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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON TUESDAY, 15TH MAY 2018 AT 11: 00AM

MR. QUINN: Chairman, just on behalf of -- sorry, Chairman, I wonder if I could just clarify something that arose yesterday, just on behalf of Juno McEnroe? Oisin Quinn, instructed by Ronan Daly Jermyn with Mr. Shane Lynch on behalf of the Examiner and its journalists. Chairman, I think just yesterday it may have been put to the witness or suggested that Mr. McEnroe was one of the journalists who was denying that he had been negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor, or indeed anyone, and I think a question from volume 19, page 5152 was put to the witness who's currently giving evidence, Superintendent Taylor. And that question, at 5152 in volume 19, was:
"I have been asked whet her I have any information or evi dence about an or chestrated campai gn di rected by seni or officers of the Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by spreading rumours about his professi onal and personal life and if so, l have been asked to provi de details and all attendant circumstances and detail of where this was emanating from"

And he answers "No". In fact there is an important previous question that wasn't put up on the screen or put to the witness at line 130 , where he says:
"I have been asked to confirm whether I was briefed negativel y about Sergeant McCabe by anyone and if so to detail by whoml was negatively briefed, to provide the details and all attendant circunstances."

And his answer is:
"I refer to my above statements in this regard."

And those above statements are found two pages back, Chairman, at page 5150 where he says, beginning at line 101:
"While l'mhere to assist the Tribunal, l believe that
I cannot answer any questions that mi ght reveal a confidential source or that might have the tendency to reveal a confidential source on account of the obl igations that l have towards my sources in my capacity as journalist. I reserve the right to refer to this statement when answering any questions put to me by the Tribunal's investi gators."

So, Chairman, just to explain, it's Mr. McEnroe's instructions, and I think reflected in this statement specifically asked whether he was briefed negatively about Sergeant McCabe by anyone, he doesn't actually deny that, he refers to his statement in relation to
privilege.
CHA RMAN A11 right.
MR. QU N: And just given the way matters were put to Superintendent Taylor yesterday and the public reporting of that, we're keen on behalf of Mr. McEnroe row to clarify that. He's not one of the group of journalists denying that he was negatively briefed about Sergeant McCabe, he's in the group who is referring back to a claim of privilege.
CHA RMAN So what does 133 mean and 138 mean then?
MR. QUN: We11, that's a separate --
CHA RMAN "No, I have not any inf or mation or evi dence about an orchestrated campai gn di rected by seni or of ficers of the Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Sergeant McCabe by spreading rumours about his personal and prof essi onal life.

No, I was not contacted by superintendent David Tayl or in rel ation to Ser geant McCabe. "

Referring to his previous statement above. Am I supposed to go, kind of, six pages above in order to get the right answer, is that what you're telling me?

MR. QU N: We11, I think, Chairman, in fairness, clearly, as I understand it, the questions that were being put to the witness in this interview were prepared questions, and I think we can only assume from the fact that two separate questions were asked about being negatively briefed in the first instance and
then, secondly, about an orchestrated campaign that someone has decided they mean two different things. I think, in fairness, they clearly do mean two separate things. He hasn't denied the first one, he has referred back to his statement of privilege. And I think it was suggested to the witness that in fact Mr. McEnroe had denied he was being negatively briefed, whereas when he is specifically asked that, he doesn't deny it.
CHAI RMAK We11, lawyers tend to deny things 15
different ways, if I'm reading Defences all my professional life and reading Statement of Claims with particulars 15 of which say exactly the same thing. So, I suppose that can spill over into investigators. But what are you telling me? I mean, are you telling me that he was negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor?
MR. QU N: No, Chairman, I'm telling you that he hasn't denied it, he's claimed the privilege that's referred to in his statement in relation to not wishing 10:05 to confirm or deny or discuss anything that might reveal a confidential source.
CHA RMAN All right. Well, Mr. McEnroe is giving evidence soon, isn't he?
MR. QU N: He is.
CHA RMAN In which case I think you have to engage with whatever circumstances give rise to such a privilege. I mean, I can't sit and do an academic exercise on this thing, I have to judge it on the basis
of whatever facts are before me. At the moment the facts which are before me are that Superintendent Taylor says he did brief - and Mr. McEnroe is on7y an example - negatively, he hasn't told me when, where or in what terms, but it was on the instructions of the Garda Commissioner. Now, whether that was said has not been adumbrated. But he has also indicated that he has waived privilege in relation to anything which he has.

Now, I know the latest case from the European Court of Human Rights says that's merely a factor, but I have to take into account other factors as we11, so I can't do it in isolation. We have evidence so far and I'm grateful for your clarification, which makes things even less clear than they were yesterday, but I understand you have a position to take, but I think you have to take a position based on evidence as opposed to based on asking me to write some kind of a law essay, which I do do indeed in my spare time every now and then. But this is a different exercise, it has to be entirely fact-based, so I think people have to engage with the facts. And if you have questions to ask which put particular facts, such as, for instance, that by indicating the nature of whatever briefing took place you would be revealing another source or would be revealing a secret journalistic methodology, well, that has to be engaged with. That's my view at the moment, obviously subject to submissions. But thank you for your intervention; I've now put a question mark beside

Juno McEnroe in consequence of it.
MR. QUN: We11, Chairman, I think you can take it clearly he's not denying that he was negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor. He has given a different answer to that question. Because he was specifically asked that and his answer wasn't a denial, his answer was to refer back to the privilege. whereas I think as a consequence of the way things emerged yesterday, it was reported that Mr. McEnroe had denied that he was negatively briefed, and that just simply isn't the case.

CHA RMAN We11, I'd certain7y taken him down as being among those never briefed with Paul williams, Paul Reynolds, John Burke and Michael o'Toole. And Juno McEnroe also appears on that list, but he still appears 10:08 on that list with a question mark beside him, and I don't know now what the answer is. If you wish to put a question to Superintendent Taylor to contradict what I heard yesterday, you're perfectly welcome to do so, but I'm not prepared to sit here and read the tealeaves on the basis that someone is referring to something above, and it could be 15 pages above. I'm taking that answer, 133, for what it says. And if people want to establish something different, they're completely at liberty to do so, that's why I'm here. But thank you very much for your intervention.
MR. QUNN Thank you, Chairman.
MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, I'm grateful to Mr. Quinn for bringing that to my attention and now to your
attention. Obviously it may be a matter for evidence and interpretation. But on the occasion when the Tribunal first wrote to Mr. McEnroe and we received a reply to our list of questions that were furnished to him and to other journalists on, our letter was 15th March and we received a reply on 28th March, in contrast to the replies from the other journalists from the Examiner, it was written on behalf of Mr. McEnroe that, it says:
"Pl ease note that Mr. McEnroe bel i eves he does not have any information rel evant to the terms of reference of the Tri bunal."

CHA RMAN A11 right. Okay, Mr. McEnroe has said that he doesn't have any information relevant to the terms of reference. And the terms of reference require me to investigate the allegation of Superintendent Taylor that he was directed to draw journalists' attention to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against Sergeant McCabe. So he has said no to that and he has said no at line 131 to 138 and now today he is saying he's not saying anything. We11, there is the background circumstance. And in due course, Mr. Quinn, you'11 engage and we'11 see where you stand. I'm not expressing any view and I'm not expressing any emotion about the matter, but the process that I'm engaged in is deadly serious and is supposed to be in the national interest and I expect people to cooperate and be absolutely straight with me. So we'11 carry on.

MR. MCGU NESS, AS FOLOVS:
1 Q.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Superintendent Taylor, yesterday I was
in the course of asking you some questions in relation to your first statement to the investigators, and could 10:10 I just go back to page 132 of that in Volume 1 ?
A. Yes.

2 Q. Now, do you see at line 266 there?
A. Yes, Mr. McGuinness.

3 Q. At the end of that line it says:
"I recall a tel ephone call with the journal ist Paul Willians where he informed me that he was in the house of the person who had made the compl ai nt agai nst Ser geant McCabe with a vi ew to intervi ewing her. I informed both the Commi ssi oner and Deputy Commi ssi oner of this by text message. Deputy Commi ssi oner O Sullivan called me and di scussed the matter."

Now, I don't want to rehearse matters, but you know that Mr. Williams believes that he went to the house on 5th March first, 2014, and your belief is that he phoned you, giving you to believe that he was in the house or had been to the house
A. That's my understanding.

4 Q. Just the way you express this is that he was in the house of the person who had made the complaint with a view to interviewing her. And it might be taken from that that he wasn't telling you that he had interviewed
her. So it's perhaps consistent with you receiving the phone call on 5th and not on the Saturday, is that possible?
A. I definitely recall receiving it on the Saturday, because I was at home at the time.

5 Q. okay.
A. And I would work nine to five Monday to Friday, core hours, and I would be at home on Saturdays.
6 Q. You see, I just wanted to draw your attention to what you say you did --
A. Yeah.

7 Q. -- and what record exists of what you appear to have done. At 6994 - it'11 come up on screen, it might be easier for you to look at that, it's volume 26 for the benefit of my friends - this is the list of your calls and texts from 5th.
A. Yeah.

8 Q. And it shows in the evening of 5th, after a call to Debbie McCann earlier, two texts to Commissioner Callinan, two texts then almost immediately to Commissioner o'sullivan and then two texts later to Commissioner o'sullivan. So, can you recollect what time of the night you got the phone call?
A. I understand it was the evening time. In the evening time.
9 Q. The evening time? I mean, no more specific?
A. I would imagine after three o'clock, something like that, from my recollection.
10 Q. In the afternoon then?
A. In the afternoon, yes.

11 Q. All right. Well, just looking then at the records for 8th, if we go to page 6996 -- perhaps just back down to the previous page, 6995. There's a text to
Commissioner Callinan on that Saturday evening at 20:48:29 and then it's followed by a second text three seconds later and then there appears to be two further texts to Nóirín o'Sullivan, is that right?
A. That's right.

12 Q. Yeah. Now that would appear to be the Saturday, as far 10:14 as you recollect it. And they are the only record of texts --
A. Yes.

13 Q. -- sent by you on that date to those two in that sequence. Is that the sequence in which you texted them?
A. I would've sent one text each to the Commissioner first and then to the Deputy Commissioner, that was my usual modus operandi.
14 Q. Yeah. And that appears to be immediately followed by a 10:15 phone call to Debbie McCann, whom you had known had previously gone up, isn't that right?
A. I don't know what date she went up on.

15 Q. Yeah.
A. But she would normally ring on Saturdays, because she was a Sunday journalist who would write on Sunday editions only.

16 Q. But this is you ringing her.
A. Yeah.

17 Q. And were you ringing her to tell her that Mr. Williams had scooped the pool perhaps?
A. Absolutely not.

18 Q.
Well, if this is the Saturday - and it's your sworn evidence it was the Saturday - this is the day you found out that Mr. Williams had got the interview, isn't that right?
A. That is the day he told me, that Saturday.
Q. Yes.
A. That he told me he'd been up at the house.

20 Q. And the person that you had previously encouraged to go up, you were now phoning. And why were you phoning her?
A. I can't recall why I would've been phoning. It would be somewhat a related matter that Ms. McCann was dealing with on that Sunday. Okay. We11, 1et's pass on to page 139 of your statement.

CHA RMAN Sorry, yesterday I did check, I think we've a11 checked before, 8th March is in fact a Saturday. And we're talking about a phone call to Debbie McCann shortly before nine in the evening when it's far too late to put anything in a Sunday newspaper.
A. Yeah.

CHAN RMAN So does that help you?
A. Not particularly, Mr. Chairman. But, as I said, there would be phone calls back and forward from time to time, so --
CHA RMAN Just about this and that?
A. This and that.

22 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: Just going to page 139 of your statement, do you see that, at line 384 ?
A. Yes.

23 Q. This is after the PAC meeting.
A. Yeah.

24 Q. You say:
"I heard the Commi ssi oner say to John MEGui nness that Sergeant MECabe was a ki ddi e fiddler."
A. Yeah.
Q. $\quad$ I was just standing behi nd the Commi ssi oner and had a di rect vi ew of the Commi ssi oner and John McGui nness."
A. Yeah.

26 Q. And there's a reference there to your original
A. Yes.

27 Q. DT3.
A. Yeah.

28 Q. And that's, the relevant portion is at page 147. And if we go to the bottom of page 147 , the second last paragraph there is:
"Prior to the appearance of the Commissioner at the Dáil Public Accounts Committee."
A. Yeah.

29 Q. Do you see that? The next paragraph is:
"I attended at the PAC hearing and was sitting directly
behi nd Cormi ssi oner Callinan. At the concl usi on of the PAC hearing the Chai rman of the PAC John MEGui nness came down froma seat at the top of the room and came down al ong the left si de of the room past where the Cormi ssi oner was sitting. They greeted each other. I was standing at this time as the hearing had concl uded. There was a conversation bet ween John MEGui nness and Cormissi oner Callinan. I heard the Cormissi oner say to Mr. MEGui nness that Sergeant MECabe was a ki ddie fiddler."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Now, that paragraph doesn't appear in your protected disclosure, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. That I put in the information, in my protected disclosure, that $I$ fully fleshed it out and filled it out in my statements to the Tribunal.

33 Q. You see, you're making a protected disclosure.
A. Yeah.

34 Q. It's going to the Minister for Justice.
A. Yeah.

35 Q. It's going to the Taoiseach. You're making a complaint about the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána who you had
served under and you failed to put in an allegation that you say you heard first hand accusing Sergeant McCabe of being a kiddie fiddler. And can you explain that omission?
A. Well, it was -- as I said, my protected disclosure was an initial placing of the information. I subsequently, in my statement, fleshed out all the issues in relation to the knowledge that I had. So it was never intention of omission, it was an intention to fully put all the matters before when I had an opportunity.

But why would you withhold from the Taoiseach and the Minister and any other persons who might be making a decision that you had first hand evidence of hearing the Commissioner describe sergeant McCabe as a kiddie fiddler?
A. when I put in the protected disclosure, I was putting the information as protected disclosure, I didn't know how further it would take it down the line. That I would, in subsequent interviews I would fill in all the information $I$ had. In my protected disclosure, not everything is in it if a protected disclosure is a confined document.

37 Q. A confined document?
A. Yeah.
Q. What confines it?
A. Well, it's a document that not all information that you would elicit when you take a full and comprehensive statement.

39 Q. I'm just not clear as to the logic here, Superintendent

Taylor, perhaps you would help me in this regard. If you look at page 6, this new paragraph that --
A. Page 6 of --

40 Q. Yes, of Volume 1. This new paragraph that I've drawn your attention to where you refer to the comment. That's been inserted essentially between the first and second paragraph of this narrative, isn't that right?
A. That's right, yes.

41 Q. That's right. Now, just bear with me, but you told us yesterday you didn't hear Commissioner Callinan make any adverse remark to Philip Boucher-Hayes?
A. No, because I wasn't in his earshot.

42 Q. Yeah. You've maintained in your evidence that you were not informed by Commissioner Callinan of what he said to John McGuinness in the car park.
A. That's correct.

43 Q. And you denied having any knowledge of that.
A. That's correct.

44 Q. And that's an issue between you and Sergeant McCabe as to whether you said something about that to him, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

45 Q. But from your own point of view, you neither heard the Philip Boucher-Hayes comment nor the John McGuinness comment in the car park. This is the only comment then 10:22 that you are alleging you heard Commissioner Callinan make, referring to Sergeant McCabe as a kiddie fiddler, isn't that right?
A. I couldn't have heard the Bewleys one, because I wasn't
there.
A. In relation to RTÉ, I was in proximity, I was -- in relation to the one at the PAC I was physically in his company.

47 Q. The point I'm coming to is a simple one: There are three occasions when Commissioner Callinan is said to have made these different remarks to different people; you were present for one but didn't hear it in RTÉ; you weren't present and weren't told about it for one at the car park; your evidence to the Tribunal is that you did hear this one. And this is the only one that you've heard then?
A. Yes.

Now, why were you not including that in your protected disclosure when you were making the complaint, as it were, that you had been -- you were blowing the whistle on the Commissioner and the former Commissioner about what they had been doing and saying in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, at the first opportunity $I$ put that information before the Tribunal.

49 Q. Well, that, I'm not sure whether it deals with it or not. But I mean, there's one matter of significance in between the date of your protected disclosure and the made your protected disclosure at the end of September, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

50
Q. This statement to the Tribunal is made in March, isn't that right, 2017?
A. Yes.

51 Q. And in between you had met John McGuinness, isn't that right?
A. That's right.
A. Absolutely not.

We11, you see, you don't mention any of the other details that Deputy McGuinness has given us evidence about. Did you hear anything else that the Commissioner said on that occasion at the end of the PAC meeting?
A. As I said yesterday, when we -- it was a long day and when the people arose from their chairs it was my usual protocol to pick up the Commissioner's hat and satche1, 10:24 and hand it to him. So I was turned around for a second and then I would turn back around. And then I was standing right behind him and I had full sight of him and Deputy McGuinness standing in front of me.
55 Q. And are they the only two words you heard him say?
A. Well, I was aware there was a conversation, but they're the words that stuck out in my mind, because I never heard them before.

56 Q. Okay. We11, that's what I am concerned to say. Are
you synopsising what the Commissioner said or are those an actual quote of the words that the Commissioner said?
A. They're an actual quote.

57 Q. An actual quote. Now, just in terms of chronology, could you go to page 181 of book 1 . Again, Superintendent, could I just ask you to ensure that you're close enough to the microphone?
A. Yes.

Thank you. Now, I think you can identify this
document; this is a document notifying you of breaches of discipline that were intended to be investigated?
A. Yes.

59 Q. And they relate to the alleged unauthorised access of Pulse and other sources of information, the alleged unauthorised disclosure of that information to third parties and alleged breaches of the Garda Síochána internet electronic mail policy. And you received that and then your solicitors sought to engage --
A. That's right.
-- in relation to that. Now, you were interviewed on a second occasion by the Tribunal investigators on 22nd September, and that statement commences at page 204. But I just want to pick you up on one aspect of something you said yesterday, which was that when I referred to the list that your solicitor had provided.
A. Yes.

61 Q. And which was expressed perhaps not to be definitive.

But you hadn't at any stage indicated to the investigators that 'I will go and check my records and come back to you', isn't that right?
A. I can't recall --

62 Q. No, you said you did that yesterday.
A. Okay.

63 Q. Now, when do you think you did that?
A. I can't give an exact date, Mr. McGuinness, when I did that.
64 Q. You can't give a date?
A. Yeah.

65 Q. You see, I want to suggest to you that you didn't do that. Because the investigators came back to you on 22nd September and you hadn't provided any additional names, either yourself or by your solicitor, isn't that 10:27 right, by that time?
A. That's right.

66 Q. And just to be clear about what you were saying about the campaign, at page 215 you were asked to explain, to detail how your briefings to journalists took place, whether they're conducted over the phone, during face-to-face meetings, "whether l ever sent such negative briefings by text messages or e-mail or by ot her el ectronic means whatsoever." And your answer at the top of page 216 was:
"I did this over the phone and at face-to-face meetings, for example at press conferences. It was never by e-nail and l doubt if I ever sent it by text
to journal ists. I did not send it by any ot her el ectronic means either. Mai nly face-to-face meetings and by phone that I conveyed this message."

Now, I think that represents your position. Did you ever send a message by text to any journalist, media or politician about Sergeant McCabe?
A. No.

67 Q. No?
CHA RMAN Superintendent, I'm going to have to ask you 10:29 to speak up, if you don't mind?
A. Sorry, no. No.

CHA RMAN I appreciate it's not easy giving evidence and all the rest of it, but the microphone is now on full blast --
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN -- to try and catch you up. Unfortunately it makes me, if the microphone is on, boom all over the place. If you wouldn't mind just stepping in a wee bit closer and --
A. I'm obliged, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHA RMAN Or maybe point it up a wee bit or something. But I mean, you have experience in these matters.
A. Yeah.

68 Q. MR. MEGI NESS: And you just confirmed you never sent 10:29 any messages by text of a derogatory nature to journalists, media, politicians or otherwise?
A. No.

69 Q. So the lack of your phone wouldn't show that, isn't
that right? It's got nothing to do with it?
A. The lack of my phone unfortunately doesn't show my engagement with the text to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner about the updating in relation to the
interest in Sergeant McCabe.

70 Q. Yeah. We11, that was in the norm, in the way of normal briefing about how he was being mentioned in the press, isn't that right?
A. It would show the level of interest that was in Sergeant McCabe.

71 Q. It would show what you were reporting upwards in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. But he was a person of particular interest.

72 Q. But in terms of a smear campaign, I want to be clear that your evidence is that Commissioner Callinan never compiled texts to send to you for you to circulate out, isn't that right?
A. No, never. okay. And you're in conflict with Sergeant McCabe on that issue, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

74 Q. And you're in conflict with Mr. McGuinness about that too, isn't that correct, Mr. John McGuinness?
A. That's right, yes.

Perhaps we'11 just go to 3225, which is in Volume 13 -- 10:31 3275, I beg your pardon. And at the bottom of that you're discussing the meeting that you had with John McGuinness in January of 2017.
A. That's correct.
Q. At the top of page 3276 you said you'd been used to brief the media that Sergeant McCabe had been motivated by revenge and this was borne out from the Ms. D allegation.
"I did tell theml had been used by Mr. Callinan and Mb. O Sul I i van was aware of it. I don't know why John MEGui nness wanted to meet me. But to provi de some context, at this time M. Justice I arfhlaith O Neill's report was with the $M$ ni ster, there was a lot of political and media attention about protected di scl osures ans al so John MtGui nness was Chai rman of PAC ans Sergeant McCabe appeared. I have been asked whether I made a note or any record."

And you didn't. Then this extract from Mr. McGuinness' statement is put to you:
"I met David Tayl or and he told me that he had made a protected disclosure. He toldmethat he had been used by Mr. Calli nan and Nói rín O Sulli van, the current Commi ssi oner of An Garda Sí ochána, to ci rcul ate text messages briefing the reci pi ents agai nst Mr. McCabe by telling themthat he was not to be trusted. Mr. McCabe told me that Mr. Tayl or had given hima similar account 10:32 of what he had been asked to do by Mr. Calli nan and Ms. O Sul I i van. "

And I think you disagree with that?
A. I disagree with that, yes.

77 Q. And you say at the top, on line 28 -- sorry, 428 of page 3277:
"I never stated that l circul ated text messages briefing the reci pients agai nst Mr. McCabe by telling them he was not to be trusted."

And then there's a portion put to you from Mr. Clifford's statement.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

78 Q. And Mr. Clifford's statement refers to his book. And in the book, at the bottom of page 3277 of our papers, it's quoted:
"The most basic was the conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands of text messages to medi a and Garda personnel casting McCabe in a bad Iight."

Now, did you say that to Mr. Clifford?
A. No. I would've said I sent numerous, hundreds of texts to Commissioner Callinan and Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan in relation to Sergeant McCabe as updates.

79 Q. And I think you had some engagement with Mr. Clifford --
A. That's right.

80 Q. -- in relation to his book, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

81 Q. And he sent you, for proofing and reading, a chapter of
his book relating to your involvement, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

82 Q. And at volume 25, page 6617... The relevant extract is at page 6622. And the portion at the bottom of 6622 is 10:34 as quoted there:
"There were a number of strands to the campaign he $\mathrm{tol} d$ the incredul ous MECabe. The most basic was the conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands of text messages to medi a and Garda personnel casting McCabe in a dark light."
A. Hmm

83 Q. And you'll see frompage 6617, whi ch encl osed this, you see:
"Dave, this is the chapter l was telling you about where you enter the McCabe story. See what you think, particul arly in terns of factual accuracy."
A. Mm-hmm.

84 Q. Now, you didn't correct that?
A. Well, I didn't proofread it in the sense of go through it line-by-1ine.
Q. Yeah, but did you not read what was being said about you?
A. I gave it a very perusal look through it.

86 Q. Well, I mean, one of the other things that I'd like your evidence on is did you pick that up as something that was being said about you?
A. As pick it up as something that's being said about me?

87 Q. Yeah. Did you notice it?
A. No, I didn't notice it.

88 Q. You didn't notice it? You don't, you didn't make mention originally of the second meeting in your house. 10:36 And you know Sergeant McCabe has given evidence that he came to you the next day --
A. That's right.
-- specifically to ask you about the text messages. Do you recal1 that?
A. I do, yes.
A. He came the next day to say he was making a protected disclosure.

CHA RMAN I'm sorry, Superintendent, I beg your pardon, I appreciate you've got a soft voice --
A. Yeah.

CHAN RMAN -- and I respect that, but --
A. He came the second day.

CHA RMAN Even if you moved your chair in, say, six inches it'11 probably will pick up a wee bit better.
A. He came --

CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. McGuinness, would you just go back if you wouldn't mind then please?

92 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. I was suggesting to you that I'm sure you've heard it - Sergeant McCabe has said he specifically came to ask you about the text messages.
A. No. He came the next day and it was a very quick, he just arrived at my house, myself and my wife was there, to tell me he was making a protected disclosure.
93 Q. You see, at the top of page 6624, part of the same extract reads as follows:
"They ret at Tayl or's home the day after that. McCabe asked himagai $n$ about some of the detail rel ated to the text messages. Then he informed Tayl or he was obl iged to make a protected disclosure on the issue."

Is that wrong?
A. Yeah. Mr. McCabe came to me the second day, it was a very quick conversation - I was there with my wife - to say he was going to make a protected disclosure. There 10:38 was no conversation of the previous day's conversation.

94 Q. No reference to text messages --
A. No.

95 Q. -- good, bad or indifferent?
A. Good, bad or indifferent.

96 Q. Okay. Did you read Sergeant McCabe's evidence on this issue?
A. I did.

97 Q. And he's got it wrong, has he?
A. Yes. I was there.

98 Q. Okay. Now, that sentence, did you read that sentence?
A. which sentence?

99 Q. When it was sent to you?
A. Which sentence is this, sorry, Mr. McGuinness?
Q. About him coming back the second day and asking about the text messages.
A. I didn't, as I said, forensically examine it, if you were to ask me that.
Q. Well, I didn't ask you whether you're a forensic examiner of chapters of books. Did you read it?
A. I would have scanned it very quickly, yeah.

102 Q. We11, do you pay attention when you're reading things in terms of anything that's been written about you?
A. Not always.

103 Q. Not always? Okay. And is it the case that you didn't see this or you just, didn't cause you any concern?
A. Well I didn't -- as I said, when I was asked, in relation to my statements, my recollection, $I$ gave the full facts as I knew it, as opposed to what somebody else was writing.
Q. We11 --
A. Because I was actually there.
Q. Al1 right. But, you see, you had met Sergeant McCabe, isn't that correct?
A. That's right.
Q. You had met Mr. Clifford.
A. That's right.

107 Q. This was furnished to you --
A. Yes.

108 Q. -- in the course of his work.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

109 Q. And it represents, I suggest, on the evidence of Mr. Clifford and others, something that you had been
saying.
A. I hadn't been saying it.

110 Q. You hadn't been saying that, at any stage?
A. No.

111 Q. And it's clear from your evidence, therefore, that there was no text messages sent out to journalists, any form of media, politicians, other senior guards about Maurice?
A. As I said yesterday, the nature of my engagement with Maurice McCabe was conversational pieces with journalists at opportunistic times.

112 Q. I referred yesterday obviously to the radio interviews that Mr. Clifford and Deputy Daly did. And did you perceive yourself as having some interest at that point in time in doing damage to the Commissioner?
A. Absolutely not.

113 Q. We11, why, when you were making what's normally a protected confidential disclosure, did you decide to go to a journalist and to a TD? what were you hoping to achieve?
A. The TD came to me.

114 Q. Pardon?
A. The TD came to me.

115 Q. The TD came to you. We11, you --
A. I didn't seek that meeting, Deputy Daly rang and sought 10:41 me. I did not seek that meeting.
116 Q. We11, you went to the meeting.
A. They came to my house.

117 Q. Yeah. You invited them to your house.
A. Well, they asked to meet.

118 Q. We11, there's no ob1igation to meet TDs of any shape or form. You invited them into your house. Now, why did you do that?
A. They asked to meet.

10:41 unfairly targeted by the Commissioner, Commissioner o'sullivan?
A. Well, I felt it was a robust investigation into me. CHA RMAK No, you really have to answer the question please, Superintendent.
A. Yes. Well, by the very nature -CHA RMAN I mean, if you take the view that, for instance, it's a trumped up charge, we've all been through the process of being in the criminal courts, out of the criminal courts and you do hear that kind of thing, 'The police invented it' etcetera, etcetera. Sometimes it doesn't go down very well --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- but you do hear it a lot. So if you think this was a trumped up charge, any of the three were looking at, I think I need to hear that. Now, if you feel, on the other hand, you were completely in the wrong and you'd done something wrong, therefore it
would seem, to me certainly, unless there's some other reason that I'm not aware of, that they were perfectly right to investigate you. So I mean, I think you do need to take a stance on the matter one way or the other please.
A. I don't deny the right of a Garda Commissioner to investigate any member and I accept that.
121 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: You see, one interpretation of it is that you were en1isting, or attempting to enlist both media and political support for a narrative that you were being unfairly investigated and unfairly targeted --
A. No.

122 Q. -- isn't that right?
A. No, I wouldn't, I wouldn't support that.

123 Q. You wouldn't support that?
A. Yeah.

124 Q. We11, what were you doing?
A. I made my protected disclosure.

125 Q. Yeah. And in terms of the matters being investigated by Clerkin, you knew precisely what they were investigating, isn't that right?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Because they were into your actions that you had done and that you've now admitted you did, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

127 Q. Yeah. So you'd nothing to complain about, isn't that right?
A. Well, as I said I made my protected disclosure long
before these matters came to finality.
128 Q. Yeah. And is that why you made it, because all of these things were in the balance?
A. Absolutely not.

129 Q. We11, why did you make it in october or September 2016?
A. I made it, as I said, because I wanted to do the right thing.
130 Q. The right thing? okay. We11, we'11 come back to that. Just going back to your statement that we've been looking at, at page 218.
A. What volume is that, Mr. McGuinness?

131 Q. It's in volume 1 again, Superintendent. At line 22 --
A. Sorry, Mr. McGuinness, what page again, sorry?

132 Q. I'm sorry, Superintendent, page 218.
A. 218. Thank you.

133 Q. Now, the question there is:
"। have been asked whether I provi ded any information to the following journalists, Debbie McCann of the Irish Daily Mail or Eavan Murray of the Irish Sun,
whi ch led these journalists to separatel y attend at the home of ME. D in early 2014 and to seek to intervi ew ME. D for the purpose of publishing newspaper articles. If yes, I have been asked to provide in detail all attendant circumstances in respect of these contacts."

And the answer was:
"I was aware they were goi ng up there. I did not
di scourage it. I did not know if I knew Mb. D's name. I knew that Mb. D's family lived up in Cavan. I don't know if l knew thei $r$ address. I don't thi nk so. l do rementor Debbi e McCann and Eavan Murray contacting me separatel $y$ and telling me at the time that they were going to do a story bef ore each of them went up to Cavan. I never had the whole detail of the MB. D al l egations. I never had the mintiae of the exact allegati ons by Ms. D agai nst Sergeant McCabe. I never saw the investigation file. I did not know that it was 10:46 Mr. D's daughter who made allegation agai nst Sergeant MkCabe. I don't think I gave these journalists any i nf or mati on about the address of Mb. D. I recall they had a fair amount of information thensel ves. I was aware they were going to go to the house, yes. I did not di scour age themfrom attending Cavan. I woul d have encour aged them I do bel ieve that I woul d have texted or contacted the former Commissioner Callinan at the time about what the journalists told me. My strong recollection is that both journal ists contacted me on my work nobile phone. In the context of timing, it woul d have been post-PAC when they contacted me, post-J anuary 2014."

Now, there's a lot of statements in there I'd like your 10:46 assistance on. But first, your solicitor had volunteered a list of nine names in April.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

134 Q. You hadn't come to the Tribunal with any other names,
isn't that right?
A. Yes.

135 Q. And why was that?
A. They're the names I provided at the time.

136 Q. Yeah, but you knew whom you had been in most contact with at this period of time, isn't that right?
A. Yes. But as I said, I subsequently added names to that 1ist.
Q. We11, you didn't add names. You didn't add names. When did you ever add a name to the list?
A. Well, with Debbie McCann and Eavan Murray.
Q. Well, let's come to that in a moment. But the person you had most contact with, journalist, at this point in time was Ms. Eavan Murray, isn't that right?
A. That's right, yes.

139 Q. Now, how is it that in neither your first statement to the Tribunal, in your first interview or in your solicitor's list you omitted Ms. Murray's name completely?
A. We11, I added it in, I added it in a subsequent statement.

140 Q. We11, that's not the question I asked you. why did you omit it? Because you must've omitted it deliberately.
A. No.

141 Q. We11, how could you forget to include it, that's what I'm just --
A. But it wasn't a case of forgetting --

142 Q. -- puzzling towards?
A. It wasn't a case of forgetting, Mr. McGuinness. I
always put all the information, as it came available to me, before the Tribunal.

143 Q. Ah, well sure, as it became available to you? I mean, this is something you knew from 2014.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

144 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Well, I put all this information before the --

145 Q. This wasn't new information becoming available to you in September 2017, isn't that right?
A. But I put all this information before the Tribunal.

146 Q. We11, you didn't.
A. But, I did.

147 Q. And of concern on one interpretation is that the Tribunal had heard the evidence from the $D$ family last summer, before you were interviewed, when Mr. D, Mrs. D and Ms. D gave evidence and the evidence emerged about the visit of these two 1adies.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

148 Q. Isn't that right?
A. That's right.

149 Q. That's right. And that enabled the investigators to raise these issues with you, isn't that right?
A. And I confirmed those issues.
Q. And you said in answer to a later question -- well, perhaps we'11 come to that in a moment. But just
sticking on this paragraph; you knew from 2014 that these journalists were trying to get the Ms. D story, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

151
Q. You knew it suited the agenda?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew they were well disposed to the Commissioner, isn't that right?
A. I don't know how they're well disposed towards the Commissioner, but --
Q. Well, they're well disposed towards you.
A. I don't know whether they're well disposed towards me. I just, information that $I$ spoke to them about.
Q. Yeah. And you had briefed both of these, on your own account, the previous year?
A. Yeah.
Q. And whilst never being in a position to direct journalists, you were hopeful they might be interested, isn't that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And they were interested?
A. Yes.
Q. They became interested?
A. Yes.
Q. And they called you to discuss it, isn't that right?
A. Well, as I said, I would've been in conversational piece with them in relation to Sergeant McCabe. They were doing an interest in the story. How they went and did the story was their business.
159 Q. Yeah. But the purpose of which was to perhaps lead them to publish something that showed Sergeant McCabe in a poor light?
A. Well, how they published and if they published was a
matter for them.
Q. Of course. Of course, that is their matter. But that was your intention as part of the campaign?
A. We11, my intention was, as I said yesterday, was to give the narrative in relation to the attitude of senior Garda management to Sergeant McCabe. How they processed it and how they dealt with it was a matter for their own journalistic workings.
Q. Just looking at a number of statements in this paragraph; you did know Ms. D's name, you knew the surname, isn't that right?
A. I knew the surname, yes.
don't know if l knew thei r address". It seems to imply that you might've known their address or that you...
A. No, I never knew their exact address. I knew they lived in Cavan.
Q. We11, you see, it would've been easy to say that, rather than saying "I don't know if l knew their address, I don't thi nk so". Now, you had previously sought to access the Ms. D file, isn't that right?
A. That's right, yes.

166
Q. And you referred here to never seeing the investigation file.
A. Yes, never saw it.

167 Q. But did you know there was a file in the Commissioner's office?
A. No.
Q. A synopsis of allegations that had been made in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No.

169 Q. On which were details of the alleged sexual assault?
A. I wouldn't be privileged to any documents --

170 Q. Pardon?
A. I wouldn't be privileged to any documents in the Commissioner's office.
171 Q. But sure, you were trying to see the file originally.
A. I asked the Commissioner.

172 Q. Yeah. And did he direct you towards this file?
A. No.

173 Q. Did he provide you with that file?
A. No.

174 Q. Did you see the file when you were going in and out of the Commissioner's office at any stage?
A. No.
Q. You see, the file seems to, in its summary as contained in the synopsis, seems to veer very close to the details that Ms. McCann had, as related by Ms. O'Reilly in her statement. Do you recall that?
A. Well, I haven't seen it, but...

176 Q. We11, I asked you about Ms. O'Reilly's statement
yesterday.
A. Yes.

177 Q. And you probably recal1 that?
A. Yes.

178 Q. The detail, there was some detail in it of the alleged offence.
A. I knew no intimate detail of the allegation.

179 Q. Now, you had extensive phone contact with Ms. McCann and Ms. Murray --
A. That's correct.

180 Q. -- isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

181 Q. And did you keep in touch with them to find out who had got to the house first?
A. No.

182 Q. We11, did Ms. McCann never te11 you that she went there, found the house, but didn't get speaking to Ms. D?
A. She told me afterwards that she'd gone to the house, but had not obtained any interview.

183 Q. Yeah. And she told you that, presumably, in one of your phone calls?
A. Yes.

184 Q. Yeah. So she did tell you how she got on?
A. Well, briefly, in the sense that I didn't know the exact details of her engagement at the house.

185 Q. Yeah. And you say you believe you would've texted the Commissioner Callinan at the time about what they told you?
A. Yes.

186 Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.

187 Q. And you were encouraging them also?
A. I wasn't discouraging them.

188 Q. Pardon?
A. I wouldn't discourage them.

189 Q. We11, you've said "I woul d have encour aged them"?
A. Yes.

190 Q. It's in the statement there.
A. Yeah.

191 Q. At page 219, $1 i n e 244$ you're being asked if you confirm the information that it was Mr. D's daughter that had made the allegation against Sergeant McCabe "and I bel ieve that I did confirmthat to them both separatel y."
A. Yes.

192 Q. So, you've two journalists asking you who's made a sexual assault against Sergeant McCabe and her identity, isn't that right?
A. Well, not -- I didn't know her name. But yes, it was the daughter of a fellow member.

193 Q. And why were you confirming that to them?
A. Because it was well known it was, that the allegation was from the daughter of a fellow member.
194 Q. Well, if it was well known, you seem to be saying here in the next sentence "they would have known this froma previ ous bri efing". So were you telling them something new or were you giving them some additional piece of
information?
A. I wasn't giving them any additional information. It was well known that the victim was the daughter of another member.
well, you said in your statement that your attitude to Sergeant McCabe would be well known, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And well known to them from what you had said to them?
A. Yes.

And why were they ringing you to tell you that they were both going up?
A. I can't tell you why they were ringing me, why they were going up. As I said, journalists would often tell me they were doing stories, or proposed to do stories and end up not doing them or doing them.
198 Q. Yeah. Well, you see, Ms. McCann has told us that she had to run this by her editor, I think Mr. Cox, and get approval for it and so forth and that they sanctioned the trip up, as it were, and there was a discussion about taking a silhouette photographer perhaps. But do ${ }^{10: 58}$ you recall her reporting to you that in fact she'd got the green light to go up?
A. She didn't give me the exact, that she got the green light --
199 Q. Yeah.
A. -- I didn't ask her the mechanics of how she engaged with her management.
Q. okay. And you, on your account, were keeping Commissioner Callinan informed, is that right?
A. That's right, yes.

201 Q. You don't refer to Commissioner o'sullivan here.
A. Well --

202 Q. May I take it that you weren't keeping her informed of this?
A. We11, my usual was to text both the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner. That was always my modus operandi.
Q. Well, I know you've referred to your modus operandi, but it's not clear from your own statement whether you texted Commissioner Callinan or contacted him in some other way here.
A. The only way I ever contacted him was either by text or by phone call. frequently be called into his office to discuss matters relating to Sergeant McCabe.
A. Yeah, but in relation to updates --
Q. Updates?
A. -- Mr. McGuinness, I would always send either by text or by phone call.

206 Q. You see, what I don't understand is, you don't refer to Commissioner Callinan -- or o'Sullivan in this context at a11. And is that an omission on your part or did you intend to include her on that?
A. No, as I said, I always made it clear in all my statements and all my -- that 1 always kept Commissioner Callinan and Deputy Commissioner o'sullivan updated at all times in relation to Maurice

McCabe.
A. I can, Mr. McGuinness.
Q. Do you see line 20?
A. Yes.

212 Q. "In February 2014 we had been hearing murmurings about Sergeant McCabe. As I say, it was around the February 2014 period."

Now, you had in fact briefed her prior to that, on your 11:03 own evidence, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

213 Q. "The Gardaí were big in the news at this point. Martin Callin nan made the di sgusting remark. There was al so controversy sur rounding Al an Shatter at that
point. I deci ded to look into the murmurings of an allegation agai nst Sergeant McCabe a little more $\mathrm{closel} y$ at that point. I approached a number of different sources in respect to trying to firmup the al I egat i on. "

And she certainly contacted you in advance of going up?
A. Yes.

214 Q. And you confirmed -- what did you confirm to her?
A. Well, I confirmed that there'd been an allegation against Sergeant McCabe, it had been investigated in 2006, it had gone to the DPP, he'd been cleared and that the victim had been the daughter of another member.
215 Q. And is that it?
A. That's it.

216 Q. Well, did you make it clear that it was an allegation of alleged sexual abuse?
A. A sexual allegation.

217 Q
Q. But did you make clear it was on someone who was a child at the time?
A. I didn't know the intimate details of the whole allegation, Mr. McGuinness, but it was known, do you know, it was known that it was the child of another member.
Q. 1east --
A. No.

220 Q. -- to make a decision 'We11, I can safely pass on this detail to this journalist or that detail to another journalist'?
A. The instruction --

221 Q. Or to be able to field a question about something?
A. The instructions I got from the Commissioner was to draw the media attention to the fact about the motivation of Sergeant McCabe in bringing these issues about the penalty points to the public forum and that it was driven by revenge based upon the allegation and the investigation into him. I never got into the minute detail of the allegation.
222 Q. okay. She says at the bottom here:
"I approached a number of different sources in trying to firmup the allegations."

And you agree you spoke to her in that respect.
"And I establ ished that there had been an allegation made around the 2006/ 2007 mark. "

Now, did you provide that piece of information?
A. Yes, the 2006, yeah.

223 Q. "I wasn't sure of the date precisely. I was al so aware it rel ated to a child at that poi nt who now in 2014 was a teenager."

You must've told her that?
A. No. No, I didn't.
Q. okay.
A. -- I wasn't...
Q. "I established it was an allegation of i nappropriate touchi ng. "

Presumably you were in a position to tell her that?
A. No, I didn't know that.
Q. Well, what did you tell her about the nature of the sexual assault?
A. I just -- the nature I told her was that Sergeant

McCabe had been investigated in relation to a sexual assault back in 2006, an investigation had been carried out, a file gone to the DPP, he'd been cleared and this was the root cause of his motivation, revenge on An Garda Síochána. I did not know the intimate details
of --

228 Q. Yeah, but did she not ask you for, we11, some detail as to what he had done or what --
A. No.

229 Q. -- he was meant to have done?
A. No. As she said, she'd numerous other sources. I have never known --

230 Q. We11, did she say that to you at the time?
A. No, but I'm just saying from her statement.

231 Q. Yeah.
"Around the information that l recei ved from by News Editor Robert Cox, who in turn spoke to our overall editor in Mail on Sunday, Conor O Connell. As would be usual, I reported al ong my line manager Robert Cox. I run everything by himfirst. The decision was made in mid to late February 2014. The decision was made to approach the family of ME. D and ask if they would like to comment on the allegation."
So just in terms of your contact with Ms. McCann, you've a number of texts to her --
A. Yes.

232 Q. -- you've a call on 15th February. And they're at page 6990, if you'd like to just look at those.
A. Is this in the same volume?
Q. It's in volume 26. If you go to 6989 .
A. Volume which?
Q. volume
26.
A. 26. Yeah.

So in the middle of the page there, there's a number of calls; there's a call to Ms. McCann at $4: 28$ on 12th February, then there's a number of texts later the following day.
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, would that accord with your recollection of when she might've told you of her intention to go up?
A. Possibly.
Q. Possibly?
A. Yeah.
Q. You see, she says here:
"The next morning l travelled to Ms. D's family home. I think fromrecollection it was a Friday, either 14th or 21st."

So, these phone calls and texts are before 14th.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

239 Q. So it would seem possible that you could've had that conversation at that point in time; would you agree with that?
A. I can't recal1, you know, the nature of --

240 Q. Yeah?
A. -- the conversations, I just see from the records
you're showing me here.
241 Q. okay. On the next page, 6990, there's a call from you to Ms. McCann on 15th February, 17:11:58, it's call of approximately six minutes seventeen.
A. Yeah.

242 Q. And if she didn't go on 14th, the second date she mentioned here was 21st. And there seemed to be then this call to her on 15 th and a number of other texts. Presumably it's possible that you could've discussed matters with her in that call?
A. I haven't a recollection, Mr. McGuinness --

243 Q. Yeah. We11, have you any recollection of what you were ringing her about on these two occasions?
A. As of now, no, I can't have -- I don't have a recollection of what $I$ was ringing her about. As I said, she worked as a Sunday journalist. They'd be working on a multiplicity of stories at the time.

244 Q. Yes. You see, after the call on 15th at 17:11:58, if we go up the page there, there seems to be a call immediately then to Mr. Williams. Do you see that?
A. Sorry, what date is that again ?

245 Q. This is on 15th February.
A. 15th February, yes. Of February?

246 Q. Yes.
A. I'm on March here at the moment.

247 Q. It's on page 6990.
A. 6990, sorry. Oh, yes. Yes.

248 Q. And you see that immediately, it would seem fairly closely after the call --
A. Yeah.

249 Q. -- you phone Mr. Williams and would have appear to have been talking to him.
A. Yes.

250
Q. Can you recollect what that would be about?
A. No, I can't.

251 Q. okay. But you were aware presumably, or were you at that stage, of his interest in going up?
A. No.
Q. okay. 'Look, Debbie McCann is going up to try and get the story'?
A. No. I never discussed interactions between different journalists.
253 Q. And you see, you appear to have sent two texts, a text to Commissioner Callinan and Commissioner O'Sullivan after that.
A. Yes.

254 Q. Not immediately after it, obviously, but in the period. One of them was a call actually, sorry, to Commissioner 11:12 Callinan.
A. Yeah.

255 Q. And have you any recollection what that phone call was about?
A. Em, I can't recall at the moment, but it would always 11:12 be updates, it always would be follow-ups, bringing information to his attention.

256 Q. Yeah. It could be anything then, is it?
A. It could be anything, yeah.

257 Q. Okay. There's four or five other calls to Mr. Williams then on 17th March.
A. I think in relation to February, Mr. McGuinness --
Q. Yes?
A. -- February was a very intense period --
Q. Yes.
A. And I would've engaged with Paul williams in relation to that GSOC story.
262 Q. Yes. On page 6991 you appear to have made a call to
Ms. McCann on 21st February, which was the second of the two dates she initially nominated.
A. Yes.

263 Q. Do you -- perhaps were you just leaving her a message? Any recollection why you were ringing her?
A. As I said, if she was -- if that's after the date she would've been up there, she would've been telling me or discussing her interaction with that family.
264 Q. Yes. And we subsequently got a letter written on behalf of Ms. McCann, indicating that she's now not so sure whether it was either of those dates and she seems to believe it may not have been 21st, for a reason that I needn't trouble you with, and that it might've been later in the month. But if it was later in the month
then, could I ask you to look at 6992?
A. okay.
And then later in the afternoon there's a call to
Mr. Williams.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. On 26th then there's two calls to Ms. Murray and then there's a number of texts to Debbie McCann and then there's a call to the Commissioner. And then in the afternoon, after one o'clock, there appear to be two calls to Ms. McCann at 13:15 and 13:59, there's a cal1 to Ms. Murray briefly at 15:32 and then there's apparently two calls to Mr. Williams.
A. Em, as I said, the whole February issue is all tied into the whole GSOC story.
Q. And any idea what that's about?
A. The Mr. Williams call would definitely be, in February was the whole GSOC story.
A. Yes. $11: 14$
Q. There's a short cal1 to Ms. Murray at 9:54 in the morning there.
to Mr. williams.

269 Q. Okay. But is there a possibility that you were finding out here what you've told the investigators; that each of them told you they'd been to the house?
A. Well, they told me after they'd been to the house, yes.

270 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

271 Q. And you're not precisely sure when they went to the house?
A. I can't recall the exact dates they were up there,

Mr. McGuinness.
Q. So it's more than possible that these could be calls by you to find out had they been to the house?
A. Well, they'd be return calls, yes. Yes, I would accept that.
Q. I mean, that's a real possibility?
A. Yes.
Q. And you seem to ring Mr. Williams shortly after trying to get through to Ms. Murray there.
A. Yes.
Q. Perhaps it's a coincidence, but these are the three journalists who actually went to Ms. D's house.
A. Well, I never knew Ms. Williams -- or, Mr. Williams had an interest in the Ms. D case until he told me.
Q. Okay. Well, when did he tell you?
A. That phone call on that Saturday, when he told me he was up there.
Q. And he asked you nothing about the case in February then, is that right?
A. In February it was all about the GSOC Garda story. And 11:17 he was covering it extensively.
Q. And just to be clear, are you maintaining you had previously briefed Mr. Williams about Sergeant McCabe --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and the sexual abuse?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that on one occasion or more?
A. Like, I mean, these would be conversational pieces,
they wouldn't be the same conversation every time. But, you know, his name would come up as regards, do you know, what was in the media at the time and that. well, just going forward to March, obviously by the time Ms. Murray and Ms. McCann had contacted you --
A. Yes.
-- after their visit --
A. Yes.
-- you must've asked them 'Are you going to get the story out of this?'
A. Well, I would've asked were they writing a story. when it was going to be written, $I$ don't know.
Q. Yeah. Well, it gets published is another matter, it has to go through --
A. Yeah.

285 Q. -- legal and editing and...
A. Yeah.

286 Q. But did Ms. McCann tell you that her editors weren't interested in pursuing the story?
A. No, she didn't tell me that.

287 Q. Okay. We11, just going back to Ms. McCann's statement at 3731 - it's in Volume 14 - at line 32 she says:
"I thi nk fromrecollection it was a Friday, either 14th or 21st February. I wasn't sure of the exact I ocation 11:19 of the house, so when I arrived in the area I asked some nei ghbours for directions. On arrival at ME. D's house, I got out of my car and knocked on the door. A woman came out who I bel ieve was Mb. D's mother. I
tol d her why I was there. I dentified myself as journal ist with the Irish mail on Sunday. She appeared to me to be a little upset. She made reference to listening to the one oclock news, so it must have been that time of day. The reason I gathered she was upset was that Sergeant MECabe's name had been mentioned on the radio. I asked her would she would like to tal ka little bit more and l recall I gave her my card that would have had my mobile number and contact details on it. She was very ni ce and polite. I think we left it that she would thi nk about it or words to that effect. She did not speak to me about the allegation. I was on my own and onl y spoke to Mrs. D. We sai d good-bye. I think I apol ogi sed if I had upset her, as if in my presence brought up these matters. I got into my car 11:20 and drove to a petrol station. I rang my news editor Robert Cox. I told him what had been said. I said that Mrs. D had been upset at Sergeant MLCabe's name bei ng mentioned on the news and I thought there may be a possi bility she would talk in the future. He then told me to come back to Dublin at this point. This is the only menber of M . $\mathrm{D}^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ family I had contact with, the only contact I had with Ms. D's family. Sometimes in these cases a letter is sent as a follow up. In this case l don't bel ieve it was. I can find no record 11:20 of such correspondence.

Shortly after this meeting I went on maternity leave on 22nd March 2014. I returned to work in Septenber 2014.

Ms. D's family were never contacted by me subsequently. There were multiple sources in rel ation to the al I egation agai nst Mauri ce McCabe made by Mb. D. There had been whi sperings in a very general sense and I had been approaching peopl e trying to firmup the inf or mation. Whi sperings would have been in a prof essi onal capacity where l would have been hearing them Obvi ously source protection is integral to being a journalist and I cannot reveal those sources. I al so bel ieve l cannot reveal the names of the persons who firmed up any information. I don't believe that the wai vers I have been shown rel ating to former Commi ssi oner Martin Callinan and Commi ssi oner O Sul I i van and Superintendent David Tayl or rel ease me frommy obl igations in respect to journalistic privilege."

And on that point, as someone who has given evidence that he briefed Ms. McCann, you've provided the waiver and you'd like her, amongst all of the others, to come forward and assist the Tribunal?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN what if the story she has to tell, Superintendent - I don't know obviously - is completely different to the story you're telling me? In other words, what if the story is that you told her the name, the address of Ms. D, that you told her the details from the file, that you encouraged her to go up there and that you checked with her all the way through in
relation to how she was getting on and whether that story was ever going to actually hit the newsprint; what if it be that story, would you still say you wish to waive your obligation?
A. Completely, Chairman.

11:22
MR. MEGI NNESS: Just in that regard, have you spoken to Ms. McCann or Ms. Murray directly and asked them to come forward at any stage?
A. No.

289
Q. And have you spoken to them, not in the context of a waiver, but in order to discuss these matters?
A. No. Like, I mean, as I said, I provided my statements.

291 Q. Yeah.
A. I signed the waiver.

292 Q. Yeah. No, I understand that answer, you have provided your statements. But the question was: Have you spoken to them in order to discuss these matters?
A. No.

293 Q. On any occasion?
A. No.
Q. Have you spoken to them since the setting up of the Tribunal?
A. I haven't spoken to Ms. McCann. Ms. Murray spoke to me, yes.
Q. In what context?
A. In just a conversational piece, it wasn't anything to do with the Tribunal.

296 Q. We11, about the issues in the Tribunal?
A. No, no, not the issues. I wouldn't discuss that.

297 Q. What issues then?
A. It was in the sense of a conversational piece, personal pieces in relation to personal matters.
298 Q. We11, we'11 leave that for the moment. But I want to draw your attention to what was put to Ms. McCann --
A. Yes.

299 Q. --n at one point. And at page 3779 -- sorry, 3739, at line 161, Ms. McCann had been asked:
"Have you any inf or mati on or evi dence about an
or chestrated campai gn directed by seni or officers of An Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by spreading rumours about his professional/personal life? 11:24 Mb. Al i son O' Reilly of the Irish daily mail has stat ed the following to the disclosure Tri bunal:
' I do not have any direct information. I was told by my former colleague inthe Irish Mail on Sunday, Debbie 11:24 MLCann, bet ween 2013 and 2014 that Superintendent Dave Tayl or and then acting Commi ssi oner Nói rín Ó Sullivan, told her Maurice McCabe abused a girl when she was a child. Debbie told me that the abuse was covered up because Mr. McCabe was a Garda and the case was never 11:24 gi ven a Pul se number'."

And the question then to Ms. McCann is as follows:
"I have been asked whether what ME. O Reilly has stated above is accurate and whether I wish to make any comment."

And the answer given is:
"I wasn't invol ved in any orchestrated campai gn to mal ign Sergeant McCabe. I have no evi dence of any orchestrated campai gn to malign Sergeant McCabe. The allegations that we were looking at, at the time were di scussed in the office. I certainly did not negativel y brief Alison OReilly. We certainly would have discussed the allegations. As journalists, we become aware of allegations all of the time. Our job is to investigate them see if we can substantiate them 11:25 and publish themif they are in the public interest. But until proven, they are treated only as an allegations. The allegations were di scussed in a private capacity. They were never going to be aired and shared with anyone else. I worked primarily on 11:25 crime with the Mail on Sunday. Alison would al so have worked on crime. We would have di scussed stories all the time together. She was a colleague and friend at that point and any di scussion around stories were in that context. Just to say, it wasn't a briefing in any 11:25 description, it was a di scussion anong colleagues. To clarify, any di scussion was into the allegation we were I ooking at al ready as described above in my statement."

And she doesn't appear to dispute the accuracy of what Ms. O'Reilly said she said, do you see that?
A. I see that, yes.

So would you like to comment then on what Ms. O'Reilly has said there, that you provided these details?
A. I never knew the intimate details of the allegation. And does it in fact reflect a position that you were, in effect, attempting to orchestrate the airing of newspaper stories about the allegation that had been made against Sergeant McCabe, would that be a fair description?
A. What I was putting by the journalists is the narrative in relation to Sergeant McCabe's motivation and where this motivation stemmed from. And how the journalists took that forward was their prerogative.
Yeah. But you were hoping to light the match, as it were, isn't that right, and get the publicity?
A. Well, I was hoping to draw their attention to Sergeant McCabe's motivation.
Q. Yeah.
A. How they took that forward and in what form they took that forward was their sole choice.
Q. And it was to point them northwards to Cavan, isn't that right, to the home of Ms. D?
A. It was to point them towards the motivation of Sergeant 11:28 McCabe.

305 Q. Yeah. And to go to Ms. D's house, isn't that right, to try and get a story from her?
A. I never directed them to go to Ms. D's house.
Q. Ah, sure I know that. But we're not going to quibble over the use of the word "direction", are we Superintendent Taylor? what was your intent and purpose?
A. My intention was to draw their attention to Sergeant McCabe's motivation, acting on the instructions of the Commissioner.
Q. Was it for that reason that you facilitated each of those two ladies with information about the allegation, Ms. D and Ms. Murray?
A. I didn't know the intimate details of the allegations.
Q. Whatever you did know you were providing to them?
A. Well, the allegation that $I$ did know was there had been an investigation in 2006.
Q. Yeah. I am not asking you what you knew, but the purpose for which you were providing the information to them was to enable them to go up, if they wanted to pursue the story?
A. Well, I provided them with that narrative, the motivation, they would have a lot more sources that they would go and verify and build their story.
Q. And having learnt of the outcome of their visits, you had the interaction with Paul williams, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
does that refresh your memory as to whether that was the only occasion on which you provided him with information and that he may be correct in saying that you hadn't previously briefed him?
A. I had previously spoke to him. But I didn't know he an 11:30 interest in the story.

Now, could I just ask you about a different topic?
CHA RMAN Just, Mr. McGuinness, before you move on to that, sorry, if I can perhaps clarify one thing, superintendent, with you please. You say, am I correct 11:30 in thinking, Debbie McCann never asked you for the name and address of Ms. D and what the allegation precisely was?
A. No.

CHA RMAN And you never gave her that information?
A. I don't know that intimate detai1, Chairman.

CHA RMAN You did not know the name, you did not know the address --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- you did not know precisely what the
allegation made was, and so, therefore you couldn't have and didn't pass those on to her.
A. No, I didn't.

CHA RMAN You simply told her that there had been an allegation against Maurice McCabe, a file had been sent 11:30 to the DPP, no prosecution had been directed and that bitterness in consequence arose against his colleagues arising out of that.
A. That's correct Mr. Chairman.

CHA RMAN And that is as far as you went with any journalist.
A. That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHA RMAN And you feel that's as far as you could have gone because at that stage you didn't know the name, you didn't know the address, you didn't know precisely what the allegation was, though you knew they probably lived in County Cavan because they served in County Cavan.
A. Yes, I did know that, Chairman.

314 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Just going back to one of your answers in relation to contact with Ms. Murray.
A. Yes.

315 Q. Did you ask her, on the occasion when you spoke to her, whether she would support your evidence at the Tribunal?
A. No, I didn't.

316 Q. But she is the journalist that you had most contact with in this period that we're looking at?
A. Yes.

317 Q. She is the journalist that you had an extraordinary degree of contact with after you ceased to be Press officer, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

318 Q. The journalist to whom you, one could use the word, leaked or disclosed, or whatever, you provided multiple pieces of Garda information to her from 2014 onwards, isn't that right?
A. That's a regrettable situation.

319 Q. Yeah. So I mean, you weren't acting as a Press Officer in that capacity and I don't know whether she knew that - did she know that?
A. I can't speak for her.
Q. You can't say?
A. Yeah.

321 Q. We11, it was common knowledge presumably that you must have been moved?
A. Oh yes.

322 Q. A lot of journalists had expressed sympathy with you, 11:32 had they?
A. They had, yes.

323 Q. Yeah. And you knew you weren't Press officer?
A. Yes.

324 Q. So did you not ask her whether she might support you in 11:32 your testimony of --
A. No.

325 Q. -- what you had been asked to do?
A. No.

326 Q. You never discussed it with her at all?
A. No.

327 Q. Okay. A11 right. We will leave that for the moment. Now I did refer in passing to a file that had been found in the Commissioner's office and I will just ask you to look at it. I think we should have a copy to hand up [SAME HANDED].
A. Thank you.

328 Q. Sir, this is one of the documents discovered by the FSNI in respect of which Mr. McConnell gave evidence
last week, resulting from the electronic searches of Garda Headquarters and this came from the Commissioner's office. It's headed: "Confidential report: Maurice MECabe. Compl ete synopsis." I just want to draw your attention to, it should be the second 11:34 page, there's a lot of redactions on it?
A. Yeah.

329 Q. The page number is, in the new volume is 7225 ?
A. Yes.

330 Q. It's at the bottom of that page. There's a file reference number which is apparently a discipline file reference number. And it says:
"On the 4th Novenber 2006, ME. D, 14 years, made a statement to Sergeant Deni se Flynn and D/Sergeant James 11:34 Fraher. In the statement she alleges when she was six years of age she was playing in the home of Garda MECabe. Mb. D was playing with the menber's children. During the day she alleges Sergeant McCabe took hold of her behi nd and began pressing agai nst her. After a few 11:35 minutes it ended. The statement does not contai $n$ any ot her details.

Inspector Noel Cunni ngham was appointed to investigate criminal aspects on the matter. A file on the matter 11:35 was sent to the DPP, not recommending prosecution. On the 24th August 2007 the DPP directed no prosecution. Chi ef superintendent Mbnaghan deci ded not to initiate discipline in the matter and the file was closed."

And that is the complete synopsis. And it's a synopsis, the last event of which is recorded as occurring in 2013, and it was apparently available in the Commissioner's office. That appears to contain many of the details which Ms. O'Reilly apparently recites Ms. McCann as knowing. Does that help you?
A. I never had access to this file.

331 Q. You never saw that?
A. No.

332 Q. And did anyone read that out to you --
A. No.

333 Q. -- or tell you of its contents?
A. No.

334 Q. Thank you.
CHA RMAN But it does contain a name.
A. No. I never --

CHA RMAN I don't want anyone to mention the name, because let's for once let bygones be bygones, it hasn't helped anybody, clearly, this matter being
brought up at a11. But the Commissioner knew the name.
A. Yes.

CHAL RMAN Why didn't he tell you?
A. He didn't, Mr. Chairman.

CHA RMAN Did he tell you the rank or the place where 11:36 the father of Ms. D served or what kind of relations he had with Maurice McCabe?
A. No. I was aware it was a daughter of another member, Mr. Chairman. I didn't know the intimate details.

CHA RMAN It's not much in the way of an intimate detail.
A. Yeah, but no.

CHA RMAK People don't -- we have been going around saying -- I've almost forgotten the name now. We've been going around saying Ms. D for about a year and a half. But no one would be doing that in Garda Headquarters.
A. It was never brought to my attention. I never saw this file, Mr. Chairman.

CHA RMAN And the Commissioner's briefing you but he doesn't tell you that.
A. No. He verbally briefs me. He never handed me any documentation or showed me any file.
CHA RMAN when did you first -- did you ever learn the 11:37 name?
A. Subsequently.

CHA RMAN From where? Because that name has not been mentioned in here. It's not in any document the Tribunal has sent out. Where did you get it from.
A. I just heard the name that --

CHA RMAN From who?
A. -- that it was a member's daughter.

CHA RMAN From who?
A. I don't know her actual name.

CHA RMAN I thought you told me you did?
A. Sorry, the surname, but I don't know her actual first name, Mr. Chairman.
CHA RMAN where did you get her surname?
A. Oh, I knew it was a member's daughter, I knew -CHA RMAN I know that. we all know that.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN But I'm asking you where did you get her surname from, superintendent?
A. I would have heard it from Garda Headquarters. It was going around it was another member's daughter. CHA RMAN Yes, but you're saying you didn't hear it back in 2013/2014?
A. What I'm saying is, I would have known it was another member's daughter and that name would have been known. CHAN RMAN I'm talking about a name.
A. I didn't know her first name, no. I knew -CHA RMAN The second name.
A. I knew the surname, yes.

CHA RMAN So, did you pass on the surname to journalists?
A. No. I didn't, no. No, I didn't.

CHAI RMAN But you certainly would have got the surname from this, you're saying certainly the surname was mentioned in 2013/2014.
A. Oh yeah, the surname would have been known. CHA RMAN Yes. And the rank of the dad?
A. Yes, would have been known, yes.

CHA RMAN Did the Commissioner tell you that?
A. No, he didn't, no.

CHAL RMAN So what did he call her?
A. He didn't call her anything. Basically what he always said is that Sergeant McCabe had been investigated for
alleged assault.
CHA RMAN what did he call the dad? And please don't mention the name.
A. No, he didn't call the dad anything. It was just, draw to the attention of the allegation and let journalists make their own inquiries after that.

CHA RMAN It would be like looking for a needle in a haystack, wouldn't it, unless you have a name? If you have a name suddenly everything comes into very sharp focus; you can make an inquiry very, very quick7y. And 11:39 you say the name was being mentioned, let's say the name was, $I$ 'm giving a random name, O'Neill I think is the most common name in Ireland --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- so if that name was mentioned up in Garda 11:39 Headquarters, why wouldn't you pass that on to the journalists, if that was your job?
A. Well, my job was not to pass on -- my job was to pass on Sergeant McCabe's motivation and where this motivation came from, not the actual details. And then 11:39 the journalists then were most resourceful in their own inquiries with other contacts they would have had. CHA RMAK I mean, you know, it is a criminal offence to pass on the name of someone who makes an allegation of a sexual offence?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN It can happen, but you need the leave of a Court.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So, are you saying people were using the name up in Garda Headquarters --
A. The name was known, Mr. Chairman.

CHA RMAN No. Look, the question I asked was: Are you saying the name was being used up in Garda Headquarters?
A. I don't know if it was being used. It's just that the name was known, of who the man -- the other -- the victim's family was.

CHA RMAN So you were moving on to something else, Mr. McGuinness.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, Chairman.
Q. Just before I leave your second statement, the investigators asked you about the contacts with the journalist who had gone to Ms. D's house.
A. Yes.

336 Q. And that was obviously after the D family had given evidence to the Tribunal in the matter. So those visits were now known about?
A. Yes.

337 Q. And you were then asked at page 223:
"I have been asked whether I shoul d have incl uded Debbi e MECann and Eavan Murray in this list in DT2 and whet her there are any ot her journal ists on reflection that should al so now be incl uded. "

And your answer was:
"Yes, they should be incl uded. I was tryi ng to put together a list at the timel created it. It may not have been compl ete."

Now, just it seems that on one view it would seem very difficult to believe that you could have forgotten the extent of the contact you had with Ms. Murray and Ms. McCann in 2014, and it seems difficult to believe that you could have forgotten that they were the two of the three journalists that you knew had gone up to Ms. D, which would have facilitated or was intended to facilitate the campaign. So, how is it that you didn't include them in your initial list of nine provided to you, to your solicitor and from your solicitor to the Tribunal?
A. Well, I put, as I said, the initial list and then subsequently when I was asked to provide more information $I$ put the whole list completely. It was never a case of trying to not put the information before this Tribunal.

338 Q. I mean, one interpretation of it that might be open or not open, I would like your comment on it, is that you were perhaps intending to conceal their involvement and your involvement in assisting them?
A. Absolutely not. Absolutely not.

339 Q. And I am just wondering is it possible that if you were encouraging these journalists to go up and it suited your agenda and you were providing them with information, was this something that you had taken on
yourself to do, that wasn't authorised by Commissioner Callinan and/or Commissioner o'sullivan?
A. No. The decision for journalists to go to that house was a professional decision of the journalists.
340 Q. I know that. But it's all about your part in it, the information you provided and my question is a direct one: were you intending to conceal that from the Tribunal?
A. Absolutely not.

And the question then is: Why was it not revealed at any stage?
A. I revealed it and placed it in my statement when asked. And it was always my intention to provide a full -Well, you're taxed with the investigators by this question as to whether they should have been included and you conceded, only at this stage, that they should have been conceded, and my question is: why did you not make it clear from the very beginning these two ladies should have been on your list?
A. The first available opportunity afterwards I did.

CHA RMAN No, what Mr. McGuinness is putting to you is that our investigators came to you and they said, let's just say, what about Joe Soap and mick O'Toole, and you say oh yes, Joe Soap and Mick o'Toole.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN But you provided the list with nine names, now it becomes 11 .
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN And you've had two opportunities in between
and yesterday you said you had to check your records.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Now, I don't know what records you were referring to there. But Mr. McGuinness has referred to, for instance, SM3, which is your phone from the 8th 11:44 September to 18th December, showed apparently 2,800 contacts with Eavan Murray, that is actually 110 days, 25 a day.
A. Well --

CHA RMAN It's very hard to forget. So that is the question Mr. McGuinness is asking you.
A. I'm not suggesting I forgot. I'm suggesting that at the first available opportunity I put that information before the Tribunal.
CHA RMAN No, but we put the information to you, 11:44 superintendent.
A. Yeah. And I confirmed it.

CHA RMAN A11 right.
343 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Can I ask you just about another piece of evidence you gave yesterday, Superintendent Taylor. You told the Tribunal that you asked the Commissioner for the file, you wanted to read the file?
A. Yes.

344 Q. obviously that's not in your protected disclosure, but you made a statement to the Tribunal and then you've had three other interviews with our investigators and that doesn't appear in any of those five documents as something that you did in relation to Ms. D's file and in relation to interaction with Commissioner Callinan,
why is that?
A. It came up as part of cross-examination yesterday. It's not a really salient point. I asked the Commissioner to see the file, he didn't provide it to me, and that was it.
Q. Well, did he tell you, look, I've got a little electronic synopsis and Superintendent walsh might print it off if you ask him --
A. No.

346 Q
-- or anything of that nature?
A. No.

347 Q. I mean, my concern is that it's not in any of those five documents and I wondering why that might be?
A. As I said, it came up yesterday during our cross-examination. It's a matter that you asked and I profited yesterday.

348 Q. A11 right. I mean, it might be thought that, you know, it was consistent with a desire to have the file for a purpose of knowing what was on the file?
A. But I never got the file, Mr. McGuinness.

349 Q. Yes. So why were you looking for it?
A. I was just asking for the file. Have you a file on the matter? You know.
350 Q. Did you speak to anyone who had been involved in the investigation?
A. No.

351 Q. Superintendent Cunningham at that point in time?
A. Never.

352 Q. Or did you speak to anyone in the divisional area? Did
you know Detective Superintendent John O'Reilly?
A. I knew him professionally, but I didn't know him personally.
Yeah. Apparently, I don't know if you heard his evidence, but he apparently had a discussion with Mr. D 11:47 about perhaps suggesting Mr. Williams as a person who might interview Ms. D, did you become aware of that?
A. I'm aware of that from the transcripts.
Q. But had you any contact with him at the time in relation to that --
A. No. No.

355 Q. -- or in particular, obviously if Ms. Murray and Ms. McCann failed to get an interview?
A. I had no contact with superintendent -Had you any concern as to whether there might be another way of doing it, with another journalist?
A. I'm unclear as to what you are asking, Mr. McGuinness.

357 Q. Well, in terms of no story appearing and then Mr. Williams in fact became one of the first journalists to write in a number of articles about the 11:47 story, I'm not suggesting anything sinister on his part, but for your part, were you still keen to fulfil the agenda of getting the story out there and getting Sergeant McCabe written about?
A. Em, I didn't know Mr. Williams had an interest in it. $\quad$ 11:48 358 Q. Okay.
A. Never knew that.

359 Q. We11, he phoned you about it anyway.
A. Sorry?

360 Q. He phoned you about it.
A. Oh yeah, but that's after the incident.

361 Q. okay.
A. I didn't know prior that he had any interest in it.

362 Q. But you certainly facilitated him in terms of what you
A. Oh yes.

363 Q. Now can I just ask you to look at Volume 20, this is a statement from Mr. Boucher-Hayes?
A. Yeah.

364 Q. At page 3260.
A. These are all fives, Mr. McGuinness. They're not three, Mr. McGuinness.
Q. I'm sorry. Volume 13, 3260. It's your third interview. It's dealing with Mr. Boucher-Hayes. At 11:49 line 152 --
A. This is my statement?

366 Q. Yes.
"Afterwards I recall Philip Boucher-Hayes shook hands with the former Commissioner and wi shed hima happy Christmas. I can state that I did not hear former Commi ssi oner Callinan negativel y brief Philip Boucher-Hayes agai nst Ser geant MkCabe, but I know he was extremely annoyed with the fact that Philip
Boucher-Hayes wanted to raise the penalty points issue on the programme."

So that confirms that you didn't know what the

Commissioner had said to Mr. Boucher-Hayes.
A. No, I wasn't within earshot.

367 Q. Okay. The issue of what Mr. Boucher-Hayes says at the bottom of his statement, which is dealt with at page 3261, there's a portion of his statement read to you, it says:
"As our conversation was ending, he added that if there was anything el se I wanted to know about Maurice McCabe or the penalty points issue that I should ask
Superintendent Dave Tayl or fromthe Garda Press Of fice who was al so present that eveni ng. Al most i mredi at el y afterwards Superintendent Tayl or buttonhol ed me and asked ' Now do you know what the probl em with Maurice McCabe and the penalty points is?'"

And you have been asked about that and your answer at line 177 is:
"I don't remember mentioning the name Ser geant Maurice McCabe to Philip Boucher-Hayes. The issue on the day, as I have al ready sai d, was to do with the penalty points. The issue of penalty points and Sergeant McCabe are inter woven. Any di scussi on I had with Philip Boucher-Hayes on that date was to do with the have been mentioned. However, I did not make reference to any sexual abuse allegations or any negative briefing agai nst Sergeant McCabe to Philip

Boucher-Hayes. "

That appears to have been your recollection on the date of your interview on the 8th March 2008. But yesterday you appeared to say that you do remember saying that to 11:51 Mr. Boucher-Hayes, is that right?
A. I remember saying the penalty points.

But not this quotation attributed to you; "Now do you understand what the position is with Maurice McCabe?" You see, yesterday you appeared to agree that you said that and you don't appear to have a recollection of it in your statement?
A. You couldn't mention the word penalty points without an obvious connection to Sergeant McCabe.
Q. But in any event --
A. Penalty points and Sergeant McCabe were intricately interwoven.

371 Q. A11 right. But whatever you said to Mr. Boucher-Hayes it wasn't in reference to or with knowledge of what Commissioner callinan had said to him?
A. You have to understand that day when Commissioner Callinan went out to RTÉ, Mr. Hayes wanted to raise the 11:52 penalty points issues and that was a red rag to Mr. Callinan.
Q. But whatever was attributed to you by Mr. Boucher-Hayes was not said by you with the knowledge of anything that

Commissioner Callinan had said to him, Mr. Boucher-Hayes?
A. I didn't hear the conversation between the two. You didn't hear, okay. Could I ask you about some newspaper articles that were written in the period, you 11:53 might be able to help us, if you could go to Volume 25. I beg your pardon, Volume 24.
A. 24, okay.

At page 6512 there's an article by Mr. Juno McEnroe.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN If you wouldn't mind giving me the date as we go along Mr. McGuinness, it's at the top of the page.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes, sorry. It's 27th January 2014. And I am really only interested in the final paragraph which says:
"A seni or Garda source said he does not approve that PAC is the place for Garda nembers to deal with wi despread allegations made but there may be some wriggle roomto deal with them"

Now obviously Mr. McEnroe is being very responsible there, in identifying where this piece of information is coming from, "a seni or Garda source", and you were the Garda Press Officer at the time, and there is a record of a phone call from you to Mr. McEnroe on the 26th February, do you recall briefing him to that effect or along those lines?
A. I recall briefing him in relation to the PAC and the concern of the Garda Commissioner that a serving member would be appearing before the PAC. We11, this appears to relate to, $I$ call it, the interregnum perhaps between when the Committee had taken Commissioner Callinan's evidence on the Friday --
A. Yeah.

|  | inter |
| :--- | :--- |
| taken |  |
| A. Yeah. |  |

Q. -- or on the Thursday, there had been the car park meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. And we've heard that Commissioner Callinan apparently saw in something that Deputy McGuinness had said that there might be a way to deal with it, and did he report back to you on that?
A. No. I was never aware of the conversation between the 11:57 Commissioner and Deputy McGuinness.
Q. Al1 right. But is the wriggle room here perhaps the PAC hearing it in private?
A. I can't -- I can't definitively say that.
Q. Okay. Well, is it likely that you were the senior
A. I would have spoken to Mr. McEnroe in relation to the appearance before PAC and the deep concern of Garda management that a serving member was going to appear before PAC. This is something that they didn't want. 11:57
Q. Okay. And you have no problem identifying yourself as the source?
A. No.
Q. If that is consistent with what you think you were
briefing?
A. Yeah.

383 Q. There's an article then from Mr. Lally on the next page, along with Mr. Kelly. And at the bottom of the first, it's dated 29th January, and it says:
"Seni or Garda sour ces have told the Irish Ti mes that they were di sappoi nted at PAC's actions, saying they bel ieved the issue had moved on substantially with the GSOC opening investigation. Some of these sources suggest the investigations represented a challenge to the Gardaí's internal command structures and di sci pline that woul d have unf oreseen repercussi ons. However, ot hers in Gar da Headquarters sai d Gar da Commi ssi oner Martin Callinan had no plans at that time to go to the Court to seek an injunction to stop the hearing."

Now again, that's related to the PAC issues and the onset of the impending GSOC investigation commencing. Is that source likely to have been you? Do you think it was you?
A. I think part of it, part of that narrative would have been me.

384 Q. Yes?
A. I would certainly have been authorised to brief in relation to the serious concern Garda management had at the likelihood of a serving member going before PAC and giving evidence.
Q. Okay. Just drawing your attention to those two
publications referring to Garda sources, senior Garda sources, does that assist you in any way in determining whether you might have briefed Mr. Lally and/or Mr. MCEnroe in the negative way about Sergeant McCabe by reference to the allegation?
A. I would have briefed them -- well, probably around that time for Mr. McEnroe, but certainly earlier than that for Mr. Lally.
Q. So are you plumping for probably briefing Mr. McEnroe about it at that time?
A. Probably around that time, yeah.

387 Q. In connection with this?
A. Yeah, but Mr. McEnroe dealt with the political reporting.
388 Q. okay.
A. He wasn't a crime reporter. So I would have had less contact with him.
389 Q. okay. I think I may have misstated that there was a phone call with Mr. McEnroe, actually, prior to that. I will check that, Chairman. But going to another
article referring to Garda sources at 6520 -- no, perhaps we're going to 6524. This is an article that appeared in the Irish Times by Cormac o'Keeffe on the 22nd February and there's a long reference to sources there. It says:
"Seni or Gardaí yesterday insisted all the complaints in the dossier at the centre of a government revi ew have al ready been fully investigated by a high level team

However, top officers are conducting a fresh probe of the case as part of the Department of Justice revi ew of the dossi er expected to... conducted at the request of Taoi seach Enda Kenny."

It goes on to say in the third column:
"Seni or officers are taking a fresh look at the compl ai nts agai $n$ as part of the Department of Justice revi ew. The Garda source said that all clains of conspi raci es and cover-ups were untrue."

Now this is Mr. O'Keeffe's article. Do you recall briefing him to that effect?
A. No.

390 Q. Or is that likely to have been you as a source?
A. No, that wasn't me.

391 Q. Pardon?
A. That wasn't me.

392 Q. That wasn't you. At page 6527 there's an article in the Irish Examiner by Mr. McEnroe of the 24th February, you do appear to have had a conversation with Mr. McEnroe on the 23rd February at four o'clock in the afternoon or thereabouts, but there's a quotation here:
"Seni or Garda source cl ai med another letter on Decenber 11th from Garda Commi ssi oner Martin Callinan di rected Sergeant MLCabe to cooperate with the force's pending Pulse inquiry. This would be used to justify

Mr. Shatter's cl ai ns that Sergeant MECabe refused to cooperate with the inquiry."

Now, that appears to have been, on your evidence, one of the matters that you were required to brief about -- 12:04
A. Yes.

393 Q. -- is that right?
A. That's right.

394 Q. And is it likely that you are the senior source referred to there?
A. Yes.

395 Q. Okay. And would you have taken the time and trouble to again brief Mr. McEnroe in relation to the negative claim?
A. I don't know on that particular day, but, do you know, I would have spoken to Mr. McEnroe prior to that. So I can't give you the exact date I spoke in relation to the motivation of Sergeant McCabe. It would have been around that period of time.
396 Q. There's an article by Mr. McConnell in the Irish Independent on the 24th February at 6531. It's in the fourth column, towards the bottom of that column on the right, it says:
"A spokesman for the Garda Commi ssi oner said he woul d not be making any comments. However, Garda sources I ast ni ght insisted both Sergeant McCabe and his fellow whi stl ebl ower, John WI son, were di rected by Commi ssi oner Cal I i nan on December 14, 2012 to cooper ate
with the O' Mahony inqui ry but failed to do so."

So it appears to be another report relating to that issue. Are you likely to have been the source of that?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Does that assist you in any way in whether you can recall a negative briefing about the sex abuse allegation?
A. well, that was a huge -- looking back on it now that was a huge political event at the time. So that's when 12:06 I came into contact more with Mr. McEnroe and Mr. McConne11. So it would have been around that period.
Q. Okay. well, does that rule out you having done it in 2013 then?
A. We11, I spoke to other journalists in 2013. Different types of journalists. These are political journalists, I wouldn't have the same level of contact.
Q. okay. There's an article in the Irish Examiner on the 26th February by Mr. o'keeffe.
A. What number is that, Mr. McGuinness?

400 Q. At 6537, it's headed: "Top Gardaí hit back at clains by McCabe." But again, in the middle of it there's a single sentence:
"A seni or Garda source said a di rective issued on the 14th December 2013, publ icised in the newspapers on Tuesday, told Sergeant McCabe that he could bring his concerns to the internal inquiry."

Now, it's not clear whether that's a repetition of what had been actually printed on the 24th, two days ago, but do you recall briefing Mr. O'Keeffe to that effect?
A. No, I don't recall that one.

401 Q. Okay. At 6579, it's an article by Mr. Stephen o'brien and Mr. John Mooney. It's published on the 23rd March 2014. It appeared to have been preceded by a phone call that you had with Mr. Mooney for six minutes on the 22nd March, the day prior to the article. But under the paragraph headed "Gilmore" it says:
"Gilnore al so said it would be hel pf ul if Callinan withdrew his description of the whistlebl owers' actions as "di sgusting". Seni or Garda sources are indicating that the Cormissioner will not apologise to Maurice MECabe or John WIson, however. "There is nothing to apol ogi se for," said a Garda source. Whi stlebl owers did not pursue their complaints about the del etion of penalty points through the appropriate channel s in every case but chose to rel ease information to politicians and others."

Now is that likely to have been you, do you think?
A. Yes.

402 Q. Okay. And that phone call with Mr. Mooney is shown on page 3295 of the documents. But I mean, obviously that's not a report of a negative briefing in the sense of the campaign instruction, isn't that right?
A. Yes. But there would be, like I mean, constant to-ing and fro-ing, asking questions in relation to attitudes to various issues that were arising.
Yeah. But does that help your recollection as to whether you briefed Mr. Mooney then or ever in the very 12:10 negative sense about the sexual --
A. I would have had a lot more engagement with Mr. Mooney because he covered crime and serious stories. So I would have spoken to him in 2013.
404 Q. Pardon?
A. I would have spoke to him in 2013.

405 Q. So you still believe you would have briefed him back then --
A. Yes.

406 Q. -- in the negative sense about the allegation, is that 12:10 right?
A. Yes.

407 Q. 6583, there's an article by Mr. Beasley and Mr. Lally. It's just at the bottom of the page there, the second last paragraph, it's about the issue of the word "disgusting":
"But sources sai d the onl y possi bl e compromise centres on his use of the word "di sgusting" but they emphasise no firm decisi on has been made."

Is that likely to have been you, do you think?
A. No.
Q. No. There's another article by Mr. Lally on the 5th

April?
A. what page is that?

409 Q. 6594. It's published on the 5th April, as I have said, it's headed:
"Seni or Gardaí bel i eve the Commi ssi oner's resi gnation was stage managed. "

And the third last paragraph says:
"Seni or Garda source whose have spoken to the Irish Ti mes bel i eve Callinan was sacrificed as part of a well-crafted pl an to make the government look strong and united and to suggest the ongoing controversies were of his making."

Is that something that you would have been involved in?
A. No, no.

410 Q. Do you recollect speaking to Mr. Lally around that period?
A. If the phone records show I would have, but I certainly didn't brief that story.
411 Q. Yes. And at 6598, there's an article by Mr. Williams here, which we referred to earlier, and published in the Irish Independent on the 12th April, and the final line of it is:

[^0]So, is that likely to have been you?
A. It's possible. It's possible, yeah.

412 Q. And in the context of having firmed up information with Mr. Williams, were you not willing to be associated with that?
A. Sometimes -- well, I don't get your question, Mr. McGuinness, sorry.
413 Q. We11, he appears to be recording that a Garda spokesman was asked for a comment and they wouldn't comment, now 12:13 you had in fact provided some information to Mr. Williams, but did you provide this no comment?
A. It's possible.

414 Q. Possible?
A. It's possible. I can't actually recall that.

MR. MEGI NESS: Okay. Chairman I have no further questions at present.
CHA RMAN Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. McGuinness.
Can I just ask about order? Mr. O'Higgins, you go last. Ms. Burns, you go last. Yes. Thanks.
Mr. McDowe11 if you have questions.

## WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MEDONELL AS FOLLOMB:

415 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Superintendent Taylor, I'm appearing on behalf of Maurice McCabe. I wonder could you indicate 12:14 to the Tribunal when you first received this instruction from Commissioner Callinan to brief journalists in the manner you say you were instructed, did you believe that the substance of the briefing that
you were being instructed to give was correct?
A. Yes.

416 Q. So you believed that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by revenge motive, is that right?
A. Yes.

417 Q. And you believed at that time that he was -- that this all arose out of a complaint of sexual abuse by him and how it was handled, is that right?
A. Yes.

418 Q. So, in spreading these statements about Sergeant McCabe $12: 15$ in the manner you've described, did you believe you were doing wrong at the time?
A. No.
Q. You believed you were giving factual information to the journalists?
A. Yes.

420 Q. And can you tell the Tribunal why then it was that you decided to indicate to Sergeant McCabe that you had done him wrong and when you had your change of mind?
A. As I said yesterday, when I had removed myself from the 12:15 hothouse of Garda culture and I could reflect and see what was done, I realised it was wrong.
421 Q. It was wrong for what reason? That it was untrue or that it shouldn't have been done whether it was true or untrue?
A. It shouldn't have been done whether it was true or not.

422 Q. I see. And I just want to be clear about this: Are you saying that you still are of the view that he was motivated by revenge?
A. No.

Yes. We will come to that in a moment. But were you -- even though you thought what you were saying was true, you didn't want any of those statements to be attributed to either you or to An Garda Síochána at an official level, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

427 Q. Now would you just indicate to the Tribunal how you, in your own mind, differentiated between off the record briefings and statements to journalists and on the record briefings? what was the distinction in your mind?
A. The distinction: where you could be attributed on the record, where you would be attributed, your name or your title or your office would be on the record; off the record would be sources.

428 Q. I see. And isn't there a third category of not for publication?
A. I'm not aware of that category.

429 Q. Let's take it step-by-step.
A. Yeah.

12:18
Q. You can say something on the record, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And my understanding is that journalistic practice is that you can say something off the record and the journalist can decide to attribute it to sources or it is generally believed or something like that, and use the information but not attribute it to somebody, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's a third category, isn't there; don't publish this but $X, Y$ and $Z$ is the true situation?
A. Well, that'd be part of -- in relation to this, that $I$ would have drawn their attention to the motivation of Sergeant McCabe and how they would have dealt with it is a matter for their professional opinion.
433 Q. You see, if any of the journalists to whom you expressed these views had said Sergeant McCabe is making complaints about abuse of the penalty points system, sources say that he was involved in an accusation of sexual assault in 2006 and is motivated acceptable to you, would it, as an outcome?
A. No.

434 Q. So I'm suggesting to you that this wasn't purely just
off the record. This was a confidential type of statement you were making. You didn't expect to see it in print under "sources say" or "it is believed in Garda Headquarters that"?
A. No.
all of this ill-motivated as an assault on the force arising out of --
A. Yes.
Q. -- revenge?
A. Yes. that was given here by Sergeant Molloy on the 9th May, at page 77 , day 71 and maybe it could be brought up on the screen for you. Do you see it there?
A. No, it hasn't come up, Mr. McDowel1.

442 Q. We will wait for it to come up. Page 76. At line 4 -sorry, at line 13 the question was put by Mr. Marrinan:
"Now in terms of Sergeant McCabe and what was known about himin the Press Office or what may have been di scussed in the Press Office concerning Ser geant McCabe in late 2013 up to J une 2014, can you hel p us in that regard?"

And he replied:
"Well, I can't say that I heard Superintendent Tayl or say anything and I can't say who said thi ngs, but I mean, obvi ousl y the case would be di scussed. "

And Mr. Marrinan said:
"Well, one would have thought so."

And he said:
"Yeah.
Q. But every witness so far as told us, and I thi nk you're the last witness fromthe Press Office, has said 12:23 that it was never di scussed.
A. Yeah, di scussed in the sense that l woul d hear from other staff what -- let's put it this way, I was clear if there was a side to be taken in this whi ch side

Davi d Tayl or was on, and it wasn't on Maurice McCabe's side, let's put it that way."

Would you say that that is a fair description of the impression that you made with your staff?
A. Yes.

443 Q. And he said:
"Can you just expand on that a little bit?
A. My difficulty is that I can't point to a particular 12:23 day and time and say Superintendent Tayl or said this and theref ore I just want to be caref ul."

And Mr. Marrinan said:
"It's an impressi on that you had."

And you said:
"It's that, married with the fact that other staff
members would tell me something that was said as well, possi bl y by Superintendent Tayl or, not in the sense they were repeating the gossi p, but in the sense that guess what he said, it would be uncompl imentary about Maurice McCabe, it would be uncompl i ment ary about any journalist who was writing in favour of Maurice McCabe and it woul dn't be very compl imentary about any menbers of the Oi reacht as who are taking Maurice McCabe's si de. "

Now, do you think that that is a fair description of the impression you created in the Press office at that time?
A. I'd agree with that.

12:24
444 Q. And this was at a time, as I understand it, that you believed that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by revenge and that it originated in a sexual assault claim against him, is that right?
A. That's correct.

445 Q. Now could I ask you again in relation to that, you've given evidence here that you weren't the only person in Garda Headquarters who apparently was privy to the fact that Sergeant McCabe had been the subject of an allegation in 2006, sorry 2014, relating to back to 2006. You say --

CHA RMAN 2006, relating back to about seven or eight years prior to that. 6, 7 and then obviously there was the other thing which emerged later on.
MR. MEDONELL: Sorry, yeah. 2006 was the allegation, 12:25 some time in late 1990s was the --

CHA RMAN Yeah.
446 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Sorry, in relation to that, who do you say -- or sorry, at what level do you say that this knowledge was generalised in Garda Headquarters?
A. It was well known at all levels. Like, I mean, it was well known around Garda Headquarters.

447 Q. And was it spoken about among members of An Garda Síochána?
A. It would be spoken in the sense of almost like a watercooler conversation.
A. I would imagine they would have a multiplicity of sources in my estimation with journalists, they don't depend on one.
451 Q. So when it comes to contact between journalists and members of An Garda Síochána other than yourself, have you any view as to whether what you were imparting on a 12:27 directed basis was also coming to them from other sources?
A. Em, they never told me that because they would never disclose other sources to me.
A. That's right.
Q. I see. Now Sergeant Molloy mentioned that you would be uncomplimentary about any journalist who was writing in favour of Sergeant McCabe. And I think you identified two journalists yesterday who were, is that right?
Q. One of them was Mick Clifford and the other was?
A. Katie Hannon.

458 Q. Hmm?
A. Katie Hannon.

459 Q. And can you just tell the Tribunal, in respect of those kind of journalists, what steps would you take to show your displeasure towards them?
A. Well, we'd no engagement with Michael Clifford while I was in the Press office. With Ms. Hannon we had some engagement, because she'd seek confirmation of questions she'd sent in about the air programmes and it would be kept at a very professional level. I'm wrong - that among your list of nine named persons in your protected disclosure, there were a number of people whose job it was to get on well with An Garda Síochána, crime correspondents?
A. The relationship between An Garda Síochána and crime correspondents, and with the media, can be complex at times.

461 Q. I can well imagine that it can be complex, but it's not a one-way street, is it? I mean, in one sense the journalist in question is dependent on the Garda machine, so to speak, to keep them on the inside track as regards stories and to make sure that they aren't always the last person to hear about something.
A. Well, it's no secret that crime sells and crime stories 12:31 sells inches and inches of publications.

462 Q. Yes.
A. So there's a huge connection and a big connection between media and police service.
463 Q. Yes.
CHA RMAN Right, Mr. McDowel1, it would be appropriate to leave it there maybe for an hour.

MR. MEDONELL: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
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464 Q. MR. MEDOWELL: Superintendent Taylor, just arising out of what we were discussing before lunch, could you tell me what your understanding was in relation to confidential briefings which weren't to be used in publication; did you regard the journalist as free to reveal the fact that you'd given that confidential briefing to them to anybody else?
A. Once I'd provided them with the information - on the confidential basis obvious7y - I depended on their journalistic code. So you were relying on a kind of omertà, is that right, that nobody would say, that neither you nor they would say that this had happened, was that your understanding?
A. Well, it's --
Q. I see.
A. -- engagement between...

467 Q. Now, could I ask you to go to page 245, which I think is in volume one? Well, maybe if we go to the previous page it would make more sense. Halfway down the page Sergeant McCabe, in his protected disclosure, is saying:
"Last week I learned froma different but equally rel iable third party that Superintendent Dave Tayl or, who is currently suspended from duty pending
i nvestigation of disciplinary charges agai nst him had stated that the main reason why he was bei ng targeted was that he knew too much about what Garda Commissioner Nói rín O Sullivan and ex Garda Cormissioner Martin Callinan had done to me in an attempt to destroy me for $13: 35$ reported wrongdoi ng."

Had you intimated that to anybody, or was that your belief?
A. Well, my belief is that they knew what I knew in relation to the briefing in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
Q. I see. And you thought that that was a significant factor in your removal from the Press office?
A. Well, that was part of the factor in the sense of I understand that one of the major factors was the release of the letter on the night that Commissioner Callinan resigned.
Q. I see. And that was that you had released a letter on behalf of Commissioner callinan, is that right?
A. Yeah, Commissioner Callinan ordered me to release a letter in relation to the bugging of Garda stations and his engagement with the Department of Justice.

470 Q. I see. And his protected disclosure continues:
"This information was obvi ously important to me and I made contact with Superintendent Taylor. I met with Superintendent Tayl or and his wife Mchelle by arrangement on Tuesday, 20th September 2016 at their
home. This was the first time l had ever met or spoken to Superintendent Tayl or.

Was that correct?
A. Correct.
"Our meeting lasted over three hours. Superintendent Tayl or spoke at great length of how when he was Garda Press Officer he had, in a sustai ned campai gn, destroyed my character and reputation by di sseminating false, scurrilous and damaging allegations about me to persons of influence and persons in the media acting on orders and instructions from Garda management."

Is that a fair summation of what you told him?
A. We11, I wouldn't agree with all the wording that's there, but I told him that I had been directed by the Garda Commissioner --
Q. I see.
A. -- to brief out in relation to his motivation and his malice.
Q. He then says: "He stated he was now being targeted because he knew too much. " And you think that that is a factor in why you were targeted as --
A. Well, they did know. Like, I mean, both the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner did know what I knew.

474 Q. "And he outlined to me the following inf ormation that
he was prepared to stand by. He al so allowed me to take notes. I have indi cated to hi mthat । intended to make a protected discl osure under the Protected Di scl osures Act 2014 in rel ation to the information he gave me."

And then he refers to the events in Dundalk and he says at the third paragraph -- third line of that indented paragraph:
"Commi ssi oner Cal Ii nan recei ved a ret urn call fromJohn MsGui nness. When Commi ssi oner Calli nan fini shed the call, he asked Superintendent Tayl or to post pone the press conference an hour and a hal f. Commissi oner Callinan stated that he was going to ' meet MkGui nness about McCabe'. The Commi ssi oner was then driven to Dubl in, where he met John MEGui nness and then he ret urned to Dundal k to do the press conference. Deputy MLGui nness was warned agai nst bel i evi ng any evi dence that I would gi ve at the PAC on the basis that $I$ was a serial sex abuser who abused my own children and ni eces."

Now, are you saying that you didn't tell him the last three lines?
A. I never knew the conversation between Commissioner Callinan and Deputy McGuinness.

475 Q. We11, did you discuss what Deputy McGuinness had stated to Sergeant McCabe about that meeting on the occasion?
A. No, I was never, I never knew anything about that meeting. I never knew the contents of that meeting.
Q. I've got to suggest to you that you did discuss that with Sergeant McCabe on the occasion.
A. No. No, I did not.
Q. I see. The next bullet point reads:
"Superintendent Tayl or sai d that Commi ssi oner Nói rín O Sullivan would have known about the meeting because Commi ssi oner Callinan al ways kept her informed of such matters. He stated that anything he knew, she knew. It is remarkable to thi nk that Commi ssi oner Callinan would post upon an i mportant press conference to travel to Dublin in an attempt to destroy my character."

Did you say that about Commissioner o'Sullivan knowing about that meeting?
A. It would be my belief they would know. Because they worked very closely together.
Q. I see. And do you think you probably did say something 13:39 like that?
A. Well, I can't say what - did I say something like that?
Q. Yes.
A. I just said that they would have, that both commissioners would be, would work very closely
Q. And did you te11 Sergeant McCabe "Superintendent Tayl or then inf or med me of the sustai ned campai gn by ex Garda Commi ssi oner Callinan, Gar da Commi ssi oner Ó Sul I i van
and ot her seni or members to destroy my character"?
A. I told him about the briefing and what I was instructed by Commissioner Callinan and what Deputy Commissioner o'sullivan knew.

481 Q. He says:
"He became upset at this stage" - that's referring to you - "He admitted that he himelf was al so invol ved in this campai gn to destroy me and that the common i ntention was to 'bury McCabe'."

Is that a fair summation of what you told him?
A. I wouldn't say the word "bury". But it was definitely to paint him in another light.
482 Q. And Sergeant McCabe says: "Wile I was angry and
di sappoi nted to hear of his i nvol vement, I di dn't show it" because of circumstances in relation to your household, is that right? There had been a problem in your household --
A. Yes, yes.

483 Q. -- the previous evening, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

484 Q. "He continued by stating that Commi ssi oner Nói rín O Sull i van knew everything. He said that she was the pusher in the campai gn to discredit me, not Martin Cal I i nan".
A. No, I never said that.

485 Q. You're certain you never said that?
A. Certain. . .

486

491 Q. You're saying you never mentioned Sergeant McCabe in texts to the media, is that it?
A. No, we spoke -- my briefing was always either by phone or in person.

492 Q. Is that because you didn't trust the media and you didn't want to put it in writing?
A. Well, as I say, it was the method I used.

493 Q. "He stated that Commissioner Martin Callinan usually provided the text of the vile messages about me and my family and sent them to Superintendent Taylor's mobile.
A. No. Never said that.
A. And so was my wife.

496 Q. Yeah.
"Commi ssi oner Callinan's orders and instructions were to forward the messages to the above persons, whi ch he al ways di d. Commi ssi oner O'Sullivan usually repl i ed with the one word, 'Perfect'."

Did you say that to him?
A. Yes.

497 Q. "He stated that Commissi oner O Sullivan would go 'to any level to lie'." Did you say that to him?
A. No.

498 Q. So Sergeant McCabe is inventing that, according to you?
A. We11, I can't say what Sergeant McCabe is saying. But 13:43 I was there.
Q. You were the man who was upset and he was taking notes.
A. I was the man that was there and that's my recollection. I can't account for what Sergeant McCabe
is saying.
500 Q. "Superintendent Tayl or told me he was so sorry for what he had done. He stated that he had contacted a
spiritual person two weeks ago looking forgi veness. He broke down twi ce and tol d me that he had destroyed and rui ned me. He said this to me a number of times. He says he absol utel y destroyed ne, but he was under i nstructions and orders to do so."

Now, what of that do you say happened?
A. I apologised to Sergeant McCabe for my involvement. And I apologise here today again.
501 Q. Did you tell him that you'd gone to a spiritual person --
A. Yes.

502 Q. -- and that you'd been advised to apologise to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, I apologised on my own volition.

503 Q. I see.
"He stated that his three phones were seized fromhim under warrant and that these phones would show all the text messages he got from Commissi oner Calli nan and sent on to Deputy Commi ssi oner Ó Sul Ii van. "

Did you say that?
A. Yes.

504 Q. Just while we're on that subject, are you saying that you always believed that the data had been transferred
from the phone you used for the latter part of your Press officership to the phone which was seized from you in its entirety?
A. Well, my understanding, Mr. McDowe11, is that data was always available there. How it technically moves around, I don't know. But my understanding is that data would be available.
Q. I see. Tell me, at the time that you made this, or you had this conversation with Sergeant McCabe, had you had any conversation with former Commissioner Callinan --
A. No.
Q. -- about deleting texts?
A. No.

507 Q. I'm curious, because even if you had deleted texts solely for the purpose of creating room on your own phone, there should've been a copy of every text sent to you and received from you by those people on their phones, isn't that right?
A. I would imagine so, yes.

508 Q. Did you ever have any reason to believe that none of the texts you'd sent them would be available?
A. No.

509 Q. Was there a custom or a practice in An Garda Síochána of deleting this type of material?
A. There was no custom or practice or formalised instruction.

510 Q. Well, we know, for instance, that former Commissioner Callinan, the day he retired, apparently destroyed the sim card from his phone. You're aware of that now,

8

> aren't you?
A. No, I wasn't aware until after.

511 Q. That transpired at the Fennelly Commission I think.
A. Yeah.

512 Q. But you weren't aware at the time?
A. No. No.

513 Q. I see.
MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, I wonder could Mr. McDowell indicate the basis for that last comment regarding Commissioner Callinan? My understanding is that that's not accurate.

CHN RMAN what do you say is accurate, Mr. O'Higgins, in that regard? It might help to, I suppose, balance the record at this point.
MR. MEDOVELL: That was my understanding from the document --

MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: My understanding of matters, Chairman, is that the phone was returned but the sim card was missing, not destroyed. And certainly not destroyed, I've no information that it was destroyed on 13:47 that day. But perhaps Mr. McDowell can indicate the basis of his information.

MR. MEDOVELL: No, sorry, we11, maybe I'm -- I presume that if it was available to former Commissioner Callinan and not destroyed, he'd have discovered it to 13:47 this Tribuna1. So I'm assuming it must've been destroyed.

CHA RMAN We didn't get it, isn't that right?
MR. MEGU NESS: No, Chairman, we didn't get the sim.

But Superintendent Flynn gave evidence that it had been deactivated as a sim.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEDONELL: We11, whatever its status, it may stil1
exist, Judge, but it hasn't been discovered to the Tribunal, that's all I'd say.
CHA RMAN Well, if it's only a piece of silicone, it's not much use if there's nothing on it. And I understand that there's nothing on it. And there it is. Now, what inference I'm to draw from that, I don't 13:48 know, but I'm not sure it's the greatest piece of evidence so far.
514 Q. MR. MEDOWELL: Yes. Now, could I ask you, in relation to the sending of -- we11, I'11 come back to it in a moment. Could I ask you in relation to the last bullet 13:48 point on that page:
"He told me there were a number of intelligence files on me in Garda Headquarters and I should look for them under di scl osure."

Did you tell him that?
A. I said there could be files in Garda Headquarters in Crime and Security.
515 Q. On what basis had you to make that remark to him? Had 13:48 you ever seen or been informed of the existence of such a file?
A. I'd never seen, but $I$ know if members have been investigated or there's issues, there may be files
there contained.
CHA RMAN Well, of course there are files. I mean, there's discipline files or whatever, as there would've been in relation to yourself. But that doesn't mean that there's some, you know, hidden gem or cache, as in some huge conspiracy theory lying somewhere in Garda Headquarters that they haven't even shown me. But I mean, what are you talking about there? what are you trying to convey?
A. Well, in relation if you're under investigation then Crime and Security would be the people who'd be the conduit to get downloads of your phones and your phone records and that type of stuff.
CHA RMAN There's no suggestion that anyone ever bugged Sergeant McCabe's phone - unless you're telling me now that you have evidence of that.
A. No, I don't have evidence, Chairman.

CHA RMAN But I don't know what you're trying to suggest. I mean, to put it mildly, we've spent a great deal of money and a great deal of time investigating this, and that includes me going up to Garda Headquarters, because there's things they will not show to anybody apart from a judge. I happen to be a judge. So unless there's a group of about a dozen people up there deceiving me, do you still think there's some kind of record in headquarters of a secret kind about Maurice McCabe or...
A. Well, I've heard the evidence and I accept there isn't, Judge -- or Chairman.

CHA RMAN But you feel entitled to just make an allegation without any evidence at all?
A. No, it was my -- sorry, Chairman, I don't mean to be rude. It was my understanding there would be.
CHA RMAN where did you get that from?
A. We11, being a member of Crime and Security - I was part of Crime and Security - there would be files kept. So it would be my understanding there would've been files kept on members who had been the subject of investigation.

CHA RMAN We11, of course --
MR. MEDONELL: Separate from --
CHA RMAN But in the same way as if I was the subject of an investigation, they'd have a file on me, wouldn't they?
A. Yeah, but you're not a member of An Garda Síochána. CHAN RMAN No. Not yet.
A. But...

516 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Superintendent Taylor, are you saying that separate from, say, a discipline file or an investigation file or a personne1, a human resources file that it was your understanding that it was likely that there was a Crime and Security file on Sergeant McCabe because of his activities in relation to making trouble for the guards, is that what you're suggesting?
A. It's a possibility.

517 Q. It was a possibility? But I mean, I've got to suggest to you that you told Sergeant McCabe that there was such a file, it wasn't just that it was a possibility
there was such a file.
A. I never said there was such a file, because I wouldn't have that knowledge. I said there's a possibility there could be a file.
518 Q. I see. I've got to suggest to you that you told Sergeant McCabe there was such a file and that you said there was one file with crime and Security and another file on a special computer at Garda $H Q$, and you said that this latter file is named oisin. Now, did you tell him, did you inform him about the word "Oisin"?
A. Yes, there's a standalone system within Crime and Security which is separate from the general Garda files.
CHA RMAN Yeah, and all of that is true. But all of that relates to...
A. Other matters.

CHA RMAN Yeah, matters that shouldn't be in any way connected to a general computer system because of fear of hacking, let us say, terrorism, be it slavic, Islamic, IRA, Unionist, whatever, it makes sense, doesn't it?
A. It does make sense.

CHA RMAN why would they put sergeant McCabe on it? Why do you think Sergeant McCabe was on it?
A. Well, I mean I'm not saying put in the same category as ${ }_{13: 52}$ those people, Chairman, but there's just, there's a standalone system which is separate from the general Garda system on which files would be kept. I'm not suggesting for a minute he'd be within that category,
but it is --
CHA RMAN I'm just wondering - I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr. McDowe11 - were you trying to wind him up?
A. Absolutely not.

CHA RMAN Because he was wound up enough already. But 13:52 I mean, to tell him that there's files on him in Crime and Security as if he's some kind of a leading terrorist...
A. I never suggested, Chairman, he was a terrorist. I was just merely trying to assist him. Because I knew how concerned he was.

519 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: We11, on the next page it says:
"Superintendent Tayl or al so stated that there was no doubt that my phone had been" - I presume it's "had been tapped" - "but he was not aware of the present position. "

Did you say that to him?
A. Absolutely not.

520 Q. Are you saying that Sergeant McCabe invented that?
A. I can't say what Sergeant McCabe did. But I was there and I didn't say that.

521 Q. I've got to suggest to you, you did say that and that it caused very deep concern to Sergeant McCabe.
A. We11, I was there, Mr. McDowe11. I know what I said and I didn't say that.

522 Q. You see, Sergeant McCabe told you that he was going to make a protected disclosure the following day, isn't
that right?
A. That's right, yes.

And he's putting into this protected disclosure his note of what had happened very shortly previously. And I've got to suggest to you that there was absolutely no 13:53 basis for him to attribute to you the suggestion that his phone had been tapped if you hadn't told him that.
A. I never said that to him, Mr. McDowel1.

524 Q. By the way, do you believe that persons' phones are tapped other than on foot of a Ministerial warrant?
A. No.

CHA RMAN We11, I think you need a High Court judge, don't you?
MR. MEDONELL: Sorry, Judge?
CHAN RMAN You need a High Court judge, don't you?
MR. MEDONELL: No, it's a Ministerial warrant I think you have to have.
CHA RMAN I thought you had to go before a High court judge as well.
MR. MEDONELL: No. Unless things have changed.
CHA RMAN There's one of my colleagues who seems to have been doing something in relation to that for a number of years, Mr. McDowe11.
MR. MEDONELL: No, I think there's two categories -CHA RMAN Maybe I'11 ask him, but I'm sure he won't give me any information.
MR. MEDONELL: No, I think there's two stages; I think the Minister signs warrants and a judge supervises in retrospect the Minister's activity.

CHAN RMAN As to whether it's being done, yes. well,
Q.

MR. MEDONELL: And I'm just asking you because it's not the first time that it's been mentioned in this Tribunal that people were afraid that their phone was tapped. And I just want to ask you now, do you believe that anybody's phone is ever tapped other than on foot of a Ministerial warrant?
A. I've never had direct knowledge in interception of phones, so I wouldn't know that. As I said, I assume it's all done --

526 Q. Well, what was your belief at the time? Do you think it could happen, that peoples' phones were tapped without --
A. I've no --

527 Q. -- Ministerial authority?
A. I have no knowledge of that, Mr. McDowe11.

528 Q. You've no knowledge at all? He then records that:
"Superintendent Dave Tayl or stated that he recei ved a phone call from Superintendent Noel Cunni nghamone day."

And he deals with Noel Cunningham and his own view of him at that stage. And then he continues:
"Superintendent Cunni ngham had heard on the news that Commi ssi oner O Sullivan had sent the Mullingar meeting to GSOC. When he rang Superintendent Dave Tayl or,

Superintendent Cunni ngham was annoyed and sai d ' Nói rín is after throwing me under the bus'."

Did that happen?
A. Superintendent Noel Cunningham rang me around -- or I rang him, sorry, I rang him around --
Q. You rang him?
A. Yes. I got information that he had heard that the file from the DPP had been returned with no prosecution. So I got his phone number and I rang superintendent Cunningham and he told me that he had heard a rumour --
Q. Stop for a second. You heard that his name was on the file, the DPP file relating to Maurice McCabe?
A. No, no. No, no. No, no. I'll go back.

Superintendent Cunningham, I'd heard that
superintendent Cunningham had heard that the file in relation to me --

531 Q. Oh, in relation to you? I see.
A. Yes. Had been returned and with no prosecution. When I heard this information, I obtained Superintendent Cunningham's number and I rang him to verify what he had heard. And he had said he had heard a rumour that the file was back. So it was in relation to me, not in relation to anybody else.
532 Q. I just want to go through this again. How did you hear ${ }_{13: 57}$ this from Superintendent Cunningham?
A. I heard it from another colleague.

533 Q. That Superintendent Cunningham believed that the file in relation to you had been returned marked "No

## Prosecution"?

A. Yes.

534 Q. This is arising out of the Clerkin --
A. Yes.

535 Q. -- investigation?
A. Yes.

536 Q. And how would Superintendent Cunningham have anything to do with that?
A. He's President of my Superintendents Association.

537 Q. I see. And you say that you heard this from another Garda and rang Superintendent Cunningham for confirmation, is that right?
A. Yes.

538 Q. And did he give you that confirmation?
A. He said he had heard that rumour. But it subsequently 13:57 wasn't true, it didn't return until February '17.

539 Q. I see. And then did he mention that he had been thrown under the bus?
A. I sympathised with the situation he was going under. And he had told me that that matter had been in
relation to GSOC and he felt that he had, yeah, gone under the bus.

CHA RMAN You mean the referral by Ms. D to GSOC saying that Superintendent Cunningham hadn't investigated the matter properly or the referral by Nóirín O'Sullivan that Sergeant Martin and Superintendent Cunningham may have in some way misled the o'riggins commission?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

CHA RMAN It is the second thing?
A. The second theory, yes.
Q. MR. MEDONELL: He then says:
"Chi ef Superi ntendent Fergus Heal y attended the O' Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on each day."

Did you have any conversation with him about Superintendent Healy?
A. I was talking to him in relation to both Superintendent Cunningham and Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy and I was telling him how good and generous those two officers had been. And a few days after $I$ had been suspended I was outside Headquarters picking up some documentation in relation to my thesis and superintendent -- or Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy drove by and he waved to me and then he went back into Headquarters and he walked back out and came over to my car and shook hands with me and wished me well in what was before me. And I was telling Sergeant McCabe the
generosity of this man. Like, I mean, as I said, there was nothing in it for him to come out and show me such comfort. And I was explaining in relation to that to Fergus Healy.
541 Q. And did you explain to him that Chief Superintendent
Healy had been carpeted by the Commissioner for not telling her what had happened at the --
A. No.

542 Q. -- O'Higgins commission?
A. No. I was given these two stories in relation to those two officers, who, as I say, were very generous in their time with me and their engagement with me and I want to pay tribute to them here again.
CHA RMAN But I mean, you didn't te11 them when they came up to shake your hand, look, the investigation is absolutely right, everything that they claim against me is true.
A. No. But I was making it in the situation their generosity in just sympathising with me and that, you know, as a fellow officer.

CHA RMAN Okay.
MR. MEDOVELL: Did you suggest --
CHA RMAN I understand. I understand.
MR. MEDONELL: Sorry, judge.
CHA RMAK No, no.
543 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Did you suggest to Sergeant McCabe that Chief Superintendent Healy had told you that he had been carpeted by the Commissioner, accusing him of keeping her in the dark about what had happened --
A. No.

544 Q. -- at the O'Higgins Commission?
A. I didn't know the engagement of Chief Superintendent Healy with Commissioner O'Sullivan.
CHA RMAN Honestly, Mr. McDowe11, I might get a bit excited if we keep on about the o'Higgins Commission. I thought we really had months of it so far. It's not going to influence me. Surely there are more important things than that. I think there are.

MR. MEDOVELL: I will pass on from it, but I mean, this is the conversation as recorded by my client. CHA RMAN No, I appreciate that, and there's a certain element of agreement, it seems to me, between you and Superintendent Taylor.
MR. MEDOWELL: We11, I'11 pass on from that, Judge.
545 Q. Did you inform him that there was a person called Kieran in Garda Headquarters who monitored all Sergeant McCabe's activities on Pulse?
A. No. I was.
Q. You didn't tell him that?
A. I spoke to him in relation to Pulse and your Pulse activity would be monitored, that peoples' Pulse activity --
547 Q. Did you suggest that somebody called Kieran --
A. No.

548 Q. -- was in charge of monitoring?
A. I don't know anybody, Kieran.

549 Q. So that is an invention by Sergeant McCabe is it?
A. I don't know a person kieran that looks after -- I know there's lots of people up there who looks after Pulse.

550 Q. And finally, did you tell him that you were informed by Deputy Commissioner John Twomey that if you, Superintendent Taylor, slipped out and retired all of this, the discipline charges against you would go away and that Deputy Commissioner Twomey could facilitate it?
A. Deputy Commissioner Twomey and my chief superintendent met my legal team and there was no suggestion that I
could slip out or slip away anywhere. I was just saying that they had met my legal team in relation to the situation that $I$ was in.
551 Q. So let's see what he said. "He said he was informed by Deputy Commi ssi oner J ohn Twomey that if he,
Superintendent Tayl or, slipped out and retired, all this, i.e. his di sci pline charges, would "go away" and that Deputy Commi ssi oner Twomey could facilitate it. Superintendent Tayl or adamantly ref used to adopt such a course."
A. No, I actually never met Deputy Commissioner Twomey. My legal team met him.
CHA RMAN So the whole things is, in other words, resign and everything will be fine, we'11 drop everything?
A. No, that's not allowed.

CHA RMAN We11, it happened a number of times in the Morris Tribunal and that's not going back terribly far. So you're saying in any event, if there is such an offer, it wasn't made to you?
A. No, it wasn't.

CHA RMAK And any report of that by Sergeant McCabe is incorrect, he's got the wrong end of the stick?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAR In some way he's got the wrong end of the stick?
A. (Witness Nods).

CHA RMAN A11 right.
552 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Now, you see, I've got to suggest to you
that you did say that to him and that Sergeant McCabe did not imagine that.
A. I didn't say it, because I couldn't have said it, because I did not meet Deputy Commissioner John Twomey.
553 Q. Could he have said it to you over the phone?
A. No.

CHA RMAN The sense I'm getting from that, Mr. McDowe11, I'm sorry I'm interrupting, but I'm just trying to understand it, is that this was some kind of an offer made in the course of -- I am not entitled as a judge normally to hear negotiations between people with a view to settling cases, but you did have a case before the High Court?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN And there was a discipline proceedings?

CHA RMAN And the sense I am getting is that your lawyers met with somebody high up in Headquarters, maybe Assistant Commissioner Twomey, and he said look, we'11 forget about the whole thing if he just goes quietly or something to that effect and that you said that to Sergeant McCabe; that is what Mr. McDowell is asking you about.
A. No, it wasn't said in that way. I just repeated that they had met my legal team in relation to it a number
of days after I had been released from Balbriggan Garda station at their legal offices.
MR. MEDOVELL: Now, could I ask you to look at pages 686 -- 6856 and 6857 in book, volume 25? And this is a statement by Mick wallace TD. And you do recall meeting Mick wallace TD, is that right?
A. Yeah, he called to my house.

555 Q. And did you say to him concerning Commissioner o'Sullivan when she moves, she's lying?
A. No.

A.
Q. I see. Now, I think, did you -- can you explain -CHAI RMAN Sorry, Mr. McDowe11, you are going on to a question, but I am not connecting the two things. what are the two things you are connecting please?
MR. MEDONELL: He told Deputy wallace apparently, according to Deputy Wallace's notes, that you could detect when Commissioner o'sullivan was lying by the

CHA RMAN All right, yes.
MR. MEDOVELL: And I'm suggesting to him that he had already told Sergeant McCabe that she would do anything
to lie.
559 Q. And I'm just suggesting that you were in the habit of impugning her honesty and saying that she was a liar. CHA RMAN Yeah, in a colourful way, if you like. what do you say about that?
A. I do not accept that.

CHA RMAR Yes.
560 Q. MR. MEDOWELL: Now, Sergeant McCabe is very clear that you told him that there were hundreds and thousands of text messages and that on the day that he, the following day when he told you he was going to make a protected disclosure, he specifically checked that out with you.
A. No, he did not.

561 Q. You say he didn't mention it at all?
A. It was a very quick conversation. He came in, I do not think he actually sat down, he might have sat down in our house for about two minutes. He was on the move straightaway. It was a very quick conversation. He never mentioned once -- he was telling me he was going to make a protected disclosure.

562 Q. But he isn't the only person who you told, according to them, that there were hundreds or thousands of text messages.
A. I always said I sent lots of texts or hundreds of texts 14:08 to both Deputy Commissioner Callinan and Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan by way of updates in relation to Sergeant McCabe.

CHA RMAN Mr. McDowe11, I'm interrupting too much, but
now please just for the point of view of clarity. Mr. McGuinness put this point to you and the point made was this: You're the Garda Press officer at the relevant time, your function obviously is to act as spokesman for the Commissioner and you have certain other functions and we've heard about those indeed. But part of your job was to keep him updated and also to copy things to the Deputy Commissioner about Maurice McCabe. Now, if Maurice McCabe, for instance, let us say for the sake of argument, appeared on the Late Late 14:09 Show and made some statement about the Gardaí, you would send that over by way of a text to Martin Callinan, copied to Nóirín o'Sullivan.
A. (Witness Nods).

CHA RMAN If somebody, let us say for instance a public representative, did a big laudatory piece on radio about Maurice McCabe, you would again send the details of that, because your eyes and your ears are open.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN It's not just the press clippings, it's what's happening on the television and the radio, you'd have people reporting that to you, you keep them informed. But you see, the problem is this: There's nothing wrong with that.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN You may say this shows their level of obsession but then again, he was a very, very big story at the time, and still is a big story, but then it was
a very big story and possibly their jobs depended on it and what was being said about him and about them together. So there's nothing wrong with any of that. It's a very, very different thing to saying you got suggestions as to what you should tell the media from Martin Callinan and that this was copied by way of, I'm going to tell the media the following thing to Nóirín o'sullivan, she says perfect or thanks or doesn't dissent in any way. Those two situations, they're radically different.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK But that's what Mr. McDowe11 is asking you about. I'm going to take it as a given that you were sending lots of information about Maurice McCabe in the sense that I have spoken about to the two commissioners.
A. That's the way I was --

CHA RMAN Yes. So that's what Mr. McDowe11 is asking you about. I think we need to have a Grand Canyon between those two things because they are very different.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN A11 right.
563 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Now, could I ask you about your knowledge of Paul williams? He was a serious crime writer for a number of newspapers, isn't that right?
A. That's right, yes.

564 Q. And a regular person to appear on television and radio, isn't that right?
4
A. That's right.
Q. Prior to the Ms. D interview episode, what was your relationship with Mr. Williams?
A. Well, he would contact me and contact the Press office in relation to ongoing stories. He never turned up at any crime scenes or press conferences or formal events like that.
Q. He was a lone wolf, was he? He was not in the pack, is that it?
A. Well, he had his own distinctive practice.
Q. I see. And as I understand your evidence, you say that you did inform him that there had been a complaint of sexual assault against Sergeant McCabe in 2006 and that he was motivated, his complaints, his current complaints were motivated by a desire to have revenge against An Garda Síochána. That's your evidence, isn't it?
A. That's correct.
Q. And can you put any -- given that you claim that you got this instruction in mid-2013, are we to take it that you imparted this information to him on more than one occasions in late 2013?
A. It would be during 2013 and, as I say, it would be various conversational pieces around Sergeant McCabe.
Q. I see. And are you saying that you had no inkling whatsoever that he was making contact with the D family or Ms. D to investigate her, to investigate her story?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. And do I understand your evidence to be that the first
you became aware that he was doing so was when he phoned you from what you understood to be her home?
A. That's correct.

571 Q. And I think you were interrupted when you were giving your account of this, I think you said he said something like 'Guess where I am?', is that right?
A. Guess where I am, yeah.

572 Q. Would you just elaborate on that please?
A. Just.

573 Q. He said, guess where I am? And what did you say?
A. I said, I don't know where you are.

574 Q. Yes. And then what happened?
A. Then he told me that he was up at the house in Cavan and he had met the family and he had spoken to them and how Sergeant McCabe had destroyed that family and how he was going to write negative articles about Sergeant McCabe.

575 Q. I see. Did he tel1 you anything about a video recording of the interview?
A. No.

576 Q. But he indicated that he was going to write an article which would reflect badly on Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

577 Q. Is that right?
A. Yeah.

578 Q. And as I understand it, this was welcome news to you, is that right?
A. Yes.

579 Q. At the time? And you passed on this good news, in
inverted commas, to the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner?
A. That's correct, yes.

580 Q. And you say that the Deputy Commissioner telephoned you back --
A. Yes.

581 Q. -- to discuss the matter. Could you tell the Tribunal what was your discussion with Deputy Commissioner o'sullivan, as you recollect it?
A. She rang me back and I told her that I had received a phone call from paul williams, he was up at that house, he had conducted an interview.
582 Q. Well, you told her that in a text. So what was the conversation about, according to you?
A. Well, the conversation was along similar lines as the text; about what Paul williams had passed on to me, where he had been and what he was going to do.
583 Q. And you said that, and was anything said to you by the Deputy Commissioner?
A. No. It was a very matter-of-fact conversation.

584 Q. Did she seem worried or upset for Sergeant McCabe --
A. No.

585 Q. -- that he was going to be accused in public of sexual abuse?
A. No.

586 Q. Did she give any reaction to what you told her?
A. No. It was just literally filling out on what I had said on the text.
587 Q. And did she express pleasure or displeasure at being
told that this was planned?
A. It was very matter of fact conversation, it wasn't any emotions shown.
588 Q. I see. So stopping there, based on your implementation of what you say was Commissioner Callinan's strategy to 14:16 discredit Sergeant McCabe, this was going to be a blockbuster, wasn't it, if it was published?
A. Well, it would be a significant piece of article.
Q. It would do terrible damage to Sergeant McCabe, wouldn't it?
A. It would, yes.
Q. And you and the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner, according to you, were waiting for this article to appear, is that the situation?
A. Well, I don't know if you could say we were waiting for the article to appear. Mr. Williams said he would be writing an article. I didn't know the timeline in which the article would be published.
591 Q. No, but you said it was a welcome development, so presumably there was anticipation that it would appear at some stage?
A. Oh, yes.

592 Q. And there would have been disappointment if nothing appeared, isn't that right?
A. Well, sometimes articles do appear, sometimes articles 14:16 don't appear for whatever legal reasons or journalistic reasons.
Q. The lawyers get at them or whatever?
A. (Witness Nods).

594 Q. But in any event, as far as -- you were never consulted about whether it was being, to use the journalist term, legalled in the background. You were unaware what happened to the articles?
A. I was unaware, yeah, unaware.

14:17
A. I was, yeah.
Q. How did it come about that you were unaware of that?
A. I may have been off at the time, it may have been a weekend. As I said, by that time I was in the Press office, Commissioner o'sullivan had been taken out, I didn't have a lead role.

598 Q. But surely it was very, very big news if --
A. As I said, I have said it from day one, Mr. McDowe11, I didn't see it, because whether I was on leave or whether I was off or what, I just didn't see it. And are we to accept then that in the two subsequent follow-up stories by Mr. Williams, where he reheated that story and said that there was going to be an attempt to meet the Opposition leader, Mícheál Martin, to discuss it, that you were unaware of that as well?
A. We11, this period of time, Mr. McDowe11, was, we had just lost the Commissioner that I had worked closely with. It was, I can't overestimate, the shell shock to me, the shock to the system. I have to be honest with
you, my interest in a lot of those articles had waned completely because of the situation that we were now in.

600 Q. But we know that even after you lost your position in the Press office that you were in regular communication with a number of journalists?
A. Yes. So you hadn't lost total interest in Garda affairs?
A. I hadn't, no. I hadn't. But I mean at that stage I was just in -- that was just in the aftermath of the traumatic events of march 25th. There was a lot of -it was a difficult time.

602 Q. And are you saying that you were completely unaware that Mr. Williams had published a number of articles and that sergeant McCabe was, so to speak, the subject of complaints to the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána -- sorry, to the leader of the Opposition, and that there were proposals that she might refer the whole matter to GSOC and have it reinvestigated, you're completely unaware of all that?
A. I never saw the articles.

603 Q. But did you hear about them?
A. I think I could have heard of them subsequently, later. I don't know how long afterwards I would have heard about them. But at the time I didn't see them.
604 Q. Well, when you were dealing with Debbie McCann and Eavan Murray in relation to possible visits to the D home, I take it, it was with the same expectation that Ms. D's complaints would be given publicity against

Sergeant McCabe, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you ever check with either of them as to what had happened to their efforts to publish these stories?
A. We11, I understand they never got a chance for an
interview. So I wouldn't think an article would ever be written, because I didn't think they got an interview.

10 Q. Can I suggest to you that, as Mr. McGuinness did, that the exclusion of Debbie McCann and Eavan Murray from your list of people to whom you gave information about Sergeant McCabe was selective in order to protect them?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Was it a pure lapse of memory?
A. No. At the first opportunity afterwards I included them and I've always -- and I've given --
But on the day that you didn't mention them, was it just a pure lapse of memory? They didn't occur to you as people who you might have spoken to?
A. Well as I say, I said in my correspondence that I would check and complete the list, which I did.
Q. I see.

CHA RMAN I'm sorry for interrupting, Mr. McDowell, but I'm just wondering, what did you check?
A. We11, I just checked by own recollection and memories and that and --
CHA RMAN You mentioned checking records on two or three occasions yesterday --
A. Well, forgive me.

CHA RMAN -- and I'm just wondering where the records are, because I certain7y don't have them.
A. Forgive me if I misled you, Chairman. I mean my own recollection, records, my own recollection, within my own memory. I don't mean any physical records. I apologise if I gave that impression.
CHA RMAN The matter has been put to you already by Mr. McGuinness and it's clear that the Tribunal came to you with those names in a particular context.
A. I accept that.

CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. McDowe11.
614 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Can I suggest to you that the exclusion from your protected disclosure of the reference to

Commissioner callinan using the term "kiddie fiddler" to Deputy John McGuinness after the PAC meeting was probably motivated by a desire to protect him and to increase the focus on Nóirín o'sullivan with whom you had a grievance?
A. Absolutely not.

615 Q. Did it just slip your mind at the time that you were making your protected disclosure?
A. I put it in at the first available opportunity in my full statement. It was not --
616 Q. I have to suggest to you the first available opportunity was your protected disclosure. Because this was irrefutable proof and corroboration of your claim that you were instructed to carry out this, that the Commissioner himself had, perhaps in a moment of exasperation, done the same thing in your presence to a member of the Oireachtas.
A. I brought this information to the Tribunal's attention in my statement.
MR. MEDONELL: Thank you.
A. Thank you.

CHA RMAN would you mind again reminding us who appear for before you asking any questions of Superintendent Taylor, he needs to know that.
MR. G LLANE: Yes, Chairman. Sean Gillane for RTÉ, John Burke, Paul Reynolds and Philip Boucher-Hayes.

THE WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR G LLANE
MR. G LLANE: Good afternoon, Superintendent Taylor. I have a very small number of questions for you and I hope to be finished with you in about five or six minutes so I hope you will bear with me.
A. Thank you.

Can I just ascertain, if I can, firstly, if I'm correct in my understanding of your evidence in relation to the parameters of what we're talking about; insofar as you describe the initiation or the starting point of negatively briefing journalists in relation to Sergeant McCabe, you've no memory with any particularity as to when that started and where and with whom who?
A. I would say mid 2013. I don't have a particular date.

619 Q. Al1 right. Nothing better than mid year?
A. Yes, roughly then.

620 Q. And do I understand also that you have no particularity in relation to when that campaign of negative briefing ended?
A. We11, it would have ended with the departure of Mr. Callinan.
621 Q. All right. And do I also understand it that between those two bookends you have no details whatsoever in relation to where, when and with whom and what the substance of these briefings were?
A. Well, I told you that I said the substance of the briefing was to draw their attention --
622 Q. No, I understand that, but my question is: You've no detail, you've no particularity in relation to any of
those potentially innumerable instances that you were referring to yesterday?
A. Am I correct to say you're asking me do I have records?

623 Q. No, no. I am asking you -- we11, if you have records you might tell me that, if you do. But you have no detail, you have no memory of any detail between the start point and the end point?
A. No. These were opportunist situations, Mr. Gillane.

624 Q. No, I understand that and you said that a number of times yesterday. But is the answer to my question yes then; you have no detai 1 to offer me --
A. No, I do not.

625 Q. -- in respect of any of those instances? And we are clear together on that?
A. Yes.

Because as you are aware, and I will put it to you directly, Mr. Burke and Mr. Reynolds deny receiving the negative briefings that you have mentioned and detailed insofar as there is any detail. All right?
A. (Witness Nods).

627 Q. Can you confirm for me in relation to your protected disclosure, dated September 2016, that neither Mr. Burke nor Mr. Reynolds are in fact mentioned in that protected disclosure as being part of this campaign that you say you were engaged in?
A. I said in my protected disclosure that I briefed media, I didn't name any particular person.

628 Q. Yes. Again, is the answer to my question yes?
A. Yes.

629
Q. They're not named in --
A. No.

630 Q. -- September 2016 --
A. No.

631 Q. -- as being part of that campaign?
CHA RMAN I think the on7y person named is Paul Williams, isn't that right?
MR. G LLANE: Paul williams, yes
CHA RMAR That is the only name that comes out in any particular context, yes.
MR. G LLANE: what then happens is, in the following year, GT3 I think is the document, there's the list of the nine named journalists --
A. Yes.

633 Q. -- is that right? And it's in that list that Mr. Burke 14:28 and Mr. Reynolds now appear?
A. Yes.

634 Q. Now, can I ask you, and I'm not going to go over ground Mr. McGuinness covered and Mr. McDowell covered, but it's just a curious aspect of that list that $I$ just want to try and put some focus on if I can; you knew what you were doing in terms of compiling that list, what you were about, what its purpose was in terms of that information being transmitted to the Tribunal, setting out an aspect of this inquiry with clarity?
A. Yes.

635 Q. A11 right. And in terms of the timeframe we've mentioned, 2012 is out of the picture, the first half of 2013 is out of the picture, the second half of 2014
is out of the picture. So, in terms of this campaign, such as it was, if it existed, we're actually dealing with a fairly narrow timeframe?
A. About nine, ten months, yeah.

And it is extensive and that's not an exaggeration to describe it thus?
A. Yes, yes.

639 Q. You've been engaged in the campaign that you've mentioned which seems to have borne no fruit, because I think as you've told us yesterday, positive media reporting of Sergeant McCabe continued, isn't that correct?
A. A certain element of it, yeah.
Q. And I think indeed I think you may have told us yesterday that Commissioner Callinan on your account media organisations that was consistently presenting Sergeant McCabe in a positive way and persistently keeping the matters that he was complaining of on the
public agenda?
A. I do not recall saying that yesterday. biting, in this sense, that in early 2014 we're now on the cusp of two significant publications, possibly Sergeant McCabe, is that fair enough?
A. Whether they published it or not, Mr. Gillane, was their prerogative.

647 Q. No, I know. But I think you heard my question. where we're at now in terms of the timeframe is that we're on the cusp of, in terms of your understanding, a story being published in two of the largest circulating papers in the country which could not be more damaging to the target of your campaign, is that fair enough?
A. Yes.
Q. And you describe that in your evidence as potentially significant. That, I'm going to suggest to you, is maybe underselling it. You must have been ecstatic if that was the position at that time.
A. I wouldn't say I was ecstatic. I was just doing what I was directed to do.
649 Q. Well, the campaign that you say you were involved in was now about to achieve a very, very serious and explosive crescendo. Am I right?
A. I wouldn't put it --

650 Q. That would have been the expectation at that stage?
A. I wouldn't put it in those dramatic terms. I passed on the information to the two journalists.
651 Q. Al1 right.
A. How they pursued it and how they developed it and published it was a matter for them.
652 Q. We11, here is a question that I do want to ask you in that connection, because I know Mr. McGuinness and Mr. McDowell have traversed the other aspects of this: This, from all of the paper I've gone through, appears to be about the only aspect of this negative briefing that in fact you have some detail, is that fair enough?
A. I just placed the information before the journalists. 653 Q. No, no.
A. And briefed the journalists as I've named.

654 Q. Maybe I've asked the question inelegantly. In terms of all of what the Tribunal has gathered together, in terms of relevant paper work and this suggested smear campaign, and your account of it, this in fact is the one period where you do in fact have detail, not much of it, but detail.
A. (Witness Nods).
Q. Am I right? You can remember talking to these people, when you were talking to them, what it was about, where they were to go, the agenda, who you reported to, al1 of that; that's colour, it's detail.
A. Yes, but I spoke to a number of journalists.
Q. Yeah, but these are the only suggested aspects of the campaign I'm putting to you that actually have some flesh on them, some detail that someone could cross-examine on for example.
A. Well, the purpose of the conversations and briefings with journalists was to put -- across the platform of the journalists was to put that information out to a multiplicity of --
657 Q. No, you misunderstand me, and it's my fault. Do you accept that this is the only aspect of the putative you?
A. Well, these journalists, as I said, they were involved in going to the house of Ms. D, yes.


Q. Yeah, I understand. But do you understand my question? This is the part of the campaign on which we now have actual detail.
A. But the campaign, Mr. Gillane, wasn't -- out, wasn't solely focused on product, it was solely focused on putting a narrative out there in relation to people.
659 Q. Again that's answering a question I don't think I've asked. This is the only detailed account you've actually given of an instance of this negative briefing.
A. well, I gave an instance of how I briefed all journalists along the way.
660 Q. Yeah, but that was all generality. This is very, very specific; named people, times, locations, subject-matter.
A. Well, I named all the other people.

661 Q. No, no, you --
A. And there would be considerable phone traffic between me and them.
662 Q. No, no, this -- I'm suggesting, and I think you know what I'm at here, this is the only time -CHAV RMAN Mr. Gillane, forgive me for interrupting just for a moment, just so that I clarify maybe. You've been asked on a number of occasions, including by our investigators, look, can you give a was on the occasion of, let us say, some terrible tragedy and they were there and we started off talking about their mother who was ill or some personal matter
and then it moved on to Sergeant McCabe and I said the following to this specific person? Now, all of that is absent. But what Mr. Gillane is saying is when you come to Eavan Murray and Debbie McCann there is some detail of them ringing you, what you said, what they said to you, what you did in consequence of it, which is missing in relation to everybody else, all the other nine. We have eleven altogether.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN These are the only two where you have that kind of --
A. And Mr. Williams.

CHA RMAN -- I suppose that kind of tangible fact that you can hold on to, as if it's a reliving of the event. So that is what Mr. Gillane is asking you about. I think, do you understand?
A. I understand. I am much obliged, Judge.

663 Q. MR. G LLANE: You understand?
A. I understand.

664 Q. And are we in agreement?
A. Yes.

665 Q. A11 right. We11, that's why it seems all the more curious, if I can put it to you this way, that when setting out your account of who it is you say you negatively briefed, that they're not just off the list, 14:36 but they're off the list, the original list, in a context where you actually have memory and detail of what you were about in relation to the Ms. D story. And I just ask you to explain how that could be so.
A. Well, at the first opportunity $I$ placed all that information before the Tribunal. But the Chairman and other lawyers have been through this, but that couldn't be so even in the sense in which you suggest it is so. Because when you put this before the Tribunal, as has been pointed out, in fact it was put to you, but it's put to you in fact I think halfway through that interview. Do you understand? The investigators were already asking you questions, already asking you to be specific and you made no mention of Ms. McCann and Ms. Murray. And you'11 find your first mention of them halfway through your interview when the investigators name them to you.
A. Well, where the investigators asked me within the statement is a matter for the investigators. But when they asked me, I confirmed it without hesitation.
667 Q. All right. Is it, and I'm going to suggest to you the situation, that being on that original list or being off it is something of potluck?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Will you confirm for me in relation to Mr. John Burke that in your entire time as Press officer and beforehand, you'd never in fact even met him?
A. I never -- I can't say if I ever met him.
Q. Well, I'm putting it to you that you never met him. CHA RMAN I mean, if he was here would you be able to recognise him?
A. I would, yes.

CHA RMAN From what? The internet or...
A. Well, like, $I$ know him well to see from television and that.

CHA RMAN okay, all right.
MR. G LLANE: You know him from being on the
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN But you never shook his hand or shared a pleasantry?
A. Yeah, during my time as Press officer. winds up on your list --
A. Yeah.

672 Q. -- yet Ms. McCann and Ms. Murray with whom you are having thousands of contacts in the specific context of 14:39 Ms. D stay off your list?
A. But I would have spoken to Mr. Burke.

673 Q. And just to be fair to you, in terms of my reference earlier to your evidence yesterday, I think you indicated that you were monitoring radio stations and the like and that one of the issues was that RTÉ shows were praising Sergeant McCabe and that infuriated Mr. Callinan.
A. Okay. Much obliged, Mr. Gillane, for that.

MR. G LLANE: A11 right. Thanks very much.
CHA RMAN Was there any questions on behalf of Alison O'Reilly?

THE WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. WALL

MR. QU N: Good afternoon, Superintendent Taylor. Oisín Quinn is my name and I am acting for the Irish Examiner and their journalists, Juno McEnroe, Daniel McConne11, Cormac O'Keeffe, former editor Tim Vaughn and then Mr. Mick Clifford.
A. Yes.

677 Q. I just want to go back and ask you some questions about the exchanges you had earlier today in relation to the email you received from Michael Clifford with the draft of the chapter --
A. Yes.

678 Q. -- of his book. And perhaps if that could just be put up on the screen for you. That's in volume 25 at page 6617. Thank you. And we can just see that email there at the bottom of that page. It's from 25th May last year --
A. Yeah.
-- from Michae1 clifford, "Subject: Book". And then:
"Dave, this is the chapter l was telling you about where you entered the McCabe story. See what you think, particularly interns of factual accuracy. Thanks, talk soon. Mck."
A. Hmm .

680 Q. And I just want to ask you some questions about what preceded that email and we'11 see what we can agree on and what you can remember. Mr. Clifford recalls calling you shortly before this.
A. Yes.

681 Q. And he said something to you to the effect that he'd written a passage about you in the book.
A. Yes.

682 Q. And he said that he'd like you to throw your eye over it for factual accuracy or something to that effect?
A. (Witness Nods).

683 Q. He recalls that you agreed and then he asked for and you gave him your, an email address to send the draft to?
A. Yes.

684 Q. Okay. And just to put the timing of this in context, by May last year, obviously the Tribunal had been established in February --
A. Yes.

685 Q. -- and in fact there had been an initial hearing even
by this juncture and I think you already had been granted representation by early April?
A. (Witness Nods).

And you were taken to the passage on page 6622 of the Tribunal's materials, if I can just call that up, where 14:42 he -- towards the bottom of that page, I think it's perhaps the last paragraph, you'11 see there six or seven lines up from the bottom, the draft of the book at this stage reads:
"There are a number of strands to the campai gn he tol d the incredul ous MLCabe. The most basic was the conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands, of text messages to medi a and Garda personnel casting McCabe in a dark light."

And I think you agree that that passage makes it into the book exactly in those terms, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

687 Q. And I think just perhaps in passing if we look over to 14:43 page 6623 and look at the top of the page, there's another reference I want to draw your attention to, the draft of the book at this stage read:
"He tol d McCabe that an intelligence file had been created on MkCabe in Garda HQ. The file was kept under a Christian name whi ch coinci ded with the name of the of fspring of a seni or oficer. An intelligence file is onl y created when the subject is suspect of serious crime, usually invol ving vi ol ence, yet HQ, according to Tayl or, saw fit to pl ace McCabe in such company."

And that was in the draft book. And it makes it into the book as well.
A. (Witness Nods).

688 Q. Do you agree with that?
A. Yes.

689 Q. I can show you the bit of the book if needs be. Now, just to tell you what Michael Clifford can recall. He says that -- or he'11 say that he recalls that you phoned him within the week of getting this. Would that be right?
A. Yes.

690 Q. And you said to him the passage was fine by you.
A. Yes.
Q. And the only issue you had was a concern about a detail that related to you not being interviewed by the Children's Ombudsman?
A. Yes.

692 Q. So I think you know that the draft of the book contained a reference, it's at page 6620 of the Tribunal's pagination and in the bottom third of that page there was an extract in the draft that said:
"However, context is requi red. Tayl or has al ways deni ed being the source of the I eak."

This relates to the leaking of the Roma child's name. 14:45
"But on the assumption that he was the prime suspect there are mitigating factors. The culture of the Garda medi a interface... to ensure that informal contacts bet ween the Press Office and certain crime correspondents were routine."

And you drew to Michael Clifford's attention, having read this draft, that your on7y concern was to point out factually that you had not in fact been interviewed 14:45 by the Children's Ombudsman, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

693 Q. And Michae1 Clifford will say that he checked this out and he found it to be accurate, so he inserted a line to that effect in the book?
A. Yes.

694 Q. So that therefore, in the book at page 320, he included the sentence:
"He was not intervi ewed in the Onmudsman's i nqui ry."

And that was the on1y factual issue that you raised with him, having been sent the draft of that chapter, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

MR. QU N: Thank you, Superintendent Taylor. Those are the only questions $I$ have for you.

Chairman, I should just say, I suppose to point out as we've indicated in the correspondence we've written to the Tribunal on 11th May, that the superintendent has alleged that he negatively briefed three of the journalists who I act for - Cormac O'Keeffe, Juno McEnroe and Danie1 McConnell - and to point out that I do not intend to cross-examine Superintendent Taylor on that issue, but to point out that that should not be taken as either an admission or denial by them of Superintendent Taylor's claims. And the reason we're doing this is in furtherance of those journalists' entitlement to protect the journalistic privilege which they assert.
CHA RMAN Mr. Quinn, at the moment we know that this is the source. Certainly if any question were to be asked which would reveal a different source, privilege could be asserted, I'm not saying you'd assert it successfully, but I'm not sure I understand how you're in a position to say the source who has revealed himself as a source and who has said on oath, in pub1ic, that he would like anyone whom he negatively briefed to confirm that he negatively briefed them, I do not understand how that gives rise to any claim of privilege. I just don't understand it. Now, maybe that's a fence to be taken down the way or maybe it's a
fence to be taken today, I don't know. But I mean, what you are saying is: I'm not going to ask any question to the effect that he didn't, I'm not going to ask any question to the effect that I did, I'm going to sit on the fence. Rather than taking the fence, you're 19:48 going to sit on the fence. Now, that is a not a criticism of you personally, Mr. Quinn, but just I don't know where you are coming from on that. And if there is to be any legal submission by anybody, it's certainly helpful for the Tribunal to get a letter, but 19:48 this is a public tribunal and people have to explain themselves publicly as to what they are doing and what their legal basis for doing it is. So I'm mystified as to what your basis for this assertion is. Is it simply that if you talk to a journalist it's like talking to some kind of sacerdotal individual or what is your basic submission on this?
MR. QU N: Well, Chair, I can approach this in a number of ways. I had not anticipated necessarily that we would have a detailed discussion now about this privilege and how it may apply in this Tribunal. And I think to some degree it would be premature to do so, given the, I think, factors and issues that need to be taken into account and I think it is perhaps too early to assess the position given that this module is only relatively recently under way and there's further evidence to be heard.

CHAN RMAN No, it's very recent -- it's very recently to finish, Mr. Quinn. I absolutely intend to finish by

13th June.
MR. QU NL Yes
CHA RMAN I do not intend to hang around Dublin Castle for the rest of my life or anything close to it.
MR. QUIN: No
CHA RMAK So I mean, you have an obligation under -MS. BURNS: Chairman, could I interrupt for one moment? CHA RMAN No, you can't actually interrupt for the moment, sorry.
MS. BURNS: I just wanted to ask if Mr. Taylor could -- 14:49 CHA RMAN No, I am sorry. Can I deal with something, sorry, Ms. Burns, I'm trying to think. I am actually trying to think and you come in, in the middle of it. MS. BURNS: of course. I was trying to save time.
CHA RMAN Could you just give me a second? I am not trying to be Judge Judy or anything else like that, but if you just let me please formulate my thought.
where the dot, dot, dot appears in the transcript I am going to try and continue.

You have an obligation under Brown v. Dunne if you have a case to put it to the witness. If your case is, no, there was no such briefing now is the time to put it; if your case is, yes, there was such a briefing now is the time to put it. It is unfair to Superintendent Taylor for him to actually leave the witness box without knowing what your case is.

Furthermore, and this is a further nuance on the matter, Juno McEnroe did write in a letter in April 2017 to this Tribunal saying he believes he has no information relevant to the terms of reference. He actually wrote that. Now, I speak English, and that means that he doesn't know anything about any negative briefing coming from Superintendent Taylor or Garda Headquarters. That's what $I$ understand that to mean. Now, is that position to shift? I mean, I know I'm putting a lot out there before you, Mr. Quinn, but there is the obligation under Brown v. Dunne and there is, furthermore, the letter and there is, furthermore, a process set up by the Oireachtas whereby I am urgently required to inquire into matters of public moment and to report, and I am desperately trying to do that and I'd like peoples' help.

MR. QU N: And Chairman, we are very conscious of that and that is why we are here today to explain why I do not propose to cross-examine Superintendent Taylor on his claim that he negatively briefed Juno McEnroe, Danie1 McConne11 and Cormac O'Keeffe, rather than simply say nothing about it. And the reason is because we feel it would compromise the entitlement of those three journalists to maintain journalistic privilege. And I respectfully submit, very firmly, that that applies notwithstanding the fact that the alleged source has waived privilege. And I would respectfully submit, and it can be done in a more detailed way at another juncture, $I$ think perhaps more efficiently, if
we are to have a more detailed argument about it, that there's very cogent reasons why the entitlement of a journalist not to reveal a source applies even when persons who claim to be sources come forward and say they were sources and waive privilege. And while I appreciate it's relatively rare, it is not a unique circumstance. There are cases where either the source or an alleged source has been perceived to be known, or indeed the source in one case that went to the European Court of Human Rights has come forward and said I'm the source and I'm waiving privilege, where the courts have nonetheless upheld the entitlement of the journalist not to reveal or to discuss -- either reveal the source or to discuss the contents of any discussions that they were alleged to have had with the source. And there are a number of reasons why that is so.

So this is very much a real proposition rooted in the circumstances that pertain here and it's why we're flagging at this juncture that it shouldn't be taken from the fact that I will not be cross-examining Superintendent Taylor about his claims that he negatively briefed Mr. McEnroe, Mr. McConnell and Mr. O'Keeffe, that it shouldn't be taken that we're either accepting or denying that. And it's for the reason that to engage in that cross-examination would inevitably compromise the journalistic privilege those journalists assert.
CHAI RMAN But I need to know why. I mean, the

European Court of Human Rights, and I know the case you are referring to, and $I$ have read all the relevant case law, and I know about the chilling effect and furthermore I am aware of my obligation under the Human Rights Act to apply the Convention, and given that the European Court of Human Rights doesn't operate on a precedent basis, it operates on a case-by-case basis, the facts have to be 1aid, I would imagine, without deciding it, Mr. Quinn, before I could actually make a ruling. I don't know, even know what the facts are. The only fact that $I$ know in relation to it is, number one, that the witness is saying that in relation to three people you represent that two of them are refusing to cross-examine and one of them wrote a letter to the Tribunal and said that he doesn't believe he has any information relevant to the terms of reference, which would automatically include, if he was negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor. If there's something else that's out there, I do think I actually need to know about it before I can actually make a ruling. where is the chilling effect?

I can understand a situation, let's say this, that a board of directors, where, let us say, the higher echelons of An Garda Síochána is leaking and all of them are required to sign waivers, well, in those circumstances, effectively you are taking away the journalistic privilege, because if people go and do that and apparently require people to voluntarily sign
waivers then the ability of the person, let's say, in Garda Headquarters to communicate is undermined, the ability of journalism to do its job with a view to informing the public is undermined.

I also have a job to do with a view to informing the public. That is the job that's cast on me. I cannot see how that now arises. I also can't see how, for instance, one of your clients can't write an article tomorrow in the newspaper saying I was negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor, who has now waived his entitlement to anonymity, or to say a source high in Garda Headquarters briefed me negatively. They can write that tomorrow if they wish, but apparently they don't want to tell the Tribunal anything about it.

I just don't get it, Mr. Quinn. I don't see what your factual foundation is at the moment, apart from the only fact I have is: I appear for a journalist. That's all. Now the European Court of Human Rights tells me I have to take all the facts into consideration. I just don't know what other facts there are.

Can I ask you to maybe think about that?
MR. QU N: Indeed, chair. But our position is as I've stated, and I'm happy to engage in a more detailed discussion.

CHA RMAN No, I know you are, Mr. Quinn, and indeed I
could engage in a detailed discussion for the next several days about it, but that's not the way court cases are decided. I appreciate that. You feel you want to, I suppose, prime your ammunition and let it off at the correct time. Well, can we do it in this way, it's subject to recalling Superintendent Taylor, if the necessity arises?
MR. QU N: Chair, we are very happy to facilitate having a more structured debate in relation to the issue or set of submissions at whatever is the convenient time from the Tribunal's point of view, but I think the important thing, allowing for the fact that the witness is in the box, was we felt it was appropriate to flag firmly and clearly at this stage that we wouldn't be cross-examining Superintendent Taylor on that allegation and to explain why. CHA RMAN But I would be entitled to raise an inference if you're not denying it. I mean, I had a situation, if I can just go back, Mr. Quinn, in the Library in relation to something I'm not going to say anything about, obviously for perfectly good reasons, where I had a list of people who were allegedly in the public eye and people in the Law Library were accusing a colleague or a former colleague of being on that list, and this was being said over coffee, and I said, well, I have the list in my office and sorry, that person isn't on it. Now, is that a breach of legal professional privilege? I actually don't think so, because I was never instructed by that person. But if
the person was on the list certainly I could say absolutely nothing and wouldn't have said anything. But, even as Mr. McEnroe has told me, he's saying no, I know nothing in relation to any negative briefing coming from Garda Headquarters or Superintendent Taylor, even if that were to be done, at least it might be some progress.

By the way, Mr. Quinn, you're dodging the issue as to whether you might recall Superintendent Taylor. Is that what you want in the event the matter is ruled against negatively? And I have come nowhere close to making up my mind. Or, do you want to ask him any questions with a view to laying any foundation, apart from the fact that I represent a journalist, I am saying nothing?

MR. QU N: No, there is no questions I need to ask Superintendent Taylor in relation to the issue. CHA RMAN Well, how do I know -MR. QU N: And I do not anticipate that we'11 require him to be recalled.

CHA RMAN Because you are sticking by that and that's it?

MR. QU NN Yeah.
CHA RMAR No matter what ruling I make? But you're entitled to write about it tomorrow, of course, in the newspaper, but you are not going to tell the Tribunal? MR. QU N: No, those three journalists are sticking by their journalistic privilege, Chairman. That's the
position
CHA RMAN we don't know if they have it as yet. I don't know anything to indicate that they have it. This is the person who says he is the source, he says he's voluntarily waived his privilege; you're saying the journalists have a privilege even though the person waves the source. Now, what other facts would you like to establish --

MR. QU N: well, chair --
CHA RMAN -- which would indicate that the situation that emerges in the most recent European Court of Human Rights decision may apply in these circumstances?
MR. QU N: Well, Chair, I would strongly submit that it doesn't pierce or demolish the privilege simply because an alleged source says I'm waiving it. The journalist is entitled to hold on to it because there can be any number of reasons why an alleged source might claim to be a source, why either confirming or denying that the source is or isn't a source could be problematic. And of course it's not simply the
question of whether or not the alleged source is a source, there are then the follow-up questions which can create difficulties with inadvertently revealing other potential sources, or not, as the case may be.

So it's certainly not straightforward and I do not think, with respect, should be portrayed as being as straightforward as simply saying we11, the man who claims to be the source is simply waiving the source so
can't we all get on with it?
CHA RMAN That is the problem, Mr. Quinn. I have constantly said it's not as straightforward as that; you need to lay a foundation in fact. And I have been inviting you to do that. I never said it's straightforward. A11 right, it's parked. So are there any other questions?
MR. QUN: No, not from me, Chairman.
CHA RMAN No, I didn't mean from you, Mr. Quinn, but I understand you position.

MS. BURNS: Chairman, I am sorry.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Ms. Burns, it's my fau7t for not coming back to you.
MS. BURNS: My apologies. Superintendent Taylor just wants a very short break just to use the facilities.
CHA RMAN okay. I don't know how he is able to communicate that to you but not to me. But anyway, that's what's happened, apparently.

## AFTER A SHORT AD OURNMENT THE HEARI NG RESUMED AS

 FOLLOVS
## THE WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. LEHANE

695 Q. MR. LEHANE: Good afternoon, Superintendent Taylor. My name is Darren Lehane, down here at the back, and I am 15:07 counse1 for Deputy John McGuinness and I have a small number of questions to ask you arising out of your meeting with Deputy McGuinness in the Skylon Hotel in January 2017. I think it's your evidence that when you
met Deputy McGuinness you were in a low mood?
A. That's correct.
Q. You were concerned about yourself and your family?
A. Very much so.

697 Q. And Deputy McGuinness was anxious to establish the facts about what had happened to you?
A. That's correct.

698 Q. And he was sympathetic to you?
A. That's correct.

699 Q. And you've no reason to doubt his, that is Deputy McGuinness', sincerity, reliability or truthfulness, do you?
A. I've no doubt to question his sincerity.
Q. Okay. But you are questioning his reliability and truthfulness?
A. Well, I'm just questioning in relation to the statements that were put to me.

701 Q. okay. And I can come to that. Because you've read Deputy McGuinness' evidence in relation to what transpired at that meeting?
A. Yes.

702 Q. And I have to put to you Mr. McGuinness' account of what happened at that meeting and I have to put to you that you told Deputy McGuinness that you had been used by Mr. Callinan and Ms. Nóirín O'Sullivan to circulate text messages briefing the recipients against Maurice McCabe by telling them that he was not to be trusted.
A. That's not correct.

703 Q. Okay. Do you have any view on why Deputy McGuinness
has come in here and given unreliable or untruthful evidence in relation to those, to that matter?
A. I can't account for other peoples' evidence.

MR. LEHANE: Okay, thank you very much.
CHAI RMAN Thanks very much. Are there any questions? MR. FANN NG Yes, Chairman, I think I'm next in the sequence.

## THE WTNESS MAS THEN CROSS-EXAM NED BY MR FANN NG

MR. FANN NG Superintendent Taylor, my name is Rossa Fanning and I'm counsel appearing for paul williams and for the INM interests in respect of other journalists in this Tribunal. I have a number of questions for you arising out of your interaction with Mr. Williams.

Your evidence yesterday, and it's recorded on the transcript yesterday, being day 74 , page 95 , was that you were confident that you did brief Mr. Williams adversely as to Sergeant McCabe and you repeated that evidence again today before lunch when Mr. McGuinness raised it with you. He asked you this morning if this occurred on one occasion or a number of occasions and I think you said something along the following lines, that it was by way of conversational pieces. Mr. McDowell also explored the same issue with you this 15:10 afternoon, as did Mr. A Gillane on behalf of certainly RTÉ journalists in relation to your briefing of journalists. Now, just insofar as Mr. Williams is concerned, can you identify a single specific occasion
upon which you briefed Mr. Williams adversely in respect of Sergeant McCabe?
A. I can't identify a specific date. As I said in my evidence, these were opportunist in their nature, they presented themselves when they presented themselves. Is there anything distinctive about any of the conversations that you had with Mr. Williams on these opportunistic occasions that would assist you remember the context or colour of the conversation?
A. Well, as I said before, they presented themselves in -- 15:11 when they presented themselves. It could start off with one topic and migrate into the McCabe topic. There'd be no set agenda. It would be a conversation, as is normal with journalists would ring me, they could cover a number of topics, do you know, of topical issues of the day.

706 Q. But you can't assist the Tribunal in isolating any of these conversations to a particular day, week, month or occasion?
A. Well, only through isolation in relation to my phone records and when $I$ was in contact. But can I give you a specific day, time? No, I can't. As I said before, these were opportunist situations.

707 Q. A11 right. We11, just to be clear, Mr. Williams, unlike most of the other journalists, has already given evidence to this Tribuna1. And he gave evidence on day 11, and I'11 just ask that page 26 of day 11 , question 126 be put before you. No, it hasn't come up yet. CHA RMAN It will come, don't worry.

708 Q. MR. FANN NG It's day 11, page 26, question 126. Now, this is Mr. Williams' response, where he says -- the previous question at 125 was:
"Can you tell the Tri bunal where you heard themfromp"
15:12

These are rumours concerns Sergeant McCabe. And he says:
"No, I can't.
Q. And is that because you don't recall?
A. I don't recall. They were just there, they were just aware of them I don't know where -- nobody briefed -- one of the things that has come up in rel ation to this is that people were briefed. I was
never bri ef ed by Dave Tayl or or Nói rín O Sullivan or Martin Callinan, or any of them That's not the way it would happen with me."

So, just to put it to you very clearly, Superintendent Taylor, Mr. Williams has already given evidence to this Tribunal and his evidence is that he was not negatively briefed by you in respect of Sergeant McCabe.
A. I do not accept that.

709 Q You don't accept that? One slight qualification to to, is if we can just go back on the same transcript to page 20 , six pages previous to where the screen is currently, he refers to a throwaway remark, if you look
at line 14.
CHA RMAN what page are you on there again?
MR. FANN NG Page 20, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. FANN NG And this is Mr. Williams' evidence of a conversation that he had with you subsequent to the interview that he conducted with Ms. D. And he says:
"After I intervi ewed her I cont acted Dave Tayl or, tol d hi ml was looking at it, asked hi mquestions. He made a throwaway remark that it was known in the Park, as in the Phoeni x Park, and he suggested it was known in government. But it was a passing comment and I actually reported that back to her. I told her what he told me."

So save for the throwaway remark that is identified by Mr. Williams at page 20 of day 11, his evidence is that you never negatively briefed him in relation to Sergeant McCabe. And you're rejecting that evidence, is that so?
A. I'm rejecting that.

711 Q. And viewing the matter objectively, Superintendent Taylor, I want to suggest to you that it might be said that you're unfortunate in that you find yourself in disagreement not just with Mr. Williams, but with a host of other journalists, isn't that so?
A. I don't accept that totally.

712 Q. You don't accept that?

CHA RMAK We11, there's potentially five.
A. Five, yeah.

CHA RMAN Possibly four out of the original nine.
A. Yeah.

CHAN RMAN And now there are 11. So, it was a majority, it's now potentially a minority. So that's it.

MR. FANN NG Is it not the case, Superintendent Taylor, that even from this afternoon's exchanges with Mr. Gillane on behalf of RTÉ that Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Burke, the two journalists that that he represents, also disagree with a similar proposition that you've urged upon the Tribunal in respect of them?
A. Well, that's their evidence and this is my evidence.

714 Q. Yes. And you know that Mr. O'Toole, another journalist 15:16 who I do not represent, also takes issue with you on similar grounds?
A. I can't comment on their stance.
Q. Yeah. And can you offer the Tribunal then any objective explanation as to why multiple journalists from different media organisations would all reject your evidence that you adversely briefed them in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. I can't comment on other peoples' evidence or --

716 Q. I want to suggest to you that the only rational explanation is that your evidence is untrue in respect of all of them and that it's more likely that their evidence is accurate, including that of my client, Mr. Williams.
A. I do not accept that.

717 Q. All right. I will move on to a slightly different topic now, which is the attendance of Mr. williams at Ms. D's house. Now, there has been evidence of Mr. Williams' attendance at Ms. D's house given by Mr. Williams, by Ms. D and by her father also last year. And the evidence, just to remind you of it, is to the effect that Mr. Williams attended at Ms. D's house on two occasions in March 2014. He met her parents on the first occasion, on 5th March, and he returned on Saturday, 8th March when he conducted an interview that was recorded with Ms. D. You're familiar with that evidence now, I take it?
A. You're telling me that, yes.

718 Q. We11, were you familiar with it before I mentioned it in the last 60 seconds?
A. I hadn't recalled it now, you're just refreshing it to me now. I hadn't read that transcript.
719 Q. I see. And I think you accept, and there's no dispute between us, that you had nothing whatsoever to do with Mr. Williams attending at the D house?
A. That's correct.

720 Q. And are you familiar with Mr. Williams' explanation as to how he came to be at the $D$ house?
A. Is that in relation to Superintendent Reilly?

721 Q. It is.
A. Yes.

722 Q. That he was contacted by Ms. D's father, who in turn was given the contact details for Mr. Williams by Chief

Superintendent o'Reilly, who had been historically familiar with Mr. williams from other matters?
A. (Witness Nods).

And both Ms. D's father and Chief superintendent
o'Reilly gave evidence to that effect, as did
A. I'm aware of that.
Q. Yeah. And in respect of the discussions that you had with Mr. Williams about Ms. D, you have given slightly different versions of those discussions on different occasions. The first account you gave was in your protected disclosure of 30th September 2016, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

726 Q. And we can put that up perhaps before you, page 5 of the protected disclosure, or page 5 of the Tribunal's documents. If we scroll down the page to:
"I recall a tel ephone call with a journalist, Paul Wilians."

Do you see that paragraph --
A. Yes.

727 Q. -- in the centre of the page?
"I recall a tel ephone call with the journalist Paul Wlliams where he informed me that he was in the house of the person who had made the complaint agai nst Sergeant McCabe with a vi ew to intervi ewing her."

I just want to pause there. Your protected disclosure was made on 30th September 2016, isn't that so?
A. That's right.
Q. And that's already at a remove of approximately two years and three months or two years and four months after these events, isn't that so?
A. That's right.
Q. And your recollection as of two years and four months after the relevant events was that you'd spoken with Mr. Williams at a time when he was in the house of
Ms. D. You committed yourself to a version which placed him in the house at the time of the telephone conversation, would you agree with me there?
A. Well, that could be a matter of just terminology, 'in', 'at' the house. My recollection is, when he rang me he 15:20 said "Guess where I am?".
Q. "Guess where I am?" with a view to interviewing her; did you mean to convey by that in your protected disclosure that he was speaking to you on the telephone before he had conducted the interview?
A. I didn't know when the interview had taken place, either before or what timeline within that interview was taken.
731 Q. And the next sentences in your protected disclosure are
that you informed both the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of this and then he say that no article was ever published. Now, insofar as the last sentence in that paragraph in your protected disclosure is concerned, we know now that that's incorrect, isn't that so?
A. Well, when I put that in there I hadn't seen the articles and I didn't know if they were published. I had never seen them.

732 Q.
So your position is you believed it to be correct as of the date of your protected disclosure but you now accept that it is incorrect?
A. I accept that articles were published.
Q.

And that to the extent that your protected disclosure says otherwise, it is consequently inaccurate?
A. I accept that articles were published subsequently, I didn't see the articles and I've always made that clear --
734 Q. Yeah?
A. -- in all my statements.

735 Q. In your protected disclosure you didn't say who initiated the telephone call, you didn't say Mr. Williams telephoned me or I telephoned Mr. Williams; you say that you recollect a telephone call with Mr. Williams. Do you see the omission?
A. Well, I think it's a very minor omission. It's a telephone call, $I$ recall a call with journalist Paul williams.
736 Q. Yeah. In your protected disclosure you don't identify
the month or the day of the week upon which the telephone call occurred. Do you accept that that is so?
A. I didn't have access to phone records, so I couldn't give a definitive date. But I knew it was a Saturday. I see. And by that answer do you mean to convey to the Tribunal that you reconstructed your memory of when these matters occurred by reference to telephone records?
A. No, but I was able to always remember and be definitive $15: 22$ it was a Saturday. can go to page 130, I think it might be slightly lower down that page, it's line 241, yes, it's about three lines from the foot of the page, you say:
"I remenber getting a phone call fromthe journalist Paul Willians on a Sat urday in February 2014."
A. Yeah.

739 Q. And you confirmed yesterday on the transcript at page 87 of day 74 that that indeed was your recollection.
A. Yes.

740 Q. Now, do you accept that insofar as it was your recollection, that the conversation took place in February, you must be incorrect?
A. Well, I understand the date has now been fixed, Mr. Chairman. And I understand -- and when I made that statement I didn't have access to my records, but I always remembered it was a Saturday and Paul williams
ringing me.
741 Q. And what's so distinctive in your recollection, Superintendent Taylor, that assists you be so certain that the conversation took place on a Saturday?
A. Because I was at home.

742 Q. I see. And if the Tribunal is to accept the evidence of Ms. D, her father, Mr. D, and Mr. williams that the only Saturday that Mr. Williams ever attended at their house was Saturday, 8th March 2014, you'd have no basis for challenging that?
A. Well, I always remember it was a Saturday.

743 Q. Yeah. So on your view then, the conversation must have taken place with the benefit of hindsight, on Saturday, 8th March 2014, is that correct?
A. Well, if that's the date of the date he was there I accept that, yes.
744 Q. Yeah. And indeed your counsel, when Mr. Williams gave evidence, Mr. Ferry, put that version of events to Mr. Williams at day 11, page 89. Now, tell me about that telephone conversation.
A. In what sense do you want me to?

745 Q. We11, did Mr. Williams call you?
A. Yes.

746 Q. At what time of the day?
A. I understand it was in the afternoon, early afternoon.

747 Q. Yeah. And what's not in dispute is that you'd a long history of contact with Mr. Williams, you'd an established pattern of communication with him?
A. Yes.

748 Q. And I presume you'd have had his mobile telephone number saved on your mobile telephone number?
A. Yes.

749 Q. And you'd agree with me, I presume, that the established mode of communication between you was from 15:25 mobile to mobile?
A. Yes.

750 Q. So I presume that when the call came in, you could see on your screen that it was Paul williams calling?
A. Yes.

751 Q. And do you recall that?
A. Yes.

752 Q. So we know, therefore, that he definitely called you from his mobile on Saturday, 8th March 2014 ?
A. Well, you're asking me did $I$ see his name coming up. When I answered the phone it was Paul williams.
Q. Yes. But I asked you something different 30 seconds ago. Did you see Paul williams' name on your phone when you answered the call?
A. I can't remember seeing his name. But when I answered the phone, it was Paul williams on the phone.
754 Q. And is your evidence to the Tribunal that he called you on his mobile phone on that day?
A. He called me on a phone and when I answered the phone it was Paul williams. I knew him well.

756 Q. We11, 1et me tell you, he has one, or there was one mobile phone that he was using at that time. And do you agree with me, therefore, that for your evidence to make sense there should be a record of your number being called by Mr. Williams on his mobile phone on Saturday, 8th March 2014?
A. Well, all $I$ know is that Mr. Williams rang me on a Saturday.
757 Q. Yeah. Because Mr. Williams is going to come back to the Tribunal and give further evidence, he's scheduled to give evidence in a number of weeks time, and I want to give you fair warning now and put the proposition to you that he has retrieved his telephone bill --
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, $I$ just have an issue in relation to this.
CHA RMAR Yes?
MR. MEGI NNESS: Mr. Fanning will be familiar with our rules of procedure, but it's obviously premised upon the Tribunal, as it were, being in control of assembling the evidence and distributing the evidence. And under rule 7.9 , unless permission is sought from the Tribunal, a witness shouldn't be referred to a document that hasn't been produced to the Tribunal or circulated.
CHA RMAN You're absolutely right, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGU NNESS: I anticipate Mr. Fanning may be going down that road.
CHA RMAK I was anticipating a gigantic big elephant trap, and I don't mean that in any personal way,
superintendent, opening up because of this line of questioning. I was wondering where the final denouement was going to come. This apparently is it. You, for some extraordinary reason, have kept your telephone records beyond a period when anyone keeps telephone records or indeed telephone service providers are obliged to keep metadata. Is that what you are telling me? It is.
MR. FANN NG Mr. Williams has procured, Chairman, his telephone bill for his mobile phone for the month of March 2014 and it contains a log of the calls that he made that are billed to his account. And the simple proposition arising from that is that he did not call Superintendent Taylor on Saturday, 8th March 2014.
CHA RMAN And he can't say from that whether
Superintendent Taylor called him? Because he's not billed for an incoming call.
MR. FANN NG The bill doesn't answer that proposition. But of course that's not Superintendent Taylor's evidence. Superintendent Taylor's evidence is that Mr. Williams called him.

CHAD RMAN That's fine. That's fine. If you want to put that, but I think we'11 have to have the bill and we'11 have to distribute it. Is there anything else? I mean, is there any other --
MR. FANN NG oh, there are a few more questions, yes. CHAN RMAN No, I don't mean -- is there any other big surprise by way of documentary evidence that you haven't decided to reveal to the Tribunal and for us to
distribute?
MR. FANN NG Firstly, Chairman, I should say that I was conscious that this might create a minor degree of controversy and I did have a word with Mr. McGuinness about it during the luncheon break.

CHA RMAN We11, I don't think you should tell me about that, so -- you are entitled to communicate whatever you want to him. I'm not going to blame you, Mr. Fanning, because everybody makes mistakes. But that is the procedure.

MR. FANN NG Yes, and I did --
CHA RMAN So I think we should move on maybe.
MR. FANN NG I am anxious to move on, but I have discussed this with Mr. Kelly and I am not sure whether the Tribunal ever sought Mr. Williams' records previous7y.

CHA RMAN We11, I made a big huge statement asking for anyone who knew anything about anything to come forward, you know, and there it is. I think it was John Kelly who used the phrase coloratura foghorn wailing in the wind in the Dáil Eireann some many years ago about the Minister for Finance, but I have used it here, it stuck in my mind. There it is. Look, I'm not going to take offence. That's it.
MR. MEGI NESS: Just on that point though, Chairman, 15:30 Mr. Fanning said he didn't think the Tribunal had ever sought Mr. Williams' records and the issue was raised with him in his first interview with the investigators and he was happy to provide his mobile number, which we
were obviously grateful for confirmation of.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NNESS: However, he made it clear that that was a caveat, that he wasn't giving the Tribunal access permission to access any of his phone records.

CHAN RMAN Yes, all right.
MR. MEGI NNESS: So, that is where it stood at that stage.
CHA RMAK This may seem at the present time to be an enormous point, $I$ am not quite so sure, trying to step above matters, that it is an enormous point, but you have made the point and if you wouldn't mind also providing the record.
MR. FANN NG We will do that and Mr. Kelly will
discuss with the Tribunal's solicitor after the
Tribunal rises this after the question of any redaction. But we do have the telephone bill that substantiates the point. Perhaps I'11 just move on, Chairman.
CHA RMAN A11 right. I mean, how definite are you, superintendent, that he rang you?
A. He rang me, yes.

CHA RMAN You're very definite?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK Can you really be so definite? I mean --
A. I'm --

CHA RMAN -- we're talking about more than four years ago now.
A. I do remember it. Yeah, he rang me. I didn't see --
why it stuck in my mind, Mr. Chairman, is because it was a Saturday. And because it was a weekend.
CHA RMAN No, I appreciate how Saturday would stick in your mind, but as to whether a friend of mine rings me yesterday or I ring the friend, I'm not sure I'd remember that detail. But in any event, it's there for whatever you fee1 I ought to make out of it, Mr. Fanning. So will we move onto the next point then? MR. FANN NG But, Chairman, just on the point that you have raised, just to be clear about it: The Tribunal obviously does have the calls from Superintendent Taylor to Mr. Williams and there were no calls made by Superintendent Taylor to Mr. Williams on Saturday, 8th March either. And that appears from page 6994. I do not think we need to call it up on the screen.
CHA RMAK No, no.
MR. FANN NG But that is the position.
CHA RMAN No, that is fine. And if it was indeed from Garda Headquarters it would appear as a general number anyway, and besides it was a Saturday and he works office hours, nine to five, Monday to Friday. I do understand the point.

MR. FANN NG Superintendent Taylor, just coming back to that, you have obviously heard the exchange between me and the Tribunal chairperson and you understand the point; Mr. Williams has a telephone bill which will be produced in due course which does not show any call from his mobile to your mobile on Saturday, 8th March, which is the only Saturday that he was in the $D$ house.

You understand the point I'm making?
A. I understand the point you're making, yeah.
Q. And just for the avoidance of doubt, Superintendent Taylor, lest your firm recollection about this conversation having taken place on a Saturday is incorrect, the phone records of Mr. Williams do not show any telephone call from his mobile number to your mobile number on 5th March also, which was the other occasion on which Mr. Williams was at the house of Ms. D, do you follow that point?
A. I do, I hear what you're saying.

CHA RMAN That's the wednesday.
MR. FANN NG Yeah
CHA RMAN when you would have been in the office, yes.
A. Yeah.

MR. FANN NG And similarly, your telephone records from your mobile phone to Mr. Williams do not record any calls on 5th March 2014.
A. (Witness Nods).

761 Q. So arising out of all of that, there is no evidence before the Tribunal of a telephone call between your mobile phone and Mr. Williams' mobile phone on either of the two dates that Mr. Williams attended at the D house.
A. A11 I can give is the evidence I've given,

762 Q. I want to suggest to you arising out of that, Superintendent Taylor, with that forensic assistance for Mr . Williams' recollection that it's much more
likely that his version of what occurred is correct than your version and his version is that he telephoned you the subsequent week after attending at the D house and there is a record of him telephoning you on Monday, 10th march. And I want to suggest to you that that's what occurred.
A. My firm recollection was he rang me on a Saturday.

763 Q. Yeah. And the sworn evidence of Mr. Williams on this issue was given by him on day 11, page 32, and I'm just going to bring that to your attention. And it's question 169, page 32 . And you'11 see the question was:
"What were the next steps that you took in rel ation to this story?"

This is after having concluded the video interview and returning to Dublin with the videographer. At question 168:
"What were the next steps that you took?"

Is question 169. He says:
"I contacted Superintendent Tayl or in the Garda Press
Of fice.
Question 170: When did that happen?
A. I don't have a record of when it happened, but it would probably have been the subsequent week. "

And there is a record of a phone call from Mr. Williams on his mobile phone to your mobile phone on Monday, 10th March. And I want to suggest to you that that's consistent with the position of Mr. Williams and it's inconsistent with your evidence.
A. I can on7y stand by the evidence, Mr. Chairman, that I submitted.

764 Q. And Superintendent Taylor, I want to suggest to you in conclusion that we have an unhappy situation, in that your testimony to this Tribunal is almost devoid of detail or specifics in relation to the nature of your contact with journalists, specifically with
Mr. Williams, but once you attempt to commit to specifics, your testimony is seen to be demonstrably false.
A. I'm here to give my evidence to the Tribunal and for the Chairman to make a determination.
Q. You see, the only thing you're certain about in terms of your engagement with Mr. Williams about the Ms. D interview is that it was a conversation that took place when he was in the $D$ house on a Saturday. And his mobile phone record categorically disproves that assertion.
A. Mr. Williams rang me and the first conversation "Guess 15:37 where I am?" I didn't know whether he was in the house, out of the house, or whether a part of the house he was in. This is the conversation he started with me.

766 Q. But on your version of events, he'd have had to have used the D family telephone or somebody else's telephone to make that call. Why would he have done such a thing when he always called you on his mobile phone?
A. You're asking about something that somebody else has done. I do not -- I can't answer that. I can only give you what's within my knowledge.
767 Q. I want to suggest to you that the thesis that you're offering to the Tribunal in support of your evidence is 15:37 inherently implausible.
A. I gave my evidence to the Tribuna1, it's a matter for the Chairman to determine it.
MR. FANN NG No further questions, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Mr. Fanning, thank you for that. But the rule in Brown v. Dunne indicates you ought to put your client's case and your client's case in relation to this conversation is different to Superintendent Taylor's case
MR. FANN NG Yes. And he's already given his
evidence, Chairman. His evidence on day 11.
CHA RMAN No, but I mean you ought to put it, in fairness, to Superintendent Taylor. It doesn't take long, but if you wouldn't mind please.
MR. FANN NG Certainly.
CHA RMAN There was a list of questions, as I understand it, and that Superintendent Taylor came back to him by phone with answers to the list of questions to a particular effect. Now, Superintendent Taylor has
obviously given different evidence, but it's only fair he should have the opportunity to answer those questions.
MR. FANN NG Superintendent Taylor, your evidence to this Tribunal is that the only occasion that you spoke to Mr. Williams about the Ms. D issue was in that solitary telephone call which you date as the Saturday that he was in the $D$ house.
A. That's correct.

Mr. Williams' position is that he spoke to you the subsequent week and that he sought some back up information from you in relation to whether the DPP prosecuted and what happened to the complaint that had been advanced by Ms. D against Sergeant McCabe, and that you came back to him and provided him with some clarification.
A. That's not correct.
Q. Well, that's been his evidence to the Tribunal. And I want to suggest to you that that's consistent with the temporal gap between Mr. Williams attending at the D house and the publication of any article in the Irish Independent newspaper in relation to this, the first article of which was published approximately a month later on 12th April.
A. I've given my evidence. I can't make any further comment on that.

MR. FANN NG Very we11. Thank you, Superintendent Taylor.
CHA RMAK There's one other factor, which is that Paul
williams is supposed to have said over the telephone to Superintendent Taylor that he was -- let's leave out the bit about being at the house, Mr. Fanning, but as I understand it, that he had spoken to the family or the person involved, that's an unclear matter, and that Maurice McCabe had destroyed this person and that he was going to write an article about it. Now, that was the evidence that was given, if you look on the transcript at page 104, day 11 . Because Mr. Ferry took the opportunity to put the specific differences to Mr. Williams on that occasion on behalf of Superintendent Taylor.
771 Q. MR. FANN NG I'11 formally put that to you, but I think it's clear that there's a distinction between us on that issue. Superintendent Taylor, Mr. Williams does not accept that he used language of that nature at all or had any conversation with you along those lines, either on Saturday, 8th March or on any subsequent occasion.
A. I do not accept that.

CHA RMAN Al1 right. We11, that's clear enough. And thank you, Mr. Fanning. Sorry, I beg your pardon.
MR THULLIER: Anthony Thuillier, for Michael o'Toole from The Daily Star. I just have a number of questions for Superintendent Taylor.

THE WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR THU LLI ER

772 Q.
MR. THU LLIER: Superintendent Taylor, yesterday you were giving your evidence - and I appear for Mr. O'Toole of the Daily Star - and you were highly complimentary of Mr. O'Toole.
A. I would be very complimentary of Mr. O'Toole. He is the most prolific crime journalist I know. He turns up at every scene in the country I've turned up to.

773 Q. Yes, you said that. Does he strike you as a person who mixes things up?
A. I do not understand the question you're saying - you're saying mixing things up?

774 Q. Well, you've met Mr. O'Toole on many occasions, as you said yesterday.
A. Yes.

775 Q. Over the course of your interactions with Mr. O'Toole did he strike you as somebody who would mix facts up?
A. I have the height of respect Mr. O'Toole. CHA RMAN No, but is he a bit of an eejit? That's what you're being asked, let's put it plain.
A. No, he's not. I accept he's --

776 Q. MR. THU LLIER Is he the kind of journalist you would expect to generally be very accurate?
A. Yes.

777 Q. Because your statements are diametrically opposed. And 15:42 were you surprised to learn that Mr. O'Toole had a completely different version of events; that Mr . O'Toole says that he was never on the receiving end of a smear campaign by you of Sergeant McCabe?
A. I can't say what Mr. O'Toole says but I'm just saying what I said.
Q. Oh, I know that. But were you surprised to learn that Mr. O'Toole had a different view of --
A. I can't express an opinion on Mr. O'Toole's reaction. 15:42

779 Q. I'm not asking you for Mr. O'Toole's reaction, I'm asking you for your reaction to Mr. O'Toole's witness statement?
A. I don't have a reaction to it. I've just -- I gave you the evidence I gave and if Mr. O'Toole has a contrary view well that's his view.

780 Q. And that doesn't surprise you at a11?
A. He he's entitled to whatever view he wants.

781 Q. I'm just asking about your level of surprise.
A. It's not a case of my level of surprise, it's -- I gave 15:43 my evidence and what Mr. O'Toole responds is a matter for Mr. O'Toole.

782 Q. Very good. And in relation to these matings that you would have had with Mr. O'Toole, the smear campaign, was this a drum you were banging regularly with Mr. O'Toole?
A. No, it wasn't a drum. As I said to you in my earlier evidence, it was an opportunist, it would come up at times that the McCabe issue would be topical in the news or the McCabe issue would be a subject of conversation.
783 Q. But your intent was that Mr. O'Toole -- that there would be an effect on Mr. O'Toole's journalism in some respect, because of the things that you were saying to
him in respect of Sergeant McCabe?
A. As I said earlier I was bringing information to Mr. O'Toole. How he processed that information or dealt with that information was a matter for his professional opinion.

784 Q. Over the course of your professional life as press secretary, did you follow Mr. O'Toole's stories in The Daily Star?
A. When you say follow him, the McCabe stories?

785 Q. If you wish to call them the McCabe stories, but stories in general?
A. I would have seen him in the press clippings and that, yes.
Q. And did you feel you were getting anywhere?
A. It wasn't a case was I feeling was I getting anywhere, it was a feeling that I provided him with information. I would never dare tell a journalist how to write a story or construct a story.
787 Q. We11, it's not an issue of you daring to tell a journalist how to write a story, you had an agenda; the 15:44 agendas was to smear Mr. O'Toole, you set about that deliberately?
A. Yes.

788 Q. It's your evidence that you targeted Michae1 o'Toole?
A. I wouldn't say targeted. Like, I mean, Michael

O'Toole, like a number of crime journalists, moved in a circle and that turned up at every scene. So it wasn't a case of targeting, it was a case of taking an opportunity when the opportunity arose.

789 Q. We11 why then, why did you smear Sergeant McCabe to Michae1 O'Toole at all?
A. Michael o'Toole was a crime journalist, he was a journalist that we worked closely with in the Press Office, he was at all crime scenes, Garda conferences, 15:45 the Garda press conferences, so he was a regular attender at Garda events.

790 Q. And Michael $0^{\prime}$ Toole says that any stories he wrote in relation to Sergeant McCabe were relatively benign. And I might just direct the Tribunal's attention to two 15:45 of those stories. The first is from 20th February 2014, it's on page 6520.

CHA RMAN Do you want to just read it out, and it will come up in due course.
MR. THU LLIER I can indeed, I can synopsise. In fact 15:46 it's there now. Superintendent Taylor, you can see this story. This story from 20th February 2014, in any references to Sergeant McCabe -- it is a story principally about the sacking of the confidential recipient and the reaction of Mícheá 1 Martin to certain 15:46 revelations and his support of Sergeant McCabe. This kind of story, did you see it at the time?
A. I would have. Yes, I would have seen it at the time, yes.
791 Q. And having made those representations to Michae1
O'Toole, would you be disappointed by a story like this?
A. No, I wouldn't be disappointed with any journalist. Like, I mean, as I said, I provided them with
information, how they produced that was their professional --
792 Q. And would you agree that there's no trace of the smear, in fact it's positive towards Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, I haven't read the full article and it's very hard to see it in this, but I accept what you are saying.
I will just direct the Tribunal to another article, the page is 6593. And it's from 5th April 2014, and it's entitled "Di ssent isn't disloyalty" and it's an article 15:47 principally about the new Garda Commissioner, as she then was, and her attitude towards whistleblowers, which, as reported in the article, was a positive one and an encouraging one to whistleblowers. Again I suppose --
A. Sorry, could you advise me on what date that article was?

794 Q. That date is 5th April 2014.
A. okay, yes.

795 Q. Sorry it's rather blurred up at the top left-hand
corner.
CHA RMAN So the sub-headline is "Nói rín will support whi stlebl owers". So it looks as if it didn't work, the smearing, if you like. That's Mr. Thuillier's question, yes.
A. Yes.

796 Q. MR THULLIER So that is exactly the point. In fact, the point I want to put to you is that in fact there's no traces in Mr. O'Toole's journalism of these smears
that you say you made but he says you never made to him.
A. Well, the evidence I gave is that I spoke to michael o'Toole, again who I highly respect, and I put that information, how he used it was his prerogative.
So you had a specific agenda, there was a specific aim to that agenda, but if the aim wasn't realised it was no skin off your nose and in fact you didn't mind at all?
A. Well, the aim was to put that information, how the journalist processed that was how the journalist processed it.
Q.

You previously said that you were simply carrying out the orders of the Garda Commissioner, Martin Callinan, at the time, and his orders were, you say, to smear Sergeant McCabe, and if it was a case that you never minded that journalists never actually did that or that there was no effect whatsoever, it seems to me a strange situation, would you agree with that?
A. As I said, and I keep saying it, I put the information, 15:48 how the journalists dealt with it is their own professional opinion.
799 Q. I put it to you that if there was a smear campaign run by you it was spectacularly unsuccessful?
A. Well, you might say that.

CHA RMAN We11, just on that point made by Mr. Thuillier made there, obviously the Tribunal has searched through newspapers, as we11 as everything else, and it's very hard to come across anything
negative to Sergeant McCabe, never mind anything about him being embittered in consequence of an investigation which took place all of 14 years previously or there or thereabouts. No, no, sorry, it was more like eight years previous. So what he is saying is: wasn't it a flop?
A. I accept that.
Q. MR. THULLIER very good, just one or two more questions. why did you leave Debbie McCann and Eavan Murray out of your list of nine?
A. That was the initial list. I came back to the list and I provided it at the next opportunity.
Q. You said that many times today, but why did you leave them out of the initial list?
A. It's not a case of leaving out, I included them at the first available opportunity.
Q. well, it is a case of leaving them out though of the initial list?
A. We11, I included them when I was asked about them, when the Tribunal brought it to my attention.
803 Q. I put it to you that you left people out who should have been put in and you put people in who shouldn't have been there, and I specifically refer to Mr. o'Toole in that regard?
A. I do not accept that.

804 Q. Finally then, I'd just like to ask you, you've said that you certainly made these briefings or representations to Mr. O'Toole, but they were always of a generic nature. Is it the case that you are unable
to provide any details of that now?
A. In what sense?
Q. Can you give any specifics of anything you ever said at any point?
A. As I have consistently said, these were opportunist of their nature. They presented themselves when they presented themselves.
Q. Very good. Are you troubled by your own lack of specificity?
A. I am here to give all the information that's within my memory to the chairperson or to the Tribunal and for the chairperson to make a determination.
Q. But do you think given the lack of specificity that, perhaps Mr. O'Toole -- and I will put to you Mr. O'Toole's account, where he says that such representations were never made to him by any garda in any position of authority in An Garda Síochána, that that is a more accurate categoric denial of your version and yours is simply a vague assertion; of the two, I put it to you that his must be more reliable?
A. That's matter for the Chairman to determine.

MR. THU LLI ER: Thank you very much
CHA RMAN Mr. Keeley, did you want to ask any questions as of this particular point?
MR. KEELEY: I have no questions, Chairman.
CHA RMAN At this point, yes. Can I just ask
Ms. Kelly -- sorry, we can go off transcript. Can we go on until 4:30? Yes, we will do that. Mr. Murphy? If that's convenient to you, you're not uncomfortable
or anything like that?
A. I'm in your hands, Chairman.

CHA RMAN It's on7y 30 more minutes. I'm sorry, I have to sit late tomorrow and on Thursday, and I have to say that, just to try and get as much time used as possible.

THE WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M CHEÁL OHGGNS
808 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Good afternoon, Superintendent
Taylor. My name is Mícheál O'Higgins and I propose to ask you some questions on behalf of former Commissioner Callinan, former Commissioner o'sullivan and also some limited questions on behalf of Mr. McLindon, Andrew McLindon, the Director of Communications.

First of all, I'm going to start with some general questions, superintendent, if I may. You arrived in the Press office when? what date?
A. I think it's on 12th July 2012.

809 Q. 2012. And you've told us yesterday, I think, in evidence that you were, you brought in, and I think you indicated you were rightly proud of certain initiatives you introduced --
A. Yes.

810 Q. -- in the Press Office?
A. Yes.

811 Q. Can I just ask you briefly about those? what were they and were they a success?
A. I had -- the Press Office is based on two floors, the bottom floor being the office of the superintendent and the Director of Communications and upstairs is the main Press office. And I initiated a full refurbishment of that office.
A. New furniture, new infrastructure, new hardware, proper workstations laid out in accordance with health and safety, the installation of a large television set that was hooked up to the city traffic cameras.

813 Q. Yes.
A. And various refurbishments throughout the whole office for streamlining efficiency.

814 Q. Yes. And apart from refurbishments, were you concerned to introduce system improvements in terms of Press Office systems and the organisation of management tasks? Did you do any of that?
A. Well, I was ensuring that there was good governance and we provided the best possible service we could to the public.
815 Q. Yes. And I think you told us as well yesterday that upon you starting the role, you received, I'll use the word, briefing, but you met with Commissioner Callinan?
A. Yes.

816 Q. And he gave you the instruction to go out and develop good relations --
A. Yes.

817 Q. -- with the media --
A. Yeah.

818 Q. -- and make sure -- I'm just looking at the transcript, page 12:
"Make sure you project the Garda Sí ochána in the best I ight."

And broadly speaking that was the riding instruction he gave to you at that time.
A. Yes.

819 Q. Right. Now I'm going to ask you about obviously a number of issues that are in dispute, you'11 appreciate, between Martin Callinan, Nóirín O'Sullivan and Andrew McLindon and your position.
A. Yes.

820 Q. But firstly then can I ask you a number of questions in relation to your claim that you were given an order by Martin Callinan to engage in a smear campaign on his behalf?
A. Yes.

821 Q. A11 right. Can you assist the Tribunal, did you and Commissioner Callinan discuss how best the smear campaign could be implemented?
A. We11, he instructed me to take every opportunity when I would meet the media to brief them in relation to what he had told me, that the media's attention should be driven by revenge and this revenge was centred in the fact of him being the subject of an investigation in 2006.

822
Q. Yes. And in terms of how it was to be implemented, did you discuss that, the two of you?
A. He told me to take every opportunity with the media to drop this into conversations.
Q. Did you ask him who was in on the plan?
A. No, I did not ask him who was in on the plan.
Q. Would that not have been a natural thing and a logical thing to ask him from your purposes if you were to be the person who was the -- not just the chief, but the only implementer of the order, is that right?
A. If --
Q. You would at least like to know or you would need to know who else was in on it?
A. If the Garda Commissioner gives you an order, you don't start to question his order.
Q. Well, did you ask him is there anybody else with whom I might discuss this to ascertain who was in on it?
A. I wasn't questioning -- it wasn't my role or function as a superintendent to question a Garda Commissioner further on what instruction he had given to me.
Q. How long did this meeting take place where you claim this order was given to you?
A. These meetings were usually on a Friday, they could go on for an hour or so, we would deal with a multiplicity of issues.
Well, I'm talking now about, I had understood you to indicate that at some point in 2013 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you're in a position, are you, to recall the very
first --
A. I can't give you the exact day, but it was mid-2013.
Q. Were you called to his office to receive this order?
A. I would call to his office regularly, because I was dealing with a multiplicity of issues, press queries, 15:57 decisions that he'd be required to give, advice that he'd be required to give in response to media queries, which was the normal practice. He would direct how media queries -- not in all of them, but in sensitive ones and critical ones and what response to give.

831 Q. Yes. But this one stood out, didn't it? This was a command to carry out quite far-reaching and really quite unpleasant smearing of another human being, isn't that right, another Garda member?
A. He was giving me a direction to do, as he did in various directions, with regards to our interaction with the media and I was carrying out his direction.
832 Q. Did you and Martin Callinan discuss which journalists should be negatively briefed?
A. We didn't discuss which ones we'd negatively brief, but 15:58 we certainly stayed away from two.

833 Q. Did you discuss whom you might stay away from?
A. Yes.

834 Q. When you say you discussed it, did you ask questions to elicit that information?
A. Well, it was quite evident and quite known that those two journalists were not popular.

835 Q. No, my question is, I'm trying to get a sense of, and I think it might be of assistance to the Tribunal if you
explain the run of this conversation that you say you had with Martin Callinan. You've heard the complaints about lack of specificity --
A. Yeah.
A. It's, friday was the longest day $I$ would give in his office because we'd be on a wash-up for the weekend, cleaning up matters, there'd be sunday paper queries coming in, we'd be dealing with something that might be starting on Monday, I'd be going through his diary list and he might be going to Templemore for functions, he might be going to various functions and where $I$, as the 15:59 Press officer, would have to accompany him and things like that.

838 Q. Right.
A. So it would be a wash-up time in the evening time.

839 Q. So are you saying that was the routine, that was the stuff of a normal friday evening or was that the stuff of this smear campaign order meeting?
A. That was the stuff of a normal friday, weekends.

840 Q. We11, forget that. I am asking you about the specific first day you got an order from Martin Callinan to conduct a smear campaign?
A. You are asking me --

841 Q. When was that first time?
A. I can't give you the exact day, but it was mid-2013.

Commissioner Callinan was becoming deeply frustrated that the McCabe issue was building and building and he just couldn't seem to get it off the agenda. In exasperation he would say to me, Dave, if they only knew what I've to put up with. And he became deeply frustrated and deeply despondent that one side of a story was coming out all the time and he was having to respond and put up with this all the time.
842 Q. Can you put a month on it?
A. The middle of 2013. So...

843 Q. What season are we talking about?
A. You're talking about the summer season.

844 Q. So it was the summertime?
A. Yes.

845 Q. In 2013?
A. Yes.

846 Q. And how was Martin Callinan to know whom you'd briefed as part of this smear campaign?
A. Well, he -- like, I mean, the Commissioner would attend and knew a lot of journalists himself, because he would have attended a lot of scenes and, do you know, he would go to the Garda conferences, and by and large the same cohort of journalists would turn up at all these events.

847 Q. Yes, that's my point. How was he to know, how was he 16:01 to know to whom you had spoken so that he would know to whom you'd spoken in case he himself came in contact with them? How was he to know that?
A. Well, he left that job to me, in the sense that $I$ would
 back to him on the ongoing progress of the campaign?
A. Well, I don't know if there was an ongoing progress. I would keep him updated that I would keep this briefing going, because he'd become very frustrated from listening to the news, from listening to reports. I'd be following him up on updates, telling him that the McCabe thing is on this show, it's on this paper, it's in this article. And he'd be becoming --
850 Q. Updates on the smear?
A. Well, he'd be frustrated that the McCabe story was keeping going all the time.

851 Q. No, no, did you give him updates on the smear campaign?
A. No, he would ask me, do you know, are you talking to people and I said yes, I am.

852 Q. He would ask you?
A. Am I talking to people.

853 Q. Right. So presumably you'd give him some detail on to whom you'd spoken?
A. Well, I said I spoke to this person on this day and that person on that day? No, I would say I would be talking to the journalists.

854 Q. The journalists?
A. Yes.
Q. You'd withhold from him from whom you'd spoken, would you?
A. Well, sometimes I would tell him, sometimes I did not tell him. Just, he was just inquiring about -- like, I mean, he was deeply, deep7y frustrated --
856 Q. And would you --
A. -- this story wasn't going away.

857 Q. No, I have that point. But would you keep a note of the persons, the journalists to whom you had spoken?
A. No, no. No, I wouldn't.
Q. You didn't. would that not have been a natural thing to do, to at least have a check-1ist (a) to know to whom you'd spoke know to, (b) to know the list to whom you needed to speak?
A. Well, as I said to you earlier, Mr. O'Higgins, the amount of journalists that were within the Garda circle was a small, relatively small cohort. There wasn't a
huge -- that $I$ knew them all personally, $I$ knew them all on a first name basis, $I$ had their phone numbers.

859 Q. The order to commence this smear campaign, which you say Martin Callinan gave you, was it before or after

15th May 2013 when the O'Mahoney report was published?
A. As I said, I can't give you the specific date, but it was mid-2013.

860 Q.
Well, was it before or after the incident when the Roma children were taken into care by the Gardaí?
A. Oh, it was before that.

861 Q. It was before that?
A. Yes.

862 Q. Right. That was October 2013, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

863 Q. Right. We11, say a period of four weeks or so after you say the Commissioner gave you the command --
A. Hmm .

864 Q. -- how many journalists had you briefed?
A. I can't give you the exact number, because, as I always 16:04 say, it was opportunist. Sometimes it came up, sometimes it didn't come up. I couldn't give the exact number. But when the opportunity did arise I availed of it.
Q. No, but you must have some sense of how quickly you got 16:04 stuck into your task?
A. Well, I executed the task as quickly as possible. But then, as I said, it wasn't always possible to execute it, because it was opportunist in reason.
866 Q. And is it your evidence that you never jotted down in a 16:05 notepaper or a diary or a piece of paper any record of the journalists to whom you'd spoken --
A. No.

867 Q. -- or any record of the journalists you needed yet to
speak to?
A. As I said earlier on, I knew all the journalists that were within the Garda circle, that were turning up at a11 the events, $I$ knew them personally, so it wasn't an exhaustive list that I couldn't store in my own mind.

868 Q. You seem to have had difficulty, if you don't mind me saying, remembering the names of the journalists when you were called upon to put them down on paper. So would it not have been a natural thing to have a record of the ones you intended to speak to?
A. No.

869 Q. That didn't occur to you?
A. No.

870 Q. What about the criteria for eligibility to be journalist to have the smear campaign conveyed to you, what criteria did you decide upon?
A. Could you rephrase that? What do you mean by criteria?

871 Q. How would a journalist get on the list of persons to be involved in the smear campaign --
A. It was generally --

872 Q. -- to be briefed?
A. It was generally -- as I said to you earlier on, there was a consistent circle of journalists who were within the Garda circle.
873 Q. Did you discuss that with Martin Callinan? 16:06
A. I did not -- Mr. Callinan knew the same journalists and the same circle that $I$ knew.

874 Q. And it's your evidence, is it, that, I think you've told us already, you didn't discuss at any point with
the Commissioner the other persons who were to be let in on this command?
A. Sorry?
Q.

Did you discuss with the Commissioner or did he discuss with you whom else was to know about --
A. No.

You didn't. Would that not have been a logical and natural point to clarify?
A. I make the point, the Garda is a disciplined force. If the Garda Commissioner tells you to do something, you don't start taking out a check-1ist and start asking questions. It doesn't work like that.
We11, in circumstances where you say the Commissioner didn't -- it didn't come up, who was in on it, how did you know it was safe that you could risk talking to Nóirín O'Sullivan or Andrew McLindon?
A. Because Mr. Callinan, when I took up my position, told me always to keep him and Deputy o'sullivan fully informed of all matters.
Q. No, no, but this was a smear campaign, this was a command to do something quite far-reaching, I suggest.
A. Well, I kept them informed.
Q. But how did you know it was safe to discuss this with Nóirín O'sullivan?
A. We11, this was the Deputy Commissioner, this was number two. This was the closest person working with the Commissioner, Commissioner Callinan, and Andrew

881 Q. But I had understood you to indicate that Martin Callinan didn't indicate to you, you can tell Nóirín or you can tell Andrew?
A. We11, he indicated to me that, as I said, I was to keep Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan always informed, which I always did. And I took it as a matter of -- when Mr. McLindon came on board, to inform him. But wasn't that, the command, the standing instruction to keep the Deputy Commissioner informed, I suggest to you that was in relation to proper legitimate Garda operational matters concerning the Press Office?
A. I kept her fully informed with all - as with the Commissioner and with Mr. McLindon - of all matters, including this matter.
883 Q. That has nothing to do with a smear campaign.
A. I kept them informed of al1 matters and I spoke to Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan by phone, we discussed the matter, we discussed how I was engaging with journalists in relation to the McCabe thing and she was fully informed. I never not kept her informed.

884 Q. We11, can you assist the Tribunal on this: Are you or are you not saying that Martin Callinan said, or indicated it was all right to speak to Nóirín o'sullivan?
A. He always told me, yes, never to keep anything from Commissioner O'Sullivan.

885 Q. Concerning the smear campaign?
A. Concerning any matter.

886 Q. And did he give a -- did he green light you speaking to Andrew McLindon about the smear campaign?
A. We11, Mr. McLindon was the Director of Communications,
which was the senior media advisor to the Commissioner and it would be natural I would tell Mr. McLindon of this issue, and I did.

You see, by that logic, it would be natural that you'd te11 your Deputy Press officer as wel1. But you didn't.
A. Mr. O'Higgins, it's a rank structure --
Q. That's my point.
A. Conversations between the Commissioner and me were kept at a certain level.
Q. So was the instruction to keep it in among a tight cabal?
A. Well, I kept Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan and Mr. McLindon fully informed. I did not discuss it with more junior ranks within the Press office.
Q. But you see, forgive me for repeating the question, how did you know it was safe to discuss it with Andrew McLindon if you weren't told he was in on it?
A. But Mr. Mac Linden was Director of Communications, he was the highest ranking media advisor on strategy to the Garda Commissioner, he'd the equivalent of a Chief Superintendent rank, which is a rank above me.

You see, would it not have been, on your logic, the natural thing to do for you to organise a four-way discussion with Martin Callinan, Nóirín O'Sullivan, yourself and Andrew McLindon to discuss implementing this smear campaign?
A. Commissioner Callinan gave me instruction, personally to me. I carried out that instruction. And I kept Deputy O'Sullivan and Mr. Mac Linden fully informed.
894 Q. Well, as the weeks went by, Superintendent, and according to the briefing you claim you'd received to keep an eye out for newspaper articles -- sorry, to smear Sergeant McCabe, did you keep an eye out for newspaper articles that were critical of Sergeant McCabe?
A. I kept an eye on, because the press clippings were generated each morning and delivered to senior Garda management and we kept an eye on the McCabe stories, as 16:11 well as a lot of other stories as well, it wasn't exclusively the McCabe story.
895 Q. Well, as the weeks became months and there still appeared to be either radio silence or newspaper articles not critical of Sergeant McCabe, did you wonder what's the story, what's the problem?
A. Well, I kept it going, but I was getting it in the neck from Commissioner Callinan.



896
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. I was getting it in the neck from him.
Q. You were getting it in the neck from Martin Callinan?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we take it from that that you say there were further meetings between you and he where the smear campaign progress was discussed?
A. Well, he was deeply frustrated. He'd ring me up after Morning Ireland or some other show and he'd be pretty robust on the phone to me.
Q. And would he be saying 'what about journalist $X$ or journalist $Y^{\prime}$ what's the story?'
A. Well, he'd be telling me in a very robust and colourful exchange what the hell was I doing and to ring this show and ring that show and whatever show was on. And I would be ringing television -- radio shows to seek clarification and to put -- to say 'That's not true'.
900 Q. And --
A. He listened to every radio programme as wel1, so.

901 Q. And did he demand from you the names of the journalists to whom you'd negatively briefed?
A. No. But he was telling me, do you know, he was quite animated that this story wasn't going away and what the hell were we doing about it?
902 Q. Sorry, why was he not asking you as to progress 16:13 concerning the list of journalists whom you'd negatively briefed? would that not have been the first thing to come up if, as you say, he was becoming irate?
A. He wouldn't be coming up and saying 'Have you rang this
person', 'Have you rang that person', he would be saying 'what the' - I don't want to be colourful - but 'what the hell is going on' or 'what is doing? Like, this story's coming up'. And he'd be very animated and very agitated over it from time to time.
903 Q. The man has given you a job, on your evidence.
A. Yes.

904 Q. A rather significant job.
A. Yes.

905 Q. It wasn't an every day occurrence.
A. No.

906 Q. You discuss it within his office. It's a command to go out and smear another Garda member.
A. Yes.

907 Q. Right. There appear in the succeeding weeks and months $16: 14$ to be no fruits from the plot, from the smearing campaign. You indicate your boss was annoyed about this.
A. Yes.

908 Q. I want to know from you how is it possible he didn't demand from you a list of the journalists to whom you'd spoken and an update on why they weren't delivering the goods.
A. He never demanded a list, he was -- that was my job, because my job was frontline dealing with the journalists, it wasn't his job to frontline dealing with the journalists. He had given me a task, he wanted that task executed and I did it to the best of my ability.

909 Q. Well, whatever about Martin Callinan, did you phone up or contact any of the journalists to whom you'd negatively briefed to find out -- with a view to prodding it along?
A. As I said earlier on, it wasn't my job to prod it along or -- I gave them the information; if they went and wrote an article, fair enough. If they didn't, I couldn't push them towards that point.
Can I ask you in relation to some of the journalists whom you've now nominated as being parties to whom you briefed negatively: Paul Reynolds?
A. Yes.

911 Q. Did you give him an in person briefing or was it on the phone?
A. It would be in person.

912 Q. In person?
A. Yes.

913 Q. You're clear on that?
A. Yes.

914 Q. So you have a mind's eye memory of briefing Paul Reynolds negatively on a person-to-person encounter, are you clear on that?
A. Because again Mr. Reynolds is a very respected journalist, I would have -- he was always being at scenes and I'd meet him quite a lot at all the various Garda events.

915 Q. Right. So it was person to person and it stands out, the particular briefing you gave him, the negative briefing?
A. Well, we discussed the whole Maurice McCabe. Because the Maurice McCabe issue was becoming a huge issue.
Q. We11, I presume you discussed Maurice McCabe if you were implementing the negative briefing policy?
A. Yes.

918 Q. Right. When was this?
A. I can't give you the exact date when it was.

919 Q. Where was this?
A. It would've been at some scene, it would've been at some event, $I$ can't give the exact location. But as I say, as I said earlier on in my evidence, it was opportunist.
Q. Was it outdoors? Indoors?
A. Most of the crime scenes I went to would be outdoors.

921 Q. Yes.
A. Most of the conferences I went, we were indoors.

922 Q. Yes, so which was it?
A. As I said, it was opportunist in its nature. I can't give you the geography or the topography of where it happened. It happened.

923 Q. Michael O'Toole; in person or on the phone?
A. It would be probably both.
Q. Both?
A. Yes.

925
Q. So you would've -- well, which came first?
A. I can't tell you which one came first. As I said, it was opportunist. when the opportunity arose.
926
Q. Can you put a month on it?
A. I can't give an exact month, but I can give you the time period. It was between mid 2013 and March '14.

927 Q. 2013 and March '14?
A. Yes.

928 Q. So the period is as broad as what you're indicating is, is it the commencement of the smear campaign --
A. From about mid --

929 Q. -- and the departure from Martin Callinan from office?
A. Yeah.

930 Q. That's the period, that's the specifics you're offering, is it?
A. Yes.

931 Q. John Burke; in person or on the phone?
A. On the phone.

932 Q. And you're clear on that?
A. Yes.

933 Q. Where were you?
A. I can't say where I was. It's -- I was on the phone as we11.

934 Q. But do you have a memory of briefing him negatively in this particular phone call?
A. Yes.

935 Q. Right. In your mind's eye, where were you for this phone call that you say you remember? Where were you?
A. I can't state where I was. I was on the other end of
the phone line. And in what location that was, I can't tell you that.
Q. Was it day or night?
A. Like, I mean, it's impossible for me to state whether it's day or night. It was within the 24 -hour clock. I think we're probably safe in that. Paul williams; was it by phone or was it in person?
A. It was by phone.
Q. And when was that?
A. Again, Mr. O'Higgins, it was opportunist in its nature. 16:18 when it presented itself, it presented itself on occasions when the matter was topical.
Q.

Did you ever send to Martin Callinan a text to say something along the lines of 'I've spoken to Juno MCEnroy' or 'I've spoken to Paul Reynolds' or 'Spoken to Michael o'Toole and he's been fully briefed'?
A. I wouldn't have sent that. I would've, do you know, spoken to him, I would've -- what I was sending to Commissioner Callinan and Commissioner o'Sullivan was updates in relation to the McCabe issue of where it was 16:19 breaking out in the media and that.

940 Q. But why would you have not sent a text? Would that not have been a perfectly natural thing to do, just by way of update?
A. Well, I would've followed up in personal calls and spoke to him. Because as I say, texts are limited in their very nature as to what, how many characters - I think there's 40 characters $I$ think you can put into it or something like that.

I beg your pardon?
A. I think they're limited, the texts, by their very nature. And I'm not the most prolific dexterity when it comes to texting.
Q. You're not a prolific text sender, is it?
A. Well, as to get, to put a big long narrative into it.
Q. So are you saying that the limitation on the number of characters in a text was the reason as to why you wouldn't have sent a text to Martin Callinan to let him know that you'd spoken to a particular journalist to indicate you'd briefed them?
A. As I said, I always remember the Paul williams one. Like I mean, that stands out to me, telling him about Paul williams ringing me and going to write an article.
944 Q. So you do have a memory of sending a particular text -- 16:20
A. Yes.

945 Q. -- to Martin Callinan in relation to Paul Williams?
A. And Deputy o'sullivan.

But I had understood you to indicate that you hadn't negatively briefed. Is that right? You're not claiming 16:20 ownership, so to speak, of the Ms. D visit --
A. No.
Q. -- of any journalist?
A. No, I was just claiming that I had received information from Paul williams and I passed it on. It'd be the nature of the way I would pass on information to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner.
Q. Am I correct on that, you're not asserting that the Ms. D piece in relation to the journalist concerned,
that was not part of this disputed smear campaign, isn't that so?
A. No, I didn't know Mr. Williams was going up there. He went up there on his own steam. Yes. So I just come back to my question then: what was 16:21 to prevent you sending a text to Martin Callinan to update you on speaking to any given journalist?
A. It wasn't the case. I would be in the Commissioner's company almost every day and I'd speak to him on matters.

950 Q. You claim, don't you, that you believed in the order from Commissioner Callinan which you maintain he gave you?
A. Yes.

951 Q. That being so, there was nothing to prevent you passing it on to Inspector Ferris, your second in command.
A. Again, there's a rank structure. There's the nature of the conversation with the Commissioner, I told it to, Deputy O'Sullivan and Mr. McLindon. It's not the practice to come back from the Commissioner's office and discuss conversations with the Commissioner with lower ranks.

952 Q. I don't quite follow that. I thought, I'd understood you to indicate you imparted, you relayed to Andrew McLindon --
A. Yes.

953 Q. -- your boss.
A. Yes.

954 Q. Your next line manager up.
A. Yes.

955 Q. You discussed with him this smear campaign?
A. Yes.

956 Q. You did so because he was your line manager?
A. Yes.

957 Q. Right. Because he was your line manager?
A. Yes.

958 Q. Right. Does it not follow from that it would have been logical and natural for you, the Commissioner not having directed you not to, it would have been natural for you to discuss with your line manager down Inspector Ferris?
A. No.

959 Q. Why not?
A. Again I go back to, there's a rank structure, there's
-- conversations with the Commissioner are kept at a certain level and those levels are within the rank structure.
Q. You're not saying, are you, that Commissioner Callinan directed you not to tell it to Inspector Ferris?
A. But I'm going from being a member of the Garda Síochána, I'd know from the protocol, I'd know from out of respect and courtesy to the Commissioner that I wouldn't leave his office and discuss matters that he had told to me with people not within the appropriate level to know.

961 Q. Well, I wonder are we at cross purposes. You see, I had understood you to indicate that you didn't see anything wrong when you got this alleged command to
conduct a smear campaign, you saw nothing wrong in that?
A. No.

Right. Does it also follow you didn't pick up from Commissioner Callinan any sense that he saw something wrong in what he was asking you to do?
A. I can't say what he knew, I can only just say that he gave me an order to carry out an order and I did that.
Q. Or sinister?
A. No.

965 Q. Or dark or secret?
A. No, he was giving me an order to do what I was to do and I executed that order.
Q. But on your evidence, you left the office having been given that command, not burdened down with the sinister secret, because as far as you were concerned, you had not been -- you saw nothing wrong in what you say you were asked to do. Are we agreed about that?
A. Yes.

967 Q. Right. Did you pick up from the Commissioner any sense or impression that he thought there was something wrong 16:25 with what --
A. No.

968 Q. -- he was at? No, you didn't?
A. No.
Q. So that being the case, there would have been no necessity for secrecy, are we agreed with that? There was nothing wrong here?
A. It's a case of the appropriate people to know.

But why was it restricted to just a few people? There was nothing improper with what you had been asked to do, as you saw it?
A. This was an instruction from the Garda Commissioner, it wasn't -- it is not practice and not protocol to discuss orders by the Commissioner with lower ranks.
Q. You see, I'm just a little bit unclear and perhaps you can assist the Tribunal with just actually what your position is. You've heard of that expression the Nuremberg Defence - I knew it was wrong, but I was following orders; that's not your position, is it?
A. No.
Q. You didn't know it was wrong?
A. No.

973 Q. Right. But you claim, don't you, that you didn't see anything wrong with smearing another Garda member, isn't that right?
A. I was bringing information, which was told to me by the Garda Commissioner and I wasn't the one person to go and question the Garda Commissioner's order to me.
974 Q. You did -- sorry.
A. Here was the head of the police service.
Q. Right. Excuse me, I did not mean to interrupt, go ahead there.
A. I beg your forgiveness there.
Q. So as I understand it then, superintendent, you saw nothing wrong with being told to drop into conversations with journalists the fact that Maurice McCabe was -- had been prosecuted for alleged child abuse and that this was the real source of all his grievances and allegations, isn't that so?
A. I never said the world child abuse, I said for a sexual offence.
Q. A11 right.
A. And that it would be investigated in 2006 and this was the motivation for bringing all these matters in relation to penalty points and it was basically his revenge.
Q. And the root cause of his agenda of complaints, isn't that right --
A. Yes.
Q. -- was revenge against the Garda force that had investigated the sexual investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. And implicit in that, isn't it, is that the man isn't to be trusted, because he has improper reasons for making his complaints?
A. In essence, yes.
Q. Yes. And you claim, do you, that it never occurred to you that embarking upon such a demand -- a campaign was 16:28 in any way wrong? That never occurred to you?
A. No.
Q. Are you serious?
A. Yes. I was given an order, a direct order by the Garda

Commissioner. I wasn't there to question his orders. 983 Q. No, no, but that's a different thing as to whether you were compelled by rank to comply with a command. Forget about the compulsion to do so, I'm simply talking about whether it's right or wrong. Is it your evidence that in 2013, for all of 2013 and a good chunk of 2014, and possibly longer, you saw absolutely nothing wrong with such a campaign?
A. No.

984 Q. No? what do you mean no?
A. I saw nothing -- I was executing an order of the Garda Commissioner.
Q. You saw nothing wrong with it?
A. No.

CHA RMAN I think what he means is morally wrong or questionable or something that would make you pause and think about things
A. I didn't pause, Mr. Chairman.

CHA RMAN You didn't see anything morally wrong about it?
A. No.

CHA RMAK Can I ask you to stop there, Mr. O'Higgins? You might like to sit down, superintendent, and we will see what we are doing tomorrow. It's been a long day, thank you. Mr. O'Higgins, we'11 take it up in the morning. If I can't be here at half past ten, I'11 send a text to Mr. Barnes, so at least you can get a cup of coffee or whatever, maybe the third cup of coffee or whatever it is. I was wondering an
indicative time vis-à-vis trying to get, organise other witnesses for tomorrow. what do you think the situation is? I'm not trying to rush you now and I appreciate it's important.
MR. MCFEÁL OHGGN: Yes, I understand, Chairman.
Certainly go to lunch hour, but I imagine after lunch. CHA RMAN Ms. Burns, do you think you will have much in way of mop up?
ME. BURNS: very short.
CHA RMAN So maybe it is possible we should be finished Superintendent Taylor by, say, half two-ish, if it's the normal hour.
MR. MCFEÁL OHGGN: Could I say this, Chairman, he will certainly finish tomorrow. I just don't want to give you a false estimate. I would be hopeful it would 16:30 be not too long after lunch, but --
CHAN RMAN All right. We will organise --
Mr. McGuinness, is that okay with you?
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Can we organise things accordingly, we can?
MR MEGU NESS: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN But certainly not before lunch.
MR. MGGI NESS: No.
CHA RMAN Al1 right. We11, it's good to know that, I think. Thank you very much.
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| $80: 27,217: 19$ programmes [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:29, 121:3, } \\ & \text { 131:12, 131:21, } \end{aligned}$ | publicised [1] - | $77: 15,98: 3,$ | $93: 17,93: 21$ | R |
| $-103: 4$ <br> progress [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:29, 142:8, } \\ & \text { 142:12, 144:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:27 } \\ & \text { publicity [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:28, 99:2, } \\ & \text { 111:29, 117:19, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 167:7, 209:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:24, 144:26, } \\ & \text { 177:16, 177:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 64:17, 139:29 | 119:23, 119:25, <br> 132.2 134:19 | $155: 15,159: 3$ | 133:10 <br> radio [9]-33:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 217:25 } \\ & \text { project [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:6, 178:23, } \\ & \text { 178:29, 179:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $160: 12$ publish [7] | 141:23, 142:9, | 167:14, 167:17, |  |
|  |  |  | 144:16, 145:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 168:22, 169:7, } \\ & \text { 169:27, 171:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:7, 132:17, } \\ & \text { 132:22, 133:28, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 204:4 <br> prolific [3] - | 179:11, 179:14, | $\begin{gathered} \text { publish }[7]- \\ 40: 27,63: 16, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:17, 148:19, } \\ & \text { 149:21, 149:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 171:13, 174:10, | 153:20, 216:24, |
|  | 179:21, 179:29 protection [1] - | $96: 16,138: 7$ | 151:23, 152:5, | 184:26, 191:14 $191 \cdot 26 \quad 191 \cdot 28$ | $217: 16,217: 19$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 223:5 } \\ & \text { proof [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:8 } \\ & \text { protocol }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $154: 14$ <br> published [19] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:7, 155:2, } \\ & \text { 156:1, 161:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 192:3, 193:24, <br> 200:9, 201:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rag }[1]-82: 26 \\ & \text { raise }[4]-39: 22, \\ & 80: 26,82: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $142: 13$ <br> proofing [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:20, } 225: 22, \\ & 227: 9 \\ & \text { proud [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:29, 58:13, } \\ & 90: 7,92: 3,92: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:24, 161:26, } \\ & \text { 170:17, 170:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 201:25, 202:12, <br> 202:14, 202:18 | $166: 17$ <br> raised [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:29 } \\ & \text { proofread [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 202:23 <br> proven [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 137: 7,137: 18 \\ & 139: 14,140: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:23, 172:28, } \\ & \text { 173:20, 177:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 204:15, 206:24, | 158:27, 171:21, |
|  |  | 147:28, 148:4 | 179:7, 181:18, | 213:14 | 185:27, 187:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 29: 22 \\ & \text { proper [2] - } \\ & 203: 7,214: 11 \\ & \text { properly [1] - } \\ & \text { 124:25 } \\ & \text { proposals [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 63:17 <br> provide [14] - <br> 6:23, 7:4, 27:8, <br> 36:24, 42:19, <br> 50:9, 75:17, | 148:23, 179:3, | 183:12, 184:23, | $65: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { random [1] - } \\ & 73: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:8, 179:13, } \\ & \text { 179:16, 192:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:16, 191:22, } \\ & \text { 193:10, 193:13, } \end{aligned}$ | quick [4]-31:1, | rang [20] - |
|  |  | $211: 1$ | 194:20, 198:28, | 31:14, 131:16, | $33: 25,59: 16$ |
|  |  | publishing [2] - | 199:4, 199:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:19 } \\ & \text { quickly [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 29,123: 5 \\ & 123: 6,123: 7 \end{aligned}$ |


| 123:10, 123:21, | reasons [7] - | 83:27, 95:14, | 130:12, 183:22 | 85:18, 101:17, | 222:20, 223:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 124:11, 136:10, | 137:26, 137:27, | 95:22, 95:24, | referring [10] - | 157:23 | 223:29, 228:12 |
| 178:20, 183:7, | 163:2, 163:16, | 95:27, 95:28, | 8:9, 8:21, 11:21, | relates [2] - | relations [2] - |
| 186:21, 186:22, | 166:21, 168:17, | 95:29, 96:6, 96:9, | 20:27, 77:4, 86:1, | 119:15, 158:5 | $70: 26,203: 26$ |
| 186:29, 189:7, | 228:2 | 97:1, 115:14 | 86:21, 110:7, | relating [7] - | relationship [2] |
| 190:25, 217:29, | recalled [2] | 117:26, 154:6, | 144:2, 164:2 | 29:1, 46:17, | - 103:11, 134:3 |
| $218: 1$ | $167: 21,176: 17$ | 154:13, 183:4, | refers [4] - 7:29, | $60: 12,89: 3$ | relationships [1] |
| 72:23, 215:10, | 166:6 | 189:4, 189:28, | 173:29 | $123: 13$ | relatively [4] - |
| 215:25, 224:17, | receive [1] | 190:2, 190:23, | reflect [3]-64:7, | relation [114] - | 160:26, 163:6, |
| 225:15, 225:17, | 206:3 | 211:26, 211:29, | 94:21, 135:22 | 7:29, 8:19, 9:20, | 197:9, 210:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 229:3 } \\ & \text { ranking }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { received [14] - } \\ \text { 12:3, 12:6, 23:18, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 212:9 } \\ & \text { recorded [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reflected [1] - } \\ & 7: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:8, 13:4, 19:7, } \\ & \text { 21:3, 21:4, 21:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relayed [1] - } \\ & \text { 224:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 215:23 | 51:17, 93:26, | $70: 3,111: 2$ | reflection [1] - | $23: 21,26: 4,$ $26: 12,28: 23$ | release [4] - |
| ranks [3] - | 108:11, 114:17, | 127:2, 171:16, | 74:25 | 26:12, 28:23, | 60:14, 90:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 215: 18,224: 22, \\ & 227 \cdot 10 \end{aligned}$ | 122:20, 136:10, | 176:12 | refresh [1] - 66:1 | 28:27, 32:14, | 106:17, 106:21 |
| rare [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 154:28, 182:28, } \\ & \text { 203:22, 216:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $93: 9,135: 19$ | refreshing [1] - $176: 17$ | 34:8, 40:23, 41:5, $42: 8,46: 18$ | released [2] - $106: 19,130: 1$ |
| rather [5] - | 223:24 | records [25] - | refurbishment | 46:29, 51:1, 55:3, | relevant [11] - |
| 41:26, 160:5, | receiving [4] - | 15:2, 24:2, 52:29, | $[1]-203: 4$ | $55: 13,60: 2,61: 1$ | 12:12, 12:15, |
| 162:21, 198:20, | 14:1, 14:4, | 77:1, 77:3, 92:21, | refurbishment | 62:5, 64:13, | 17:20, 29:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 218:8 } \\ & \text { rational [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 144:17, 194:28 } \\ \text { recent [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:13, 122:18, } \\ & \text { 141:14, 141:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{s}[2]-203: 12, \\ & 203: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 67:12, 77:28, 77:29, 79:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:4, 149:6, } \\ & \text { 162:4, 164:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $175: 25$ <br> reaching [2] | $\begin{gathered} \text { 160:28, 168:11 } \\ \text { recently [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:20, 141:21, } \\ & \text { 144:3, 144:4, } \end{aligned}$ | refused [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 9,84: 1,84: 22, \\ & 85: 26,88: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:16, 173:26, } \\ & 178: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 206:12, 213:23 } \\ \text { reaction [6] - } \end{gathered}$ | $160: 26,160: 28$ <br> recipient [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:21, 180:4, } \\ & 180: 9,180: 28, \end{aligned}$ | refusing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 17,91: 2, \\ & 96: 17,100: 1 \end{aligned}$ | reliability [2] - <br> 170:11, 170:14 |
| 136:26, 195:5, | 197:20 | 184:5, 184:6, | 164:14 | $100: 23,105: 6$ | reliable [3] - |
| 195:6, 195:7, | recipients | 185:15, 185:27, | 20:1, 61:6, 98:9, | 106:11, 106:22, | 97:20, 105:28 |
| 195:9, 197:20 | 27:23, 28:6, | 186:5, 188:6, | 105:8, 115:13, | 107:21, 108:4, | 201:20 |
| read [16]-11:20, | 170:26 | 188:16 | 200:24 | 110:17, 116:13, | reliving [1] - |
| 29:24, 31:21, | recites [1] - 70:7 | red [1] - 82:26 | regarding [1] - | 116:15, 117:4, | 151:14 |
| 31:26, 32:6, | recognise [1] - | redaction [1] - | 115:10 | 117:10, 118:24, | relying [1] - |
| 70:11, 77:22, | 152:28 | $186: 17$ | regards [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:22, 123:17, } \\ & \text { 123:18, 123:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $105: 14$ |
| 81:5, 140:20, | recollect [7] | redactions [1] - 69:6 | $58: 2,103: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:18, 123:23, } \\ & \text { 123:24, 123:29, } \end{aligned}$ | remark [7] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:28, 158:14, } \\ & \text { 164:2, 170:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:22, 15:11, } \\ & 54: 5.92: 19 . \end{aligned}$ | 69:6 <br> refer [9]-7:9 | 206:16 | 124:21, 125:10, | 20:11, 48:9, |
| 176:18, 197:13, | $136: 9,179: 24$ | $7: 20,11: 7,20: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { regrettable [1] - } \\ & \text { 67:29 } \end{aligned}$ | 125:15, 125:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:25, 154:7, } \\ & \text { 173:29, 174:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 198:5 | 220:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 2,46: 22 \\ & 68: 23,139: 18 \end{aligned}$ | regular [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:1, 127:12, } \\ & \text { 128:2, 129:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $174: 17$ |
| 9:11, 9:12, 28:29, | - 14:28, 32:14, | 200:23 | 197:6 | 131:27, 134:5, | $109: 12$ |
| 32:8 | 37:20, 47:13, | reference [19] | regularly [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:27, 143:8, } \\ & \text { 143:11. 143:18 } \end{aligned}$ | remarks [1] - |
| reads [3] - 31:5, | $52: 11,52: 19$ | 12:12, 12:16, | $195: 20,206: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:11, 143:18, } \\ & \text { 143:24, 143:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 21:8 |
| 109:6, 156:14 $\text { real }[3]-57: 6$ | $53: 11,53: 12$ | $59: 3,69: 11,$ | rehearse [1] - | 144:21, 150:6, | remember [16] - |
| 163:18, 228:5 | $55: 20,58: 24,$ | $69: 12,81: 27$ | 13:20 <br> reheated | 151:7, 151:28, | 82:7, 147:9, |
| realised [2] - | 82:3, 82:14, 91:4, | 82:22, 86:5, | 138:22 | 152:21, 154:27, | 149:11, 155:17, |
| 94:22, 199:7 | 112:29, 141:12, | 86:24, 141:29, | Reilly [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:11, 164:12, } \\ & \text { 166:9, 166:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 172:8, 180:10, |
| really [6] - | 141:20, 178:13, | 153:18, 156:27, | 176:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:9, 166:20, } \\ & \text { 167:4, 167:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 180:17, 181:11, |
| $34: 14,78: 3,$ 83:15. 126:27. | 178:20, 180:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:27, 162:4, } \\ & 164: 17,180: 8 \end{aligned}$ | reinvestigated | 170:16, 170:19, | 182:20, 186:29, |
| $186: 25,206: 12$ | 188:4, 188:29, | references [1] - | [1] - 139:19 | 171:2, 171:27, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:6, 221:28, } \\ & \text { 223:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| reason [14]- | $189: 7,220: 7$ | 197:18 |  | 172:20, 173:15, | remembered [1] |
| 35:2, 55:27, 59:5, | recommending | referral [2] | rejecting [2] - | 174:19, 175:23, | - 180:29 |
| 65:8, 94:23, | [1] - 69:26 | 124:23, 124:25 | $174: 20,174: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:25, 183:15, } \\ & \text { 189:14, 190:12, } \end{aligned}$ | remembering |
| 106:2, 114:20, | reconstructed | referred [12] - | relate [2] - | 191:17, 192:12, | [1] - 212:7 |
| 159:14, 162:22, | [1] - 180:7 | 9:5, 9:20, 23:27, | 23:14, 84:4 | 92:22. 195: | remind [1] - |
| 163:26, 170:10, | record [28] - | 33:12, 42:1, 46:9, | related [7] - | 197:9, 204:16, | 176:7 |
| 184:4, 211:24, | 14:12, 15:11, | 77:4, 84:21, <br> 88:10, 92.24 | $16: 15,31: 8$ | 204:24, 214:11, | reminding [1] - |
| 223:8 | 27:14, 59:25, | 88:10, 92:24, | $42: 26,50: 12$ | 214:20, 219:9, | 142:22 |



| 15:7, 176:16, | 186:29, 189:11, | 147:24, 152:4, | 37:11, 40:23, | 199:16, 200:1, | shock [3] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 182:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 190:19, 197:16, } \\ & \text { 197:22, 198:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:21, 183:4, } \\ & \text { 201:2, 206:28, } \end{aligned}$ | 40:27, 41:6, 42:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 204: 26,216: 15, \\ & 216 \cdot 16 \\ & \hline 16 \cdot 25 \end{aligned}$ | 102:8, 138:28, |
| 227:2 | 215:7, 215:19, | 208:29, 211:20, | 45:6, 46:17, 48:2, | serial [1] - | shook [3] - |
| secret [6] | 216:4, 225:27 | 226:5, 226:10, | 48:12, 48:21, | 108:21 | 80:20, 125:19, |
| 10:26, 102:14, | 225:28, 227:11, | 226:24 | 49:23, 50:29, | serious [7] | 153:8 |
| 103:20, 117:26, | 227:19, 229:19, | ensitive [1] | 57:23, 59:6 | 12:27, 85:26 | [3] - 56 |
| 226:15, 226:20 | 229:24 <br> seein | $206: 9$ | $59: 18,62: 14$ $63: 8,63: 9,64$ | 91:8, 133:25, | 169:15, 230:9 |
| 196:7 | 42:1, 182:20 | 15:17, 24:22 | 64:13, 64:18, | 228:28 |  |
| Security [8] - | seek [6]-33:25, | 24:29, 25:25, | 64:25, 65:5, | served [3] - | shortly [5] - |
| 116:24, 117:11, | 33:26, 36:22, | 28:21, 28:29 | 69:19, 72:29, | 19:1, 67:8, 70:26 | 16:22, 57:8, |
| 118:6, 118:7, | 85:16, 103:3, | 31:28, 33:6 | 73:19, 79:24, | service [4] - | 59:28, 121:4, |
| 118:23, 119:7, | 217:16 | 54:15, 59:24 | 80:24, 81:20, | 103:24, 184:6, | 155:18 |
| $119: 12,120: 7$ | seem [10]-35:1, $44 \cdot 26,52 \cdot 24$ | $66: 25,69: 26,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:23, 81:26, } \\ & 81: 29,82: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $203: 19,227: 26$ | should've [1] - |
| see | $53: 28$ | 111: | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 29, \\ & 82: 19, \end{aligned}$ | serving [3] | $114$ |
| 17:27, 18:24, | 136:21, 186:9, | 113:24, 114:16, | $87: 28,88: 1$ | 85:27 | 25:29, 26:2, 26:9, |
| 22:13, 24:12, | 208:3, 212:6 | 114:21, 122:28, | 88:18, 88:27 | session [1] | 26:11, 92:21, |
| 29:14, 29:15, | seized [2] | 131:25, 158:28, | 89:28, 94:3, | 7:26 | 102:28, 110:16, |
| 29:18, 31:4, | 113:21, 114:2 | 222:17, 222:22, | 94:10, 94:18, | set [5] - 162:13, | 113:22, 117:22, |
| 32:12, 32:19, | selective [1] - | 223:9 | 96:19, 96:22, | 166:10, 172:13 | 125:22, 157:14, |
| 35:8, 41:20, | 140:28 | sentence [8] | 97:13, 97:17, | 196:21, 203:9 | 187:27, 188:7, |
| 41:25, 42:15, | sells [2] | 31:26, 31:27 | 97:27, 98:5, 98:7, | setting [3] - | 209:21, 217:9, |
| 42:21, 42:24, | 103:20, 103:21 | 31:29, 44:27, | 100:7, 100:14, | 61:23, 145:25, | 217:15 |
| 45:16, 46:22, | send [10]-25:1, | 89:24, 158:23 | 101:11, 102:18, | 151:24 | Show [1] - |
| $47: 28,49: 7$, $52: 16,52.29$, | 25:6, 26:16, | 179:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:20, 105:24, } \\ & 106: 11, ~ 108: 29 \end{aligned}$ | settling [1] - | 132:11 |
| 52:16, 52:29, | 46:20, 111:12, | sentences [1] |  | 129:12 | showed [3] - |
| 53:18, 53:20, | 132:12, 132:17, | 178:29 | 109:4, 109:27, | seven [2] | 40:27, 71:14, |
| 53:28, 54:15, | 155:27, 222:13, | separate [7] |  | 100:17, 156:13 | 77:6 |
| $63: 15,64: 2,64: 3$, $78: 4,82 \cdot 13$ | 229:27 | $8: 11,8: 28,9: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:24, 112:7, } \\ & \text { 112:24, 112:25, } \end{aligned}$ | seventeen [1] - | showing [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 78: 4,82: 13 \\ & 94: 21.94: 27 \end{aligned}$ | sender [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:12, 118:20, } \\ & 119: 12.119: 27 \end{aligned}$ | 112:24, 112:25, 112:29, 113:11, | $53: 4$ | $53: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 94: 21,94: 27, \\ & 96: 1,96: 21,97 \end{aligned}$ | 223:5 | 119:12, 119:2 separately | 113:16, 114:9, | several [1] - | shown [4] - |
| 97:29, 101:3, | 111:6, 116:14, | $36: 21,37: 5,$ | 117:15, 118:23, | 166:2 $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s e x }}[2]-89$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 12,90: 26, \\ & 117: 7,137: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 101:11, 101:14, | 133:14, 222:18, | 44:16 | 118:28, 119:6, | 108:21 | shows [4] - |
| $102: 18,103: 6$, $105: 19,106: 13$, | 223:15, 224:6 | September [12] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:23, 119:24, } \\ & \text { 120:21, 120:22, } \end{aligned}$ | sexual [17] - | 14:18, 132:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:19, 106:13, } \\ & 106: 19,106: 24 \end{aligned}$ | senior [25] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 27,23: 23, \\ & 24: 14,36: 5.39: 9 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 21,120: 22, \\ & 120: 25,120: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $42: 10,44: 19$ | $153: 21,217: 16$ |
| 107:20, 109:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:20, 8:13, 33:7, } \\ & 41: 6,62: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 24:14, 36:5, 39:9, 59:29, 77:6, | 124:26, 125:20, | 48:28, 48:29, | side [6] - 18:4, |
| 109:20, 113:19, | 83:18, 83:25, | 106:29, 144:22 | 126:17, 127:8, | 57:26, 73:25, | 99:29, 208:6 |
| 114:8, 115:7 | 84:20, 85:7, 86:1, | 145:3, 177:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 127: 19,128: 22, \\ & 129: 1.129: 26, \end{aligned}$ | 81:28, 91:6, 94:7, | sight [1] - 22:23 |
| 119:5, 120:28, | 86:27, 87:8, | 178:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:1, 129:26, } \\ & \text { 130:17, 130:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $96: 25,100: 8$ | sign [2] - |
| 123:18, 124:10, 124:17, 128:4. | 87:26, 88:9, | sequence [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:17, 130:29, } \\ & \text { 131:8, 131:28, } \end{aligned}$ | 134:13, 136:23, | 164:26, 164:29 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 124: 17,128: 4, \\ & 128: 29.130: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 89:26, 90:15, | 15:15, 171:7 | 134:13, 134:24, | $228: 7,228: 18$ | signed [1] - |
| 130:19, 132:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 6,92: 11, \\ & 110: 1.111: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sergeant }[1] \\ & 69: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 135:15, 135:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shake }[1] \text { - } \\ & 126: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 61:16 |
| 134:11, 134:25, | 111:19, 154:4, | Sergeant [160] - | 135:22, 136:21, | 126:6 <br> shane [1]-6:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { significance [1] } \\ & -21: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 135:18, 137:4, | 157:4, 215:4, | 6:21, 7:3, 7:28, | 137:6, 137:9, $139: 15,140: 1$ | shape [1] - 34:2 | significant [5] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:19, 138:20, } \\ & \text { 139:25, 140:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 216:19 | $8: 8,8: 14,8: 19$, $12 \cdot 20,13: 15$ | 140:28, 143:11, | shared [2] - | 106:13, 137:8, |
| 141:9, 153:2 | sense [30] 29:22, $43: 25$ | 12:20, 13:15 | 146:21, 146:28, | 63:20, 153:8 | 147:25, 148:9, |
| 155:4, 155:11, | $60: 4,62: 4,90: 28$ | $19: 14,20: 19$ | 147:27, 151:1, | sharp [1] - 73 <br> Shatter [1]- | 218:8 |
| 155:16, 156:12, | 91:6, 91:15, | 20:27, 21:20, | 153:22, 171:19, | $48: 10$ | 121:28 |
| 165:8, 165:17, | 98:27, 99:22, | $25: 7,26: 5,26: 10$ | 172:2, 173:7, 173:23, 174:20, | Shatter's [1] - | silence [1] - |
| 176:19, 177:26, | 99:23, 101:1, | 26:12, 26:19, | $175: 23.178: 4 .$ | 88:1 | 216:24 |
| 179:17, 179:25, | 103:15, 105:23, | 27:2, 27:13, | $192 \cdot 14.194: 2$ | shell [1] - 138:28 | silhouette [1] - |
| 180:6, 180:12, | 106:15, 119:20, | 28:23, 30:6, | $196 \cdot 1 \quad 197 \cdot 1$ | shift [1] - 162:9 | $45: 20$ |
| 181:6, 182:8, <br> $182 \cdot 15,182 \cdot 18$, | 119:22, 129:7, | 30:28, 31:21, | 197:9, 197:18, | shifts [1] - | silicone [1] - |
| 182:15, 182:18, | 129:21, 133:15, | 32:19, 37:9, | 197:21, 198:4, | 130:26 | 116:7 |


| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i m }}$ [4] - 114:29, | 95:9, 128:1, | 93:7, 137:25, | 168:18, 168:19, | 141:6, 153:17, | 17:16, 19:7, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 115:18, 115:29, | 142:7 | 210:11, 211:16, | 168:21, 168:22, | 178:14, 193:4, | 19:28, 21:26, |
| 116:2 | slipped [2] - | 211:17 | $168: 29,228: 5$ | 208:26, 208:27, | $22: 1,22: 11,$ |
| similar [4]- | 127:24, 128:6 | somewhat [1] - | sources [30] - | 210:3, 210:9, | 23:23, 27:17, |
| 27:25, 136:15, | slipping [1] - | 16:15 | 7:19, 23:15 | 210:17, 211:27, | 28:10, 28:12, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 175:12, } 175: 17 \\ \text { similarly }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $102: 5$ SM3 | somewhere [2] - $102: 11,117: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 14,50: 1 \\ & 50: 19,51: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 218:22, 222:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 9,38: 16, \\ & 38: 21,42: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| 188:16 | small [4] - 143:3, | soon [2] - 9:24, | $60: 2,60: 9,65: 20$ | 223:10 | 42:29, 44:10, |
| SIMON [2] - | 169:26, 210:25 | 155:13 | 85:7, 85:10, 86:1, | spokesman [4] - | 45:5, 46:10, |
| 3:21, 3:21 | smear [34] - | sorry [53] - 6:4, | 86:2, 86:21, | 88:25, 92:28, | 47:25, 51:14, |
| simple | 26:14, 149:6 | 16:19, 25:12 | 86:24, 88:26 | 93:9, 132:5 | 58:21, 63:28, |
| 21:6, 184:12 | 149:26, 194:29, 195:19, 196:21, | $28: 2,30: 17$, $30: 25,31: 29$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 15,91: 23, \\ & 95: 29,96: 10, \end{aligned}$ | spreading [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 15,69: 16 \\ & 69: 21,74: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11:10, 66:24, | 197:1, 198:3, | 36:13, 36:14 | 96:24, 97:3, | $94: 10$ | 76:12, 77:25, |
| 160:14, 162:22, | 199:15, 199:23, | $53: 21,53: 27,$ | 101:19, 101:21, | SQUARE ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 80:9, 80:17, 81:4, |
| 168:14, 168:20, | 204:17, 204:21, | $54: 20,62: 9,66: 9,$ | 101:27, 101:29, | $4: 11$ | 81:5, 82:15, 97:2, $130: 5,132: 11 .$ |
| 168:28, 168:29, | 207:22, 207:26, | 71:27, 79:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 154: 9,163: 4 \\ & 163: 5,168: 24 \end{aligned}$ | staff [3] - 98:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:5, 132:11, } \\ & \text { 142:10, 142:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 199:13, 201:19, | 208:18, 209:10, | $80: 14,83: 14$ | $163: 5,168: 24$ | $99: 5,99: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:10, 142:19, } \\ & \text { 152:15, 180:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 229:4 } \\ & \text { sincerity [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:23, 209:26, } \\ & \text { 210:28. 212:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 8,98: 3 \\ & 100: 15,100 \end{aligned}$ | spare [1] - 10:19 <br> speaking [6] - | stage [19]-24:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:15, 180:12, } \\ & \text { 180:28, 185:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 170:11, 170:13 | 212:19, 213:22, | 100:23, 100:24, | 43:17, 92:19 | 61:8, 67:5, 76:11, | 195:8 |
| single [2] - | 214:16, 214:28, | 113:2, 115:23 | 178:24, 204:7 | 76:16, 92:7, | Statement [1] - |
| 89:24, 171:29 | 215:2, 215:26, | 118:3, 120:2, | 215:1, 224:7 | 110:7, 122:25, | $9: 12$ |
| sinist | 216:8, 216:15, | 121:14, 123:6 | special [1] | 137:21, 139:9 | statements [15] |
| $79: 21,226: 13$ | 217:6, 218:13, | 126:15, 129:8, | 119:8 | 140:23, 148:18, | - 7:9, 7:11, 18:23, |
| $226: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 221: 10,224: 1, \\ & 225: 2.226: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:20, 139:17, } \\ & \text { 141:10. 141:27. } \end{aligned}$ | specific [13] - <br> 14.26, 150.14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:14, 156:28, } \\ & 166: 14,186: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 14,37: 25, \\ & 41: 9,46: 27, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { sit [6] - 9:28, } \\ \text { 11:20, 160:5, } \end{array}$ | smearing [4] | 161:9, 161:11, | 151:2, 152:10, | stages [1] - | 61:14, 61:18, |
| 160:6, 202:4, | 198:24, 206:13, | 161:12, 166:26, | 153:15, 171:29, | 121:27 | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 10,95: 17 \\ & 95: 23,170: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 229:23 } \\ & \text { sitting } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 218:16, 227:20 } \\ \text { smears [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:11, 169:12, } \\ & \text { 193:22, 198:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 172: 3,172: 22 \\ & 193: 10,199: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { stance }[2] \text { - } \\ 35: 4,175: 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 23,170: 17 \\ & \text { 179:20, 194:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 17:29, 18:5, | 198:29 | 198:20, 200:4, | 207:24, 211:2 | stand [4] | stating [1] - |
| $130: 11$ | $\text { so" [1] - } 41$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:27, 202:3, } \\ & 213: 3,216: 14, \end{aligned}$ | specifically [8] - 7:27, 9:8, 11:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:24, 108:1, } \\ & 190: 7,220: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:23 } \\ & \text { station [2] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| situation [14] <br> 67.29.96.16, | so.. [1]-208:10 <br> Soap [2] - 76:23 | $217: 25,227: 25$ | $30: 9,30: 29$ | standalone ${ }_{[2]}$ | $59: 16,130: ?$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:29, 96:16, } \\ & \text { 124:19, 126:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Soap [2] - 76:23, } \\ & 76: 24 \end{aligned}$ | sort [1] - 146:9 | 131:12, 190:13, | $\begin{gathered} \text { standalone [2] - } \\ \text { 119:11, 119:27 } \end{gathered}$ | stations [2] |
| 128:3, 137:14, | soft [1] - 30:18 | sought [7] - | 200:23 | standing [5] | $106: 22,153: 20$ |
| 139:2, 152:18, | sole [2]-64:22, | 23:19, 33:25, | specificity [3]- | 17:12, 18:6, | status [1] - |
| 164:23, 166:19, | $101: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 28,183: 21 \\ & 185: 15.185: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:9, 201:13 } \\ & 207: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $22: 23,22: 24,$ | 116:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 168: 10,190: 10 \\ & 199: 19,230: 3 \end{aligned}$ | Solely [3] 114:15, 150 |  | specifics | stands $[2$ | 206:22 |
| situations [3] - | solicitor [6] | source [46] | 190:12, 190:15, | $219: 27,223: 1$ | stayed [1] |
| 133:9, 144:8, | 23:27, 24:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 17,7: 18,9: 22, \\ & \text { 10:25, 60:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 201:3, 207:5, | star [3] - 193:24, | 206:21 |
| 172:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 26,75: 14, \\ & 186: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:25, 60:8, } \\ & \text { 83:18, 83:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 221:14 } \\ & \text { spectacularl } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 194:4, } 196: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { steam [1] - } \\ & 224: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 30:22, 53:4, | solicitor's [1] - | 84:21, 84:27 | [1] - 199:2 | 146:10, 172:11, | stemmed [1] - |
| 69:16, 90:9, | 38:18 | 85:20, 87:10, | spent [1] - | 202:17, 205:15, | 64:14 |
| 143:4, 156:12, | SOLICITORS [6] | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 16,87: 26, \\ & 88: 9,89: 4,89: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 117:19 | $213: 13$ | step [3] - 96:4, |
| 173:28 | $-3: 6,3: 11,3: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:9, 89:4, 89:26, } \\ & 90: 18,92: 11, \end{aligned}$ | spill [1] - 9:14 | started [3] - | 186:10 |
| skin [1] - 199:8 | $3: 29,4: 3,4: 10$ | 90:18, 92:11, | spiritual [2] - | 143:13, 150:28, | step-by-step [1] |
| Skylon [1] - | solicitors [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:15, 154:11, } \\ & \text { 158:3, 159:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $113: 4,113: 13$ | 190:28 | - 96:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:28 } \\ & \text { Slavic [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 23:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:3, 159:19, } \\ & \text { 159:20, 159:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spoken [31] - } \\ & \text { 61:6, 61:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { starting [3]- } \\ \text { 143:10. 203:22. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stephen [1] - } \\ & \text { 90:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $119: 19$ | 192:7 | 159:24, 162:27, | 61:19, 61:23, | $207: 13$ | stepping [1] - |
| slight [1] - | someone [7] - | 163:3, 163:7, | 61:25, 84:22, | state [3]-80:22, | $25: 19$ |
| 173:25 | 9:2, 11:21, 49:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:8, 163:9, } \\ & 163: 11,163: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 88:16, 91:9, | $221: 29,222: 4$ | steps [3]- |
| slightly [3] - | 60:18, 73:24, | 163:11, 163:13, | 92:11, 100:28, | statement [52] - | 102:28, 189:14, |
| 176:2, 177:13, | 149:18, 153:11 |  | 101:1, 101:5, | 7:21, 7:25, 7:29, | 189:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 180:13 } \\ & \text { slip [5] - 95:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sometimes [9] - } \\ & 34: 22,59: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 168:4, 168:7, } \\ & \text { 168:15, 168:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:1, 133:15, } \\ & \text { 135:14, 140:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 21,9: 5,9: 20 \\ & 13: 5,16: 18,17: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stick }[3] \text { - } \\ & \text { 128:23, 128:26, } \end{aligned}$ |


| 187:3 | straightaway [1] | 19:19, 38:20, | 75:27 | 184:16, 184:19, | 195:12, 195:14, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sticking [3] - | - 131:19 | 138:21, 174:6, | summary [1] - | 184:20, 187:13, | $195: 15$ |
| 39:26, 167:22, | straightforwar | 189:3, 189:29, | 42:24 | 187:23, 188:3, | surprised [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:28 } \\ & \text { still r91 - 11:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{d}[4]-168: 26, \\ & 168: 28,169: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 192:11, 193:18 <br> subsequently | summation [2] - <br> 107:16, 110:12 | 188:28, 189:25, | $194: 26,195: 3$ <br> surrounding [1] |
| 61:3, 79:22, | 169:6 | [10] - 19:6, 38:7, | summer [2] | 191:23, 191:27, | $-48: 10$ |
| 91:12, 94:28, | strands [2] - | 55:24, 60:1, | 39:15, 208:12 | 191:29, 192:4, | suspect [2] - |
| 116:4, 117:25, | 29:8, 156:16 | 71:17, 75:17, | summertime [1] | 192:27, 193:2, | $157: 5,158: 7$ |
| 132:29, 216:23 | strange [1] - | 124:15, 138:7, | - 208:13 | 193:12, 193:15, | suspended [2] - |
| stood [2] - | 199:19 | 139:23, 179:16 | Sun [1]-36:20 | 193:25, 194:2, | 105:29, 125:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 186: 7,206: 11 \\ & \text { stop [4] }-47: 1 \end{aligned}$ | strategy [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { substance [3] } \\ & 93: 29,143: 25, \end{aligned}$ | Sunday [10] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:16, 202:10, } \\ & \text { 215:25, 216:12, } \end{aligned}$ | sustained [2] 107:10, 109.28 |
| 85:16, 123:12, | streamlining [1] | 143:26 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 26,16: 16, \\ & 16: 23,51: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $230: 11$ | sworn [2] - 16:4, |
| 229:22 | - 203:13 | substantially [1] | $53: 16,59: 2$ | superintendent | 189:8 |
| stopping [1] - | $\begin{array}{r}\text { STREET [3] - } \\ 3.7 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | - 85:9 | 62:20, 63:21, | [31] - 8:18, 66:10, 69:28. 72:5. | sympathetic [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:4 } \\ & \text { store }[1]-212: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3: 7,3: 12,3: 22 \\ \text { street }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { substantiate } \\ & -63: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $207: 11$ <br> Superintenden | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 28,72: 5, \\ & 77: 16,78: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $-170: 8$ <br> sympathised [1] |
| stories [22] - | 103:15 | substantiates | t [112]-6:12, 6:15, | 79:14, 109:8, | - 124:19 |
| 45:14, 53:17, | strike [2] - | [1] - 186:18 | 8:4, 9:16, 10:2, | 122:20, 122:27, | sympathising |
| 63:22, 63:24, | 194:9, 194:17 | succeeding $^{[1]}$ - | 11:4, 11:18, | 123:5, 124:24, | [1]-126:10 |
| 64:9, 91:8, 101:17, 103:18, | strong [2] - | $218: 15$ | 12:17, 13:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:27, 125:9, } \\ & \text { 125:10, 125:16, } \end{aligned}$ | sympathy [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:17, 103:18, } \\ & \text { 103:20, 126:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $37: 19,92: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { success [1] - } \\ & 202: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:29, 23:7, } \\ & 25: 10,30: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:10, 125:16, } \\ & \text { 127:28, 142:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $68: 10$ <br> synopsis [6] - |
| $134: 5,138: 22$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { strong } \\ 168: 13 \end{gathered}$ | successfully [1] | 34:15, 36:12, | 154:3, 159:7, | synopsis [6] - |
| 140:4, 196:7, | structure [4] - | - 159:22 | 36:14, 60:14, | 159:11, 169:24, | $70: 2,70: 3,78: 7$ |
| 196:9, 196:10, | 215:10, 224:17, | suddenly [1] - | $60: 24,62: 21,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:25, 184:1, } \\ & \text { 186:21, 187:11 } \end{aligned}$ | synopsise [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:11, 197:8, } \\ & \text { 197:11, 216:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 225: 15,225: 18 \\ \text { structured }[1] \end{gathered}$ | $73: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 3,77: 20, \\ & 78: 27.79: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $202: 18,203: 2$ | 197:15 |
| 216:21 <br> story $[5$ | 166:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 12,32: 28, \\ & 85: 11,92: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 11,81: 13, \\ & 93: 24,98: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 205: 19,228: 1, \\ & 229: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $-23: 1$ |
| $29: 18,37: 6$ | structures [1] - $85: 12$ | $85$ | 99:11, 99:22 | SUPERINTEND | system [8]- |
| 39:27, 40:24, | stuck [4] | 117:19, 118:27, | 105:4, 105:28, | ENT [2] - 5:3, 13:1 | 119:18, 119:27, |
| 40:25, 55:7, | 22:27, 185:23, | 119:5, 120:24, | 106:27, 106:28, | Superintenden | 119:28, 138:29, |
| 55:10, 55:14, | 187:1, 211:21 | 121:5, 126:13, | 107:2, 107:8, | ts [1] - 124:9 | 203:15, 209:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 56: 11,56: 20, \\ & 57: 20,58: 10, \end{aligned}$ | stuff [4]-- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:17, 127:15, } \\ & \text { 128:29, 130:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:13, 109:27, } \\ & \text { 112:4, 113:2, } \end{aligned}$ | superintendent <br> s [1] - 215:28 | systems [1] - |
| 58:11, 58:19, | 117:13, 207:21, 207:23 | 140:25, 141:28, | 116:1, 118:19, | supervises [1] - | Síochána [22] - |
| 60:23, 60:25, | sub [1] - 198:22 | 142:11, 148:9, | 120:14, 122:21, | 121:28 | $6: 20,8: 14,18: 29$ |
| 64:28, 65:18, | sub-headline [1] | 152:5, 152:17, $174: 24,175: 25$ |  |  | 23:17, 27:22, |
| 65:21, 66:6, | - 198:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 174: 24,175: 25 \\ & \text { 188:27, 189:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:10, 123:15, } \\ & \text { 123:16, 123:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 10,35: 15, \\ & 35: 16,67: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 51:5, 62:14, |
| 79:18, 79:21, | $10: 28,100: 14$ | 190:4, 190:9, | 123:26, 123:28, | 68:15, 191:10, | 101:8, 101:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 79: 23,92: 22, \\ & \text { 132:28, 132:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 101:6, 113:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:9, 192:19, } \\ & 213: 23,214: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:7, 124:11, } \\ & \text { 125:5, 125:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 197:21, 198:22 } \\ \text { suppose [6] - } \end{gathered}$ | 103:10, 103:11, |
| 133:1, 134:27, | 118:9, 118:13, | 213.23, | 125:16, 125:25, | $9: 14,115: 13$ | 114:23, 118:16, |
| 138:23, 140:10, | 155:8, 157:5, | 6:10, 9:6, 120:9, | 126:18, 126:23, | 151:13, 159:5, | 164:25, 201:17, |
| 147:26, 148:3, | 166:6, 195:25, | 149:6, 149:16, | 127:5, 127:24 | 166:4, 198:15 | 204:4, 215:28, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:28, 155:11, } \\ & \text { 189:15, 196:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 204:28 | 174:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:6, 128:9, } \\ & \text { 143:2, 154:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { supposed }[3] \text { - } \\ & 8: 22,12: 27, \end{aligned}$ | 225:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:20, 197:17, } \\ & \text { 197:18, 197:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $[1]-150: 15$ | - 30:27, 77:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:2, 159:14, } \\ & \text { 161:26, 162:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 193:1 | T |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:26, 208:7, } \\ & \text { 209:24, 210:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 160:9, 160:17 | $96: 29,118: 25,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:19, 163:22, } \\ & \text { 164:18. 165:11. } \end{aligned}$ | $126: 28,138: 17$ |  |
| 216:22, 216:27, | submissions [2] | $131: 2,150: 20$ | 166:6, 166:15, | 41:11, 41:12, | $147: 15$ |
| 217:12, 217:23 | submit [3] - | suggestion [3] - | 167:5, 167:10, | 71:27, 71:29, | tales [1] - |
| story' [1] - 54:12 story's [1] - | 162:25, 162:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:14, 121:6, } \\ & 127: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:18, 169:14, } \\ & \text { 171:10, 173:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 5,72: 15, \\ & 72: 16,72: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:13 } \\ & \text { tangible [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $218: 4$ | 168:13 | 127:29 <br> suggestions [1] | 174:23, 175:8, | $72: 20,72: 22$ | $151: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { straight }[1] \text { - } \\ & 12: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { submitted [1] - } \\ & 190: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $-133: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 177:1, 177:4, } \\ & \text { 181:3, 184:14 } \end{aligned}$ | surprise [5] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taoiseach [3] - } \\ \text { 18:28, 19:11, } \end{gathered}$ |
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