:3 | suffice [1]-64 sufficient [2] - | 35:1 summonses | $22: 17,37: 1$ | $50: 2,50: 4,50: 9$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 228:4, 228:5 } \\ \text { temporal [1] } \end{gathered}$ |
| STREET [2] - | 41:17, 82:4 | - 207:16 | 42:28, 49:19, | $50: 10,50: 15$ | 149:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3:6, 3:13 } \\ & \text { Street }[10]- \end{aligned}$ | sufficiently [2] - | Sunday [6] - | 63:25 | $\begin{gathered} 50: 21,52: 18 \\ \text { tape-recoro } \end{gathered}$ | $\operatorname{ten}[3]-77: 2$ |
| 126:4, 126:5 | suggest [14] | 91:18, 91:27 | 33:21, 134:10 | [5] - 48:5, 50:2, | tend [2] - |
| 138:7, 138:14, | 9:25, 11:22, 13:1, | $92: 7,157: 11$ | $134: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 9,50: 21, \\ & 50 \cdot 18 \end{aligned}$ | $100: 10,173: 25$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:16, 138:29, } \\ & \text { 139:5, 139:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 11,61: 18, \\ & 76: 14,85: 4,8 \end{aligned}$ | sunshine [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { surprised [5] - } \\ & 34: 6,34: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 52:18 } \\ & \text { tapped [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | term [4]-39:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:5, 140:6 } \\ & \text { strength [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 103:11, 121:27, | Superintenden | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 184:10, 206:16, } \\ & 227: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:20, 205:12, } \\ & \text { 205:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 226:29 |
| 163:4 <br> stress [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:2, 178:9 } \\ & \text { suggested }[11]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 129: 27,131: 16 \\ & 131: 25,132: 6 \end{aligned}$ | surprising $[1]$ - 136:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tara }[1]-193: 5 \\ & \text { task [1] - 13:28 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 15,23: 5,36: 24, \\ & 37: 5,37: 25,39: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 93:22 | 38:8, 88:19, 93:3, | 132:24, 134:12 | surrounding [4] | tattle [4]-11:16, | $46: 20,47: 9$ |
| strictly | 104:19, 107:16, | 134:15, 136:18 | - 18:10, 32: | 39:11, 39:14 | 56:23, 60:3 |
| 181:2 | 108:21, 138:29, | 137:2, 137:13, | $61: 8,181: 9$ | 95:20 | $60: 24,69: 10$ |
| strong [2] - | 157:21, 168:16, | 137:26, 137:27 | suspended [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taylor [41] - } \\ 88: 26,124: 9 . \end{gathered}$ | 73:28, 81:7, |
| 121:14, 209:16 strongly [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 190:9, 191:19 } \\ & \text { suggesting [38] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 141: 2,141: 9 \\ & 145: 26,145: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:27 } \\ & \text { suss [1] - } 238: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:26, 124:9, } \\ & \text { 129:24, 129:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:17, 90:17, } \\ & \text { 106:26, 110:26, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 204:2, 213:9, | - 8:6, 13:27, | 146:27, 191:21, | swear [1] - 54:6 | 130:7, 130:8, | 114:5, 129:3, |
| 226:19, 227:4 | 13:29, 19:2 | 192:13, 192:14, | sweet [1] - 47:27 | 130:10, 131:9, | 144:19, 147:27, |
| stuck [4] | 34:11, 34:17, | 192:16, 192:19 | switch [1] | 31:11, 131:25, | 147:28, 149:20, |
| 30:13, 206:18, | 43:17, 45:10, | 192:21, 193:5, | 51:25 | 132:6, 132:24, | 168:29, 194:3, |
| 224:28, 225:18 | 51:3, 60:1, 60:5, | 194:4, 195:23 | SWORN | 134:12, 136:7, | 195:19, 196:11, |
| studio [2] - $79.12,79 \cdot 13$ | 73:1, 75:14, | 196:14, 197:7, | 186:1, 202: | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 18,137: 2, \\ & 137 \cdot 13 \\ & 137 \cdot 26 \end{aligned}$ | 210:6, 210:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 79: 12,79: 13 \\ & \text { study }[1]-240 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 18,100: 15 \\ & 104: 16,106: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $223: 27,226: 14$ | sworn [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:13, 137:26, } \\ & \text { 137:27, 145:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 211:10, 214:16 } \\ & 217: 11,221: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| stuff [2]-83:3, | 106:10, 106:29, | [6] - 44:21, 105:9, | system [5] | 145:27, 146:7, | 226:2, 227:2 |
| $154: 11$ | 107:17, 109:12, | 105:15, 105:17, | $74: 26,117: ?$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:27, 148:22, } \\ & \text { 156:19, 184:6, } \end{aligned}$ | terribly [1] - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $13$ | 199:3, 217:2 | 192:13, 192:14, | 185:5 |
| 86:20, 113:4, | $\text { 113:1, } 113: 1$ | 's [1] - 108:1 |  | 192:16, 192:19, | $170: 25,172: 2$ |
| 118:16, 143:16, | 113:15, 114:11, | superior [1] | $128: 18,161: 22$ | 192:21, 193:5, | texts [2] |
| 145:5, 164:11, | $118: 19,121: 2$, $122 \cdot 16,127: 18$ | $114: 5$ | Síochána [18] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 194:4, 195:23, } \\ & \text { 196:14, 197:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $172: 13,172: 23$ |
| 208:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:16, 127:18, } \\ & \text { 164:1, 212:29, } \end{aligned}$ | supplier's [1] - | 8:2, 61:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:14, 197:7, } \\ & \text { 223:27, 226:14 } \end{aligned}$ | thanked [3] - <br> 66.3, 67:6, 68:10 |
|  | 213:12, 232:29, | 176 | $11$ | TAYLOR [1] - | 66:3, 67:6, 68:10 |
| submission [1] - | 233:28 | 168:4 | $158: 15,158: 17$ |  | $67: 10,69: 16$ |
| $87: 13$ | suggestion [10] | supported [1] - | $158: 21,160: 5$ | Taylor's [4] - <br> 129:27, 130:17 | THE [11] - 4:8, |
| submitted [1] - | - 13:3, 50:14, <br> 108:22, 110:11 | 69:21 | 179:20, 180:4, | 131:16, 134:15 | 4:10, 5:1, 115:8, |
| 138:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:22, 110:11, } \\ & \text { 138:28, 159:9, } \end{aligned}$ | supporting [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 180:26, 181:6, } \\ & \text { 181:9, 186:5, } \end{aligned}$ | TD [5] - 36:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:1, 173:11, } \\ & \text { 182:9. 185:21. } \end{aligned}$ |
| subsequent [2] - $17: 15,146: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:26, 165:27, } \\ & \text { 178:5, 230:4 } \end{aligned}$ | supportive [1] - | 221:18, 228:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:9, 159:7, } \\ & \text { 161:22, 162:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:22, 241:1, } \\ & 241: 5 \end{aligned}$ |



| 195:14, 196:4, | 236:24 | 23:23, 24:21, | value [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 15,132: 12 \\ & \text { 132:14, 140:20, } \\ & \text { 151:8, 179:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:3, 191:27, } \\ & \text { 198:22, 198:24, } \\ & \text { 198:26, 198:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 198:19, 199:4, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 142: 28 \\ & \text { vantage [1] - } \\ & \text { 190:10 } \\ & \text { Varadkar [11] - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 220:17, 223:25, |  | 32:1, 35:2, 36:2, |  |  |  |
| 226:11, 229:2 |  | 39:24, 67:13 |  | 203:8, 212:26 | $98: 28,199: 4$ |
| two-line [1] |  | 70:16, 83:23 |  | 216:12 | 199:5, 199:10 |
| 229:2 |  | 85:26, 101:22 | 74:6, 75:13 | Volume [16] | 199:11, 199:14 |
| tying [1]-126:4 |  | 102:3, 106:11 | 75:24, 76:1 | 24:16, 132:13 | 199:15, 220:1, |
| type [8]-49:18, |  | 107:5, 111:16, | 151:16, 151:20, | 140:25, 151:9, | 237:18 |
| 59:22, 70:10, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:7, 120:14 } \\ & \text { 122:18, 123:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:2, 152:9, } \\ & \text { 152:26, 221:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 179:15, 185:24, | weekend [5] - |
| 83:20, 125:22 |  |  |  |  | 6:26, 7:16, 8:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:20, 154:11, } \\ & 157: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:4, 131:8, } \\ & \text { 132:11, 140:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 225:13 } \\ & \text { various [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 202:10, 202:12, } \\ & \text { 203:7, 206:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 9:1, 109:18 weeks [2] - |
| typeface [1] - |  | 150:7, 150:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 5,121: 14 \\ & 150: 5,236: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $213: 16,213: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 18,80: 4 \\ & \text { weighed }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 77:13 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 6,152: 4, \\ & 152: 28,153: 5, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| typewritten [1] - |  |  | ventilated [1] - | volumes [2] - | 221:6 <br> welcome [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:1 } \\ & \text { typically }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:6, 156:7, } \\ & \text { 156:26, 157:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 153:12 | 202:17, 206:24 | $30: 20,212: 21$ |
| 205:7 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 158: 2,158: 4 \\ & 158: 24,161: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 110:1, 169:4 } \\ \text { verbatim [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 236:16, 236:18, } \\ & 237: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 14:5 |
| U |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:12, 168:28, } \\ & \text { 172:5, 174:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 27:1 <br> version [6] - | W | well-known [1] - |
|  |  |  |  |  | 98:29 |
| ultimate [1] - |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:9, 185:4, } \\ & \text { 185:12, 186:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 26,6: 2,91: 1 \\ & \text { 125:13, 164:21, } \end{aligned}$ | waiting [2]- | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-109: 15} \\ & \text { wet }[4]-99: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| 114:5 <br> ultimately $[7]$ - | unilaterally [1] - | 216:16, 220:21, | 216:12 | 135:5, 200:15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { wet [4]-99:11, } \\ \text { 101:11, 102:12, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 106:13, 108:15, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 216: 16,220: 21, \\ & 225: 6,228: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { versions [1] - } \\ & \text { 125:23 } \end{aligned}$ | wall [2]-99:10, | 162:8 |
| 110:12, 113:18, 181:4, 182:3, | Unit [3]-138:13, | 231:10, 238:8 | view [14] - 44:9, | 99:11 | whatsoever [3] - |
| 234:22 <br> unaware [1] - |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:5 } \\ & \text { upper [1] - 32:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 98:17, 113:23, | wants [1] - | 49:16 |
| 153:16 |  | upset [7] - | 148:22, 149:20, | warn [1] - | $29: 16,29: 23$ |
| uncertainty [1] - |  | 10:14, 10:24 | 174:19, 225:23, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:16, 29:23 } \\ & \text { whereabouts [1] } \end{aligned}$ |
| 155:16 unclear [2] - $15: 3,67: 24$ <br> uncomfortable | unproven [1] - | 12:4, 13:10, | $230: 5,233: 22$ | $\text { WAS }_{[14]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -27: 27 \\ & \text { whereby [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:24 } \\ & \text { unrelated }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 87 | $44: 13,44: 16$ | 165:4, 173:11, | whereby [1] - 108:16 |
|  | $152: 18$ | upsetting [1] | $44: 19,44: 28$ |  | 108:16 wherein [1] - |
| [5] - 216:8, 218:1, |  | 148:12 |  | 186:1, 193:2, | 160:18 |
| 218:4, 218:13, | 241:5 | upstairs [1] | 159:16, 208:5, $208: 21.208: 29$ | 198:12, 202:4, | whilst [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 221:7 } \\ & \text { under [8] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | $44: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 208:21, 208:29, } \\ & \text { 209:16, 209:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 198:12, 202:4, } \\ & 224: 16,226: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:21 } \\ & \text { whistleblower } \end{aligned}$ |
| 61:12, 75:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 143: 8 \\ & \text { untrue [5] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | 214:8, 232:3, | $228: 16,239: 1$ | [5] - 30:7, 83:8, |
| 99:27, 106:3, | $40: 21,45: 27$ | usual [3] | 233:5 | waste [1] - 10:28 watch [2] - | 116:23, 118:7, |
| $165: 9,171: 21$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 124: 6,142: 21 \\ & 228: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { watch [2] - } \\ \text { 101:24, 202:20 } \end{gathered}$ | 171:10 |
| undermine [1] - | 113:14 <br> untrustworthy | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 228:11 } \\ & \text { uttered [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { vile }[13]-5: 22, \\ 8: 1,13: 22,13: 26 \end{gathered}$ | Waterford [2] - | whistleblowers [20] - 12:23, 79:6, |
| 8:3 undermining [3] | $[1]-152: 18$ | $36: 25$ | $19: 16,20: 8$ | 221:1 <br> ways [4]-32:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 11,80: 15 \\ & 80: 27,94: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| - 13:23, 59:26, | 83:19 |  | 120:2, 120:4, | 51:12, 84:17, | 116:19, 155:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:23 } \\ & \text { underneath [2] - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:11, 121:7, } \\ & 213: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $227: 24$ | 175:17, 176:17, |
| $29: 4,206: 26$ <br> understand.. [1] |  |  | vileness [1] 19:23 | 190:8 | 208:5, 209:17, |
| $-94: 10$ |  | vacancy [1] | vindicated [3] - | 168:29 <br> Wednesday [1] - | 218:21, 218:25, |
| understandabl |  | 199:1 | 221:4, 222:5, |  | 231:8, 232:3 |
| e [3]-43:27, <br> 100.2, 174:24 |  | vade [1]-17 vague [5] - | 240:19 | 180:3 | white [1] - 25:19 |
| understood [7] - |  | 15:17, 16:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { visit [2]-200:3, } \\ & \text { 200:7 } \end{aligned}$ | week [26]-35:6, | $\begin{gathered} \text { whole [6]-29:5, } \\ \text { 41:12, 130:29, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 11:4, 112:23, |  | 149:20, 223:15, | voc | 36:3, 76:28, | 149:19, 176:5, |
| 129:9, 149:18, |  | 223:17 | 165:23 | 77:14, 77:21, | 238:26 |




[^0]:    "No, as I said at the time, if I had spoken about it at

[^1]:    "I cautioned on the need to be aware of the correctness

