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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FQLLOVS, ON VEDNESDAY, 30TH MAY 2018:

MS. LEADER: The former Commissioner was being cross-examined by Mr. O'Higgins.

CHA RMAN I thought there was an application for representation.
MS. LEADER: Yes, by Mr. Kierans' solicitor. I don't know if he's actually present, sorry, Chairman, at this very minute.
CHA RMAN A11 right, we'11 take it when he comes. MR. CHRI STOPHER MECANE Yes, Chairman. Christopher McCann, McCann Fitzgerald Solicitors. I would like to make an application for representation on behalf of my client John Kierans.

CHA RMAN I'm sorry, I can't see you. Would you just wave you arm? Just remind me who Mr. Kierans is please. MR. CHR STOPHER MECANE Mr. Kierans is the Editor-in-Chief of the Mirror, the Daily Mirror operations in Ireland.
CHA RMAN And he's due to give evidence?
MR. CHRI STOPHER MECANK In the morning session, I understand. But as the Tribunal may be aware, Mr. Kierans is being reinterviewed this morning, so I think that that is going to push his calling into the afternoon. So if the Tribunal is amenable, I can make the application when he's called or --
CHAI RMAN All right. Application granted. Okay, thank you, M. O'Higgins.

MR. LEHANE: Sorry, Chairman, I'm just applying, I have an application for representation on behalf of Anne Harris. Darren Lehane, instructed by Patrick F. o'Reilly \& Company Solicitors, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN Yes, granted. All right, Mr. O'Higgins. MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Good morning, Chairman. CHA RMAN We11, I don't do "good mornings", Mr. O'Higgins. But anyway, let's carry on.
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Chairman, late in the afternoon yesterday you requested that we seek specific
instructions with regard to certain matters in the judicial review papers, and $I$ spent some considerable time last night reading the papers and involved in fairly lengthy conversations with my solicitor, who was also liaising with Superintendent Taylor, and I'm satisfied that this is quite a complex issue, it's not, in my respectful submission, susceptible to a simple one line "yes", two line "no".

You have raised a number of specific issues and inquired as to whether Superintendent Taylor is standing firm on those issues or whether he's withdrawing them, and obviously the consequences in respect of that for him, within the confines of this hearing, could be quite serious.

Having read the judicial review papers and having looked at some of the excerpts from the daily transcripts and what was said by Superintendent Taylor
in evidence, it seems very clear to me that what Superintendent Taylor was saying was that he had a set of complaints about how he was treated within the confines in respect of the matter for which he was arrested. He has said in very clear and unadorned terms 'I'm not suggesting that they' - these are the people who were involved in the arrest - 'did anything improper, I'm not impugning their integrity, I'm not impugning their rights.'

And his complaint, succinctly summarised, in my respectful submission, is as follows. whether he be right or wrong about this is immaterial, in my respectful submission, but his state of mind is 'I was a Garda superintendent. I was the first Garda superintendent in the history of the State ever to be arrested. It was not necessary to arrest me. I would have attended for a voluntary interview'. As his affidavit discloses, he did attend for a subsequent and second interview, which was voluntary and passed off without incident; that it was not necessary that he should have his epaulets removed, his belt removed, his laces removed and placed in a prison cell. And from his perspective, that caused him, on a human level I think very understandably, significant humiliation and significant embarrassment. And that is his complaint. But it seemed to me from the turn of events in the late afternoon that, somehow or other, it was seen to be suggested that his complaint was of a wider variety,
that despite the fact that it was made absolutely crystal clear that the -- the fact that he was a suspect was valid, the fact that he was arrested was valid, i.e. there was a reasonable suspicion generated to justify an arrest, that a detention was justified. There seemed to be some undercurrent as to whether we were somehow -- whether he was how saying that this was Commissioner o'sullivan's doing. It was not, and no such case is being made.

So the position as of now is that, in my respectful submission, the remarks in the Statements of Grounds, which are subject to a verifying affidavit, are within a particular narrow context, but mindful of the potential serious outcome of this, I do want further time so that my solicitor can sit down with Mr. Taylor, if necessary with counse1 and to go through the affidavit line by line. I'm not familiar with the case, I wasn't instructed in it and I'm going to need a little bit of time to do that, so I'm going to ask you for some time to do that.
CHA RMAN Mr. O'Higgins, the affidavit and the judicial review papers were distributed in relation to this module and have extensively been commented on in the course of evidence, including by your client. Now, 10:11 it seems to me that there's somewhat of cross-purposes going on here and it may help if I try to clarify matters.

MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: I would be obliged.

CHA RMAN The person in the witness-box was the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána. David Taylor, when he left the Press office, in consequence of an order by this witness, decided to cause immense trouble, inter alia, by getting details of investigations and by leaking them wholesale to the press - these included murder and rape investigations - in circumstances where those investigations could have been compromised underline could have been compromised.
when that investigation took place and when this witness was the chief policeman/woman in the State, David Taylor was justifiably arrested. He decided to say nothing, as was his right, when questioned in relation to these matters, but he has now admitted in evidence some years later that of course, yes, he was doing all of these things and he finds it regrettable.

But that's not the point. The point is this: There's a core allegation made by David Taylor against Nóirín O'Sullivan, which is that he actually went in and actually discussed the campaign that he was running, he says, on behalf of Commissioner Callinan against Maurice McCabe with Nóirín O'Sullivan. No times, no dates, no details, no surrounding circumstances are supplied, but it is very definite, on his evidence, that he discussed that with her and that she did not demur or comment and it was a case, therefore, of tacit acceptance. And there are circumstances where failing
to protest is equivalent to guilt. This would be one of them.

Faced with the trouble of having been arrested and having disciplinary charges coming against him, he took 10:14 an application in the High Court, which has been distributed in the papers here over months, which has been discussed in the transcripts here over months, and in that he says, inter alia, the investigation was biased because Commissioner o'sullivan was behind it, she put her husband into it. His wife says the husband was there in order to get a charge against him, to make that successful. He says as well that his phones were seized, and the implication is, even though he has now disavowed it, and what he apparently said to other people - and whether that was said or not is something on which I reserve my decision - that there were incriminating texts flying between Martin Callinan as Commissioner and him and reports flying from him to Martin Callinan on the campaign that was being waged against Maurice McCabe, which was copied to Nóirín o'Sullivan.

He says further and said further to public representatives and in his judicial review that his phones were seized in order that the Garda would cover up this campaign. Now, that is what he said to other people. He now says something different, I agree, and in that respect, as I said yesterday, that water is
under the bridge; he said there was nothing incriminating that could be found should those phones be recovered. He also said in the judicial review that the phone, which it now appears was in his own house and in the possession of his daughter or someone in his 10:15 household, was acting up and was apparently sending messages or a message, even though it was out of Commission and in consequence of that, the investigation is fatally flawed.

A11 of this amounts to this, that somehow the Garda Síochána decided to target him and use, to put it mildly, unfair means in order to ensure that he was in trouble, whether it be a conviction, possibility of a charge or a disciplinary proceeding.

Now, why is this a fact in issue? why were these papers distributed in the course of this hearing over months? why has this been discussed in the witness-box without me cutting it off? we11, the answer to that is pretty straightforward and simple: Was David Taylor bitter out of being moved out of the Press Office and did he make a series of false claims in order to wreak revenge against them who he responsible for his plight? Chief amongst those is the former Garda Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan, who is the witness in the witness-box.

Now, I'm not asking for much - in fact all I'm asking
for is Browne v. Dunn - and, given that the matter has gone on for several months, it's not too much to ask that this be completed now. So the questions are: Does he now say that Nóirín o'Sullivan in any way interfered or caused someone to interfere with his phone? Does he now say that Nóirín O'Sullivan put her husband into the case in a leading role in order to ensure that he was, to use a colloquialism, "got" in some respect or had a charge in some respect put over him? Did Nóirín o'Sullivan control the circumstances of his arrest so that he was indeed arrested, had his laces taken off and his belt taken off - circumstances which are normal to every prisoner because of the risk of suicide, unfortunately, in custody? Does he now withdraw any allegation in relation to the seizure of phones through, again it is said, Nóirín o'Sullivan, in consequence of her being determined to ensure that evidence against herself was covered up?

Now, the opportunity to ask those questions is now and if you'd like to ask those questions, I'd be very happy to receive the answers. But it seems to me that that is all that it is about.

Now, I just want to say one further thing; why is it a fact in issue? why is this not just a matter of credit? And I'm not saying "credibility", I'm saying "credit", I've explained that earlier on what the difference is and indeed I've even written a chapter of
a book where this is mentioned, if anyone cares to read it. Well, the answer is this: It is central to the allegations being made in this case by David Taylor as to what his motivation was, and if he is now saying that he is blaming Nóirín O'Sullivan in vain or wrongly or that he was emotional and perhaps said things he shouldn't, well, that may well impact on the view that I take in relation to the central allegations made by David Taylor. It may also impact in relation to his credibility vis-á-vis what, for instance, Maurice McCabe reports him as saying, vis-á-vis what his wife Michelle Taylor reports him as saying, vis-á-vis what certain public representatives report him as saying. But it's only a checklist, it's on7y one, two, three, four, five, ask the questions, check it off, let's all get on with it. And that's as much as I'm asking. Now, if you're not prepared to do that --

MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: I can deal with it now.
CHA RMAN Mr. O'Higgins, I don't want to listen to a big speech from you. If you want to do it, carry on. If you don't want to do it, that's fine.
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: I can deal with it now. In answer to the first question, no. In answer to the second --

CHA RMAN No, you ask the questions, Mr. O'Higgins, please. Here is the witness, she can answer them.

ME. NÓ Rí N O SULLI VAN CONTI NUED TO BE CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M CHAEL O H GG NS:

1 Q. MR. MCHAEL OHGGN: Commissioner o'Sullivan, I'm not making any case good, bad or indifferent - and I thought I made this crystal clear yesterday - that you'd had any hand, act or part directly or indirectly with respect to my client's arrest with respect to the Clerkin investigation. I think you're clear on my position on that?
A. Well, Chairman, just on a point of clarity, I had absolutely no involvement whatsoever in relation to the arrest, the detention or the investigation in relation to Superintendent David Taylor.
2 Q. And you understand I am putting negatively and accepting that is the position?
A. I understand your point, Mr. O'Higgins.

3 Q. And you've heard the Chairman with regard to orchestrating the arrest, with regard to putting your husband in, with regard to the seizure of your
phones -- of his phones; you are clear that I am clearly putting to you that it is not suggested you had any part in that, directly or indirectly?
A. We11, I can confirm, Chairman, I had absolutely no hand, act or part in it. And also, just on a point of clarity that arose yesterday, my husband was not the arresting officer in relation to the investigation.

4 Q. I accept that. And you're clear on what my position to you on it is?
A. Yes, I am clear, Mr. O'Higgins.

MR. OHGGNS: Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN Any other questions? Mr. Gillane?
THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. G LLANE:

5 Q. MR. G LLANE: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Commissioner O'Sullivan, Sean Gillane. I appear for Mr. Reynolds and RTÉ. Ms. Leader took you through your evidence yesterday comprehensively, so I'11 be 1iterally 60 seconds I think. Can I just ask you to confirm, yesterday you were shown a billing record in relation to your official mobile phone and phone contacts, I think, were contained therein in relation to Mr. Reynolds?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

6 Q. And I think you can confirm that that billing record covers a two-year period from the middle of 2012 to the middle of 2014?
A. I don't have it here in front of me, but yes, I agree, I can recall it, yes.
7 Q. Yes. And if you need to see it, it's 1018, I think, in Volume 3. But I think in relation to that two-year period, that, $I$ think, indicates 20 points of contact in relation to that billing period?
A. That would be correct, Chairman, yes.

8 Q. And I think of those 20 points of contact, I think there are five telephone calls during that period?
A. Yes, Chairman, I believe that is correct, yes.

9 Q. Now, I think in relation to your evidence yesterday, I
think you were also asked questions about a story that Mr. Reynolds published on the 24th February 2014?
A. Yes, Chairman, that's correct.

And I think that story initially was published, I think, at 14:28 on that day?
A. Yes, I agree, Mr. Gillane.

11 Q. And again, without wanting to repeat myself, I didn't interrupt Mr. McDowell yesterday, I think he billed the story to you as being a story where Mr. Reynolds had suggested that Maurice McCabe had "failed to cooperate". Those words in fact - and I think we had agreed this last week - don't appear in the story in fact?
A. Yes, I agree with your point, Mr. Gillane.

12 Q. And I don't know if you remember it but that phrase, "failed to cooperate", in terms of this particular line which was prevalent at that time, that phrase "failed to cooperate" had originated in fact in 2013, when that claim was made in Dáil Éireann. I don't know if you remember that?
A. As I understand it, Mr. Gillane, yes. And I think just in relation to Mr. Reynolds, I think he describes his relationship with you as professional and personable. And is that a fair enough assessment of the nature of that relationship?
A. Yes, I would agree with that assessment, Chairman, yes. MR. G LLANE: Thanks very much, Commissioner.
A. Thank you, Mr. Gillane.

14 Q. MR. Ó MI RCLEARTA GH Good morning, Commissioner. I'm Fíonán ó Muircheartaigh and I appear for the journalist Alison O'Reilly. And I ask these questions of you because in my client's account to the Tribunal, in particular in relation to her conversations with Debbie McCann, a journalist whom you knew, you are mentioned and, therefore I want you to have an opportunity to put -- to put those mentions to you.
A. Yes.

15 Q. So that you can comment on them. Her statement, I don't think you'11 need it, but her statement is at pages 2329 -- 2834 of the Tribunal's documents. The Tribunal sent a list of questions to people whom it thought might be able to help them in relation to the Tribunal and Alison replied in relation to two of those, mentioning your name, and I'11 read out the -the first question, question 4 was seeking information:
"Have you any information regar di ng a campai gn of seni or officers to di scredit Sergeant McCabe?"

And Ms. O'Reilly states in her statement:
"I do not have any direct information. I was told by my former colleague in the Irish Mail on Sunday, Debbie MECann, bet ween 2013 and 2014 that Superintendent Dave Tayl or and the then Acting Commissioner Nói rín

Ó Sul I ivan tol d her Maurice McCabe abused a girl when she was a child."

So I must put it to you, did you te11 Debbie McCann that Maurice McCabe abused a girl when she was a child, 10:25 at any stage?
A. No, Chairman, I never discussed Sergeant McCabe with Ms. McCann ever.
Q. So does it follow then that either Debbie McCann was mistaken or Ms. O'Reilly was mistaken in relation to Debbie McCann's account?
A. We11, Chairman, $I$ can only state the facts. In fact I don't believe I had been introduced to Ms. McCann until such time in mid-November 2014 and I most certain7y never spoke to her in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
17 Q. Thank you for that. Now, there are only two other references, so I'm going to go through each of them. The second reference that $I$ think might be relevant is in reply to question 15. This goes to your relationship with Debbie McCann. If I can just get question 15. I think it says:

[^0]But we can come back to that. Anyway, the reply was:
"Debbie McCann told re she had Commi ssi oner Ơ Sulli van's number. She sai d Nói rín Ơ Sulli van
promised her an excl usi ve intervi ew when she was appoi nted Corminssioner and she was to go through the Press Office to make it look like they di dn't know each ot her. She told me Nói rín O Sullivan did an intervi ew with her of $f$ the record because she was conscious of doi $n g$ an on the record conversation with a reporter whomshe knew in the first few weeks of her new job."

So that's what's in the statement. Would you make any comment on that?
A. I'm sorry, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, I don't have the date here in front of me that that references.
18 Q. It's on page 3829 of the Tribunal's documents.
A. But, Chairman, what I can do, I can go through, as I went through yesterday, Ms. McCann had been seeking to have an interview through the Garda Press office with me back in 2012, when I was Deputy Commissioner and after I had received some award. That did not happen and did not transpire. She had tried again in 2013, asking for an interview with me and that had not transpired. And subsequently to my appointment as Garda Commissioner on 25th November 2014, Ms. McCann made contact with me, provided me with a series of questions, which I telephoned her back on in relation to my -- where I wanted An Garda Síochána to go. And it was succinctly in relation to those points. And the article appeared, I believe, around 30th November.
19 Q. The last reference that I'd like to draw your attention to is in paragraph $L$ of her statement. And this
related to a conversation which Ms. O'Reilly had with Debbie McCann in Herbert Park. You'11 recall that towards the end of 2013 and the beginning of 2014 the evidence that has been given suggests that this matter was becoming much more active; there was the PAC affair 10:28 and then there was the visit of Debbie McCann immediately after that to Ms. D's home. And my client was concerned that, put frankly, that Maurice McCabe was being set up by somebody and she challenged Debbie McCann in Herbert Park - this is what her statement says - she challenged Debbie McCann on the truth of the story that was going about in the rounds about Maurice McCabe and that he was a paedophile, and I quote from her statement:
"I asked her how she knew this story was true. She said this story was coming fromthe top. I asked her 'was that your pal Noreen', and she said 'yes'."
would you like to comment on that?
A. Well, firstly, Chairman, I would not classify myself as Ms. McCann's pal. Again it would've been a professional interaction that I would've had with her. And secondly, as I have previously stated, I have never spoken to Ms. McCann, or indeed anybody else, in
relation to Sergeant McCabe and I've never used any, or given anybody the indication of such a view of sergeant McCabe.

MR. Ó MI RCFEARTA GH Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS WAS EXAM NED BY MR. DI GNAM

20 Q. MR. DI GNAM Thank you, Chairman. Ms. O'Sullivan, I just want to ask you a few questions to cover some of the ground that you've already covered with Ms. Leader, Mr. McDowell and Mr. O'Higgins for the purpose of clarifying some of the points that were discussed yesterday, and then I want to discuss some of the specific allegations or accusations that have been made against you, both in the context specifically of this Tribunal and in the public arena which have now fed into this Tribunal.

Firstly, you said yesterday that you, at a certain point in time, $I$ can't remember the exact date, you took over from Deputy -- you took over Deputy Rice's role upon his retirement. when was that?
A. Deputy Commissioner Rice retired on 31st May 2013 and I would have assumed his responsibilities at that stage.
21 Q. And from that point on, for a period of time you're performing the role of both Deputy Commissioners, is that right?
A. That would be right, Chairman. Up until $I$ assumed the additional role as Acting Commissioner.

22 Q. Now, you were also asked about the pre-PAC meetings, beginning, I think, on 6th January. You weren't at
that meeting, but there was seen a series of meetings between that and 23 rd January when the PAC meeting took place.
A. Yes, Chairman.

23 Q. And you described your recollection of those meetings, I think, as being focused on comparing and contrasting the Comptroller \& Auditor General's report, which was the subject of the PAC hearing, and the o'mahony report, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

24 Q. You were then shown, and indeed you've had an opportunity to see in advance, the notes from those pre-PAC meetings?
A. Yes, Chairman, I did.

25 Q. And you indicated that you do not recall any discussion of the Ms. D allegation taking place in your presence whilst at those meetings, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.
Q. Now, I think you were very fairly saying that you've no recollection of any such discussion. Are you
comfortable in going as far as to say that that those discussions did not take place in your presence?
A. Yes, Chairman, those discussions did not take place in my presence.
27 Q. Now, it was put to you by Ms. Leader that, even on
former Commissioner Callinan's account, there was some discussion on 23rd January with certain individuals -sorry, 23rd and 24th January, with certain individuals of the allegations against Sergeant McCabe. And they,
obviously the circumstances of those discussions and those references are very much in dispute - you'11 have read the evidence in relation to Deputy Deasy, Deputy McGuinness, Mr. McCarthy and Commissioner Callinan's account of those discussions. But it was put to you that because, even on former Commissioner Callinan's account, there were discussions on 23rd and 24th January, that it would seem incredible that you didn't have discussions with people around those dates. Now, are you clear in your recollection as to whether or not 10:33 you had discussions about the allegations against Sergeant McCabe around those dates or at any time?
A. No, Chairman, I never had discussions with any of the individuals - I have read the evidence and read the papers - with any of those individuals in relation to Sergeant McCabe at that time or at any other time. 28 Q. Now, just to bring you on then to the evening of 23rd January. You dealt with the letter, the proposal letters, or the draft proposal letters if I might call them that, and you indicated that you had some input into their -- into them; I think they may have been sent or copied to you. And you were then examined on your knowledge as to what happened after that and whether you were ever told what happened to them. You, I think, said in your evidence that you've now become aware that they weren't sent. Did you know at the time whether or not they were sent?
A. No, Chairman, the draft letters would've been copied to me by Mr. Ruane, from the best of my recollection, who
had been tasked by Commissioner Callinan with preparing them and, thereafter, Commissioner Callinan would have dealt with them. And I wasn't aware whether or not they were sent, they would've been dealt with by the Commissioner's office and I would've had no further input or there was no further consultation with me in relation to them.
So to the best of your knowledge, they could well have been sent. And the next you knew was that you were told there was to be hearing -- that the decision had been made there'd be a private hearing on Thursday, 30th January, is that correct?
A. That is correct, Chairman, yes.

30 Q. And you referred there to Commissioner Callinan dealing with that issue; I think Commissioner Callinan, in his evidence, made it clear that he was in fact on top of this, if I might put it this way, so he was dealing with this directly with the PAC and with the clerk and indeed Chairman of the PAC, is that right?
A. Yes, Chairman, that would be correct.

31 Q. Now, you were shown a set of phone records, or a synopsis, I should say, of phone records yesterday morning at 7424 and 7425 . And these are the phone records dealing with the allegations made by Superintendent Taylor about Mr. Williams contacting him 10:35 about being in Ms. D's house and Superintendent Taylor's allegations that he texted you and that you phoned him back in relation to that issue. Now, I think, as you know, what Superintendent Taylor says in
this regard is that he received a text from
Mr. Williams on 8th March, Saturday 8th March, that he received a text to say something along the lines of 'Guess where I am? I'm in Ms. D's house'. Now, that's me paraphrasing. But there was a text to say 'Guess where I am? I'm in Ms. D's house'. The second step was that he texted Commissioner Callinan and you to tell you that news and that you immediately phoned him back, okay, on 8th March?
A. Yes, Chairman. words, a text from Paul williams to Superintendent Taylor, a text from Superintendent Taylor to you and to Commissioner Callinan and a phone call from you to Superintendent Taylor?
A. There's no sequence of that sequence recorded here, or no record of that sequence recorded here, Chairman.

33 Q. Yes. Now, Mr. Williams, as I understand what he says is that he wasn't in touch with Superintendent Taylor that day, but that he did phone him a couple of days later to fact-check, I think, or to check out some certain issues. Now, that being the case, on 7425 you have the phone records for 10th and 11th March, and if we disregard the specifics of Superintendent Taylor's evidence of it happening on 8th March and say for the
sake of argument that it may have happened on 10th or 11th, is there any such sequence of telephone contacts on either 10th or 11th March?
A. In fact, Chairman, there is no sequence, there is no such sequence and I note there is no records of any contact between myself or Superintendent Taylor on 10th or 11th March.

34 Q. Yes. So there is no text from Mr. Williams to Superintendent Taylor, a text from Superintendent Taylor to you and a phone call from you to Superintendent Taylor --
A. No, Chairman, there's not.

35 Q. -- on either of those dates? Now, you were also asked about some phone contacts on, during February 2014. Were there any other significant issues or controversies involving An Garda Síochána in February 2014?
A. There were several, Chairman. There were several. There was a number of very serious and high profile issues ongoing at the time.
36 Q. Yes. And could you tell the Chairman what they were?
A. Yes, Chairman, in February 2014 one of the pressing issues was the allegations of An Garda Síochána bugging the GSOC offices and there was the -- Mr. Justice Cooke had been appointed in around that time to do the
investigation. And then we also had a number of ongoing issues in relation to the tapes issues, the taping in Garda stations issues. And also we were dealing with a number of Garda Inspectorate reports.

37 Q. Now, is it fair to say that there was media interest in the GSOC bugging controversy, for example?
A. Yes, Chairman, if I was to pick what was the most topical issue for the months of February, or the month of February 2014, it was the GSOC bugging issue.
Q. Now, it was put to you yesterday that the phone records showed that you had contacts with Mr. Williams, relatively regular contacts with Mr. Williams up to Apri1 2013 and then there was a gap unti1 February 2014 and you were asked what the contacts in February 2014 may have been about. I think you said very clearly that they were not about Sergeant McCabe or Ms. D. Is it possible - and I think you said you don't remember what they were about, other than them not being about Sergeant McCabe or the Ms. D allegations - but is it possible that they were about one or more of these controversies that were raging in February 2014 ?
A. Yes, Chairman, it's possible. And as I said yesterday, there were other issues also that $I$ had been dealing with in relation to Mr. Williams of a personal -- his personal security issues.
Q. If I could then just ask you to deal with the correspondence that came in to your office about the Tusla notification, this is the absolutely incorrect notification that was received from Tusla. Now, is it correct to say - and I think this was the substance of your evidence yesterday - that you did not appreciate, for whatever reason, you did not appreciate or identify the difference between the allegation that was
contained in that notification and what you knew of the 2006 allegation?
A. Yes, Chairman.

Yes. And is it also correct to say that you didn't know that in fact, at local level, Chief Superintendent 10:41 Sheridan, who was involved in that issue, had identified within a short number of days that this was incorrect --
A. That's correct, Chairman.

41 Q.
-- this notification was incorrect?
A. Yes.

42 Q. Now, it has been previously suggested that An Garda Síochána were happy to let that allegation, the incorrect notification or allegation sit there dormant but percolating away to be used at some point in the future perhaps. I think you've heard that suggestion being put on previous occasions, have you? Or you've read it?
A. That suggestion is absolutely untrue, chairman. yes. Now, just to be clear, that allegation, that notification received from Tusla and the substance of it, that was never communicated by you to anybody, is that correct?
A. That's correct, Chairman. As I say, the only time that was ever communicated was in February 2017, in response 10:42 to the questions that were raised by the Department.
44 Q. Yes. It was -- you have waived your privilege in relation to your instructions to your legal team in the o'Higgins Commission, and we don't want to go back to
the O'Higgins Commission, but you waived your instructions in order to allow this Tribunal to do its work in relation to that, to that issue and they have seen all of the relevant documentation. But could you confirm to the Tribunal that you did not instruct your legal team in the o'Higgins Commission --
CHA RNAN Mr. Dignam, I really don't think we should go to the o'Higgins thing. And, you know, it may be there's just -- please correct me in the event that my understanding is incorrect; I mean, the plain reality is in May of 2014 the allegation of anal and vaginal, digital penetration did go up from the Commissioner for the Northern Region to headquarters. The plain reality is, whatever happened in Headquarters - and I'11 review
all the evidence, but there doesn't seem to be any evidence that anyone did anything about it and it came at a time when Commissioner Callinan was already gone and there is nothing to suggest that he knew about it but it was simply left there uncorrected by the Commissioner for the Northern Region, even though the Commissioner for the Northern Region had that allegation corrected to him by Chief Superintendent sheridan. Now, that is the state of the evidence as I understand it. I don't know if you want to make something, but --
MR. DIGNM No, I think that's a correct -CHA RMAN Commissioner o'sullivan is saying 'I didn't notice the difference, A. And B, in any event, it was just sitting there, it didn't affect me in any way'.

Would that be a fair summary?
MR. DI GNAM Yes, I think your summary of the evidence, Chairman, that nothing further happened to it is correct. And really the only -- and obviously the Tribunal will have to make of that what it thinks appropriate. But I simply wanted to deal with the suggestion that has been put previously that the matter was left, deliberately left percolate there for a nefarious reason of some sort.
CHA RMAN We11, yes, if that were to be the case, one would expect it to be somehow circulated. And I don't know if there's any evidence of that, I haven't seen any so far.
45 Q. MR. DI GNAM Thank you, Chairman. (To witness) Now, if I could then bring you back, Ms. O'Sullivan, to 23rd January to the PAC hearing and the conversations that took place in and around that hearing. It was put to you yesterday, I think by Mr. McDowe11, and I think the implicit point that he was putting to you was that it was difficult to believe that you didn't hear the remarks made by Commissioner Callinan, or allegedly made by Commissioner Callinan to various individuals. Now, you, as I understand it, you introduced Commissioner Callinan to Deputy Deasy because you had met Deputy Deasy previously, is that right?
A. That would be correct, Chairman, yes.

46 Q. And Deputy Deasy's evidence on that is that that took place in the coffee dock immediately above the Committee rooms; is that right?
A. That would be correct, Chairman. Just on the edge, yes.
47 Q. And Deputy Deasy's evidence is that as he approached you and the Commissioner, you touched Commissioner Callinan on the arm to point Deputy Deasy out to him, they then met and you stepped away. Is that right?
A. That would be correct, Chairman. There were a number of people present and I would've rejoined the company that we were originally in.
And Deputy Deasy described the coffee dock, I think in general, but certainly at that point in time as a noisy place, is that your --
A. Yes, it would be a noisy and busy place. As all of the various committee rooms and the attendees are meeting, there would be a real buzz and it'd be a hub where people would meet, yes.

49 Q. Now, Mr. McCarthy, the Comptroller \& Auditor General, describes the conversation he had with Commissioner Callinan as having taken place between the two of them, is that right?
A. Yes. I've read the evidence in relation to that, Chairman, yes.

50 Q. Were you present for that conversation?
A. No, Chairman, I was not.

51 Q. Commissioner Callinan's recollection of it is that it took place on the stairway down and then into the lobby outside the Committee room. Mr. McCarthy's recollection is that it took place in the lobby. But wherever it took place, you weren't present for that
conversation?
A. No, Chairman, I was not.

And Mr. McGuinness's evidence -- sorry, Deputy MCGuinness's evidence of the conclusion of the PAC is that he approached a group of Gardaí, senior Gardaí.

But he also described the meeting room after a PAC meeting as being a hubbub of activity where people are meeting each other and exchanging pleasantries.
A. Yes, that would be correct, Chairman. It's an accurate description.

53 Q. Now, you were asked about a text which is in the report at 4644. I don't need you to open it, Ms. O'Sullivan, but you were -- this was the text in relation to removing Superintendent Taylor from the position of Press officer. And that text took place on 10th October, you sent that text on 10th October 2016. And there was some, I think, questioning of how you knew that Superintendent Taylor was the person who had made the protected disclosure. Do you remember when Superintendent Taylor's name was first mentioned in the media as being the discloser?
A. We11, Chairman, the immediate aftermath of the protected disclosures, the two protected disclosures being made, there was an enormous amount of media coverage. To the best of my recollection, I think there was an article on 7th October, and there may have been something before that, but $I$ believe there was a newspaper article on 7th October which in fact named Superintendent Taylor as the, as one of the disclosees.

54 Q. Now, just dealing with Superintendent Taylor as the head of the Press office, you were explaining to the Chairman yesterday why you removed him and I think you were describing your decision-making in relation to various moves, but ultimately you said that you simply didn't trust Superintendent Taylor, that you were going to have to work closely with him and that you couldn't see that happening, is that right?
A. Yes, Chairman.

Now, just to put that in a slightly broader context so the Chairman has all of that information, I think - and you might correct me if I'm wrong on the number - I think you moved 29 people pretty much at one time around the time of moving Superintendent Taylor, is that right?
A. That is correct, Chairman, yes.

56 Q. And presumably they were for various reasons, but the underlying one was the one that you were conveying yesterday of trying to shake things up, is that right?
A. Yes, that would be correct, Chairman.

But the specific reason why Superintendent Taylor, why you felt the need to move him was that you didn't trust him, is that right?
A. Yes, Chairman. And I needed somebody in the Press office that I knew had my back and that I knew was there and would be doing the job in the manner in which I wanted them to do it.
58 Q. Now, you were then, you were asked yesterday then about how an assistant commissioner - this is Assistant

Commissioner Michae1 Finn - attended at Sergeant McCabe's uncle's house - as you know he had contacted the Commissioner's office to make various complaints and you were examined or challenged as to why an officer of such a high rank was dealing with that matter. Could you explain how that came about to the best of your knowledge?
A. Yes, Chairman, Mr. Bernard McCabe had contacted my general administrative office, as a number of people would do. The person that, the staff member that took that call forwarded that on to the Deputy Commissioner Operations because it was dealing with road traffic matters, not specifically in relation to Sergeant McCabe but violations of the road traffic enforcement. It was sent to Deputy Commissioner Policing and Security and that office would have nominated Assistant Commissioner Finn, who had responsibility for roads policing at that time and he was nominated to make contact.
59 Q. Yes.
CHA RMAN It's still extremely weird that an assistant commissioner goes down to talk about Maurice McCabe and travels on the Erne and whether he's taking too many foreign holidays and sheep and goats and cattle. It's just really odd. And I don't know -- I mean, whatever explanation there is about commissioners and offices and all the rest of it, I still can't see how someone beyond the rank of a sergeant was sent down there. Maybe there is an explanation, I don't know,

Commissioner.
60 Q. MR. DI GNM That's the point I'm going to bring you to, Commissioner. That explains how the matter came to An Garda Síochána's attention, but I think the issue that the Chairman is interested in is why an officer of $10: 52$ such serious rank is detailed to deal with it. But just perhaps before you answer that, I think, as I'm sure you now know, Mr. McCabe, Mr. Bernard McCabe had in fact been previously in touch, making various complaints and allegations. This contact, I think, was 10:52 in terms of people getting off with traffic offences, is that right?
A. That would be correct, Chairman, yes.

61 Q. Now, you might then explain to the Chairman why an officer of that rank --
A. So, Chairman, so obviously at the time the issue of people avoiding road traffic offences was a very big issue. I can't speak for what the decision-making was in the Deputy Commissioner's office, but it went to the Assistant Commissioner Roads Policing, he went. But if

I could explain, Chairman, it's not unusual. A number of people would ring the Commissioner's office making complaints and usually they would have tried at local level to maybe make contact with chiefs and assistant commissioners and different people and not had any satisfaction. And that is why we would send it through the rank structure and then somebody would be appointed to go and meet with them. So ordinarily, people that would ring the Commissioner's office would be
dissatisfied with the level of interaction that they'd had locally at a particular point.
62 Q. Now --
CHA RMAN We11, I don't know about that. Look, it may be somebody just wanted to get away from the office for a day. I mean, I just, I'm still mystified as to 'Operation Squeeze', Bernard McCabe and I'm not going to say any more, but presumably you've read the stuff.
A. Yes, I have read it Chairman. And maybe just to make the point --
CHAN RMAN But I mean, how seriously would you take that?
A. 'Operation Squeeze' only became, I only became aware of it in the papers that were circulated and I had no knowledge of it prior to that.
63 Q. MR. DI GNMM Now, if we could then just turn to the chronology document which has been referred to. And this, the document that was given to you was found by the FSNI when they were given access to the Garda computers to do their work. I think you've had the benefit of reading Superintendent Walsh's statement to this Tribunal of 4th July 2017?
A. Yes, Chairman.

64 Q. And I think Superintendent Walsh endeavours to explain what that document is as long ago as July 2017.
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

65 Q. And in fact he makes specific reference to that document.
A. That's correct, Chairman.

66 Q. That's on page 3216. I'm sorry, it's page 3216 of an earlier module. But what he says is that from an initial -- so part of his function, $I$ think, as private secretary in the Commissioner's office is to manage the confidential recipient, o is to have managed the confidential recipient process, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

67 Q. And what he says, halfway down that page, the main paragraph on the page, is that:
"Froman initial revi ew of files at the Commissioner's office I was aware that Sergeant McCabe had made various reports on alleged wrongdoing by members of An Garda Sí ochána and, in an effort to follow the trail of correspondence, 1 had a chronol ogy created of all file entries with the first entry rel ating to 3rd December 2008. This file runs to approxi mately 3, 500 pages and the chronol ogy was an effort to easily identify and retrieve indi vi dual pieces of correspondence as requi red. Chronol ogi es were so created for all confidential reports/ protected disclosure files and some other files that were very large, agai $n$ with a vi ew to easily finding and revi ewing any issues that may arise. I am not aware of the actual date on which thi s chronol ogy was created. However, I understand it was last modified on 12th June 2013. Thi s chronol ogy was pl aced on the el ectronic file and staff were requested to ensure that the chronol ogy was updated when any new item of correspondence, meeting notes or
tel ephone calls were made or recei ved. Attached to that chronol ogy is a list of issues in rel ation to Sergeant MECabe, one of which is a reference to an i nci dent invol ving a statement froma 14-year-ol d femal e whi ch allegedl y occurred in 2006. There is a second si milar chronol ogy document on file agai $n$ incl uding reference to this allegation with the heading ' Reports on Sergeant Maurice MzCabe'... and retired Garda John Wilson and this report was last modified on 12th June 2013."

Now, I think you weren't involved in the preparation of that chronology document?
A. No, Chairman.

68 Q. And indeed I take it that you're not involved in the
day-to-day administration function of the Commissioner's office, or you weren't involved?
A. No, Chairman. And I wasn't Commissioner at that stage either, so I wouldn't be involved on a day-to-day basis on that, no.

69 Q. Yes. And is that -- are you familiar or are you aware that these types of documents are prepared for complex or lengthy files?
A. Yes, Chairman, a similar type of chronology or file index would be created to cross-reference, for example, 10:57 complex operational or investigative files, complex administrative files and there would be a routine ready reckoner or aide-memoire on the cover of a file. 70 Q. Now, if I could then just turn briefly to the core
allegations and accusations that have been made in the protected disclosure which led directly to the establishment of this Tribunal and indeed that have been repeated endless7y in pub7ic fora, both in public -- in political commentary and in media

71 Q. Yes. Now, if I could then just bring you to the events or the two particular time periods which led to the, to this Tribunal. Just to put that in context, we now know, through the evidence, that in May 2016

Superintendent Taylor contacted Sergeant McCabe -sorry, Superintendent Taylor contacted Mr. Clifford, the well-known journalist, that in June/July 2016 he had two meetings with Mr. Clifford, there was then some contact between Superintendent Taylor -- sorry, between Sergeant McCabe and Mrs. Taylor about meeting Superintendent Taylor, and that eventually happened on 20th September 2016, and you'11 have read the evidence of -- in relation to that meeting.
CHN RMAN Yes, sure. But in between there was contact 11:00 between Sergeant McCabe and Mr. Clifford as well. But anyway, it's only a detail.

MR. DI GNAM Yes. And there was then a further contact on 21st September 2016 between Sergeant McCabe and the Taylors in which Sergeant McCabe either sought confirmation of what Superintendent Taylor had said about the text messages or told the Taylors that he was going to make a protected disclosure, there's a dispute between them on that point. But we now know that on Wednesday, 28th September 2016 Sergeant McCabe made a protected disclosure which, in fairness to him, is entirely based on what he was told by Superintendent Taylor and two days later, Friday 30th September, a protected disclosure was made by Superintendent David Taylor. And we now know that Mr. Clifford met, says that he met Superintendent Taylor again in early October. And then on 3rd October, we know that Sergeant McCabe met with Deputy Mick wallace and deputy Claire Daly at around lunchtime and Sergeant McCabe
told them what Superintendent Taylor had told him. And they, quite correctly and appropriately, asked to meet Superintendent Taylor and then made contact with Superintendent Taylor and they had a meeting on the evening of 3rd October.
A. Yes, Chairman. an explosion or a continuation of the vortex that was going on since May '16, and it reopened the whole thing again. But it was -- I remember that article very we11, yes.
And do you recall that after that article there was intensive media and political coverage of the allegations and of the controversy flowing from those allegations?
A. Yes, Chairman, there was a complete bombardment of articles and the commencement of a whole pattern of calls for my resignation and public polls about whether I should continue in office or not and a constant barrage of morning, noon and night media coverage, let it be on TV, on newspapers and, as I say, various other
media as well.
76 Q
Q. And I think you took the rather unusual step during that period of time to issue a public statement denying any wrongdoing, is that right?
A. Yes, Chairman, such was the public outcry of the nature of the allegations that had been made against me, I had to do that.
77 Q. Yes. And I think that followed a statement in the Dáil by the leader of the Opposition in which it was described as a character assassination attack on Sergeant McCabe, and Superintendent Taylor I think was also included in that?
A. That's correct, Chairman, there was a number of debates in the Dái 1 and a number of comments under Dái 1 privilege in both Houses in relation to the matters. And I think there were also some radio interviews, I think Deputy Daly gave an interview on Morning Ireland, isn't that right, on 5th October?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. And I think it followed that radio interview that you issued your public statement or your press statement denying the wrongdoing that was being alleged against you?
A. Yes, Chairman. And what I found particularly difficult was, because of the protected disclosures legislation, I was trying to observe that and at the same time
respond to allegations which I hadn't seen. And also at that stage I didn't even know who the people that were making the allegations against me were.
81 Q. And is it your view, Ms. O'Sullivan - and obvious7y it's ultimately a matter for the Tribunal - but is it your view that that coverage and that controversy flowed directly from the story which reported that the protected disclosure, particularly by Superintendent Taylor, had been made?
A. Yes, Chairman.

82 Q. Now, on 7th October 2016 the Minister for Justice of the day, Minister Fitzgerald, announced that

Mr. Justice O'Neill would carry out an initial inquiry into the protected disclosures.
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

83 Q. And Judge O'Neil1 reported on 17th December 2017 and the Minister announced she was considering the matter. And then on 7th February -- sorry, I might just ask you, in the intervening period was there ongoing media and political commentary or it had abated to some extent?
A. No, Chairman, from that point forward there was constant and repeated calls for my resignation, coverage, and erroneous coverage in my view, of the allegations that had been made against me, the continuation of the allegations made around the Taylor investigation and it was ongoing, constant and, as I say, morning, noon and night.
84 Q. Now, I think during that October period you were also,
you appeared in front of the Justice and Defence Committee and these matters were raised with you also, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman. I had a meeting, or an appearance on 12th October and these matters were put to me and again the issues in relation to the whistleblowers and the specific allegations that are contained in the protected disclosures.
Yes. And I think is it correct to say that on that occasion you were challenged, you were even challenged on having appointed a friend, in fact your bridesmaid, but having promoted her, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, and surrounding myself with people - so the allegation, succinctly, was nepotism but that I had surrounded myself with people that were close to me and in particular that $I$ had promoted my bridesmaid. MR. DI GNAM Yes. And when you say you had none, what do you mean?
A. I had no bridesmaid that was promoted, or no bridesmaid from An Garda Síochána.

88 Q. Now, that was made in the context, I think, of a
criticism being levelled at you by Deputy wallace that you were -- that you had promoted people against whom complaints had been made, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

89 Q. And is that true?
A. No, Chairman, not at all.
A. That's correct, chairman, yes.
Q. And on 8th February the terms of reference, or draft terms of reference for that Commission were published. And I think there was then a significant intervention by Deputy Howlin in the Dáil, do you remember that?
A. Yes, Chairman, I remember that very well.

92 Q. And what was the substance of that?
A. The substance of that was that Deputy Howlin, under Dáil privilege, claimed that he had been contacted by a journalist who had direct knowledge of me passing smears in relation to sergeant McCabe - and I may be paraphrasing - but passing directly to journalists allegations of smears against Sergeant McCabe. And I found myself having to come out and defend that on that day, which would be most unusual, but such were the seriousness of the allegations, I found myself with no choice.
93 Q. Yes. And just to deal with the substance of those allegations - we'll be hearing from Deputy Howlin - but
to deal with the substance of those allegations - and Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh has already asked you - had you had direct contact or any contact with journalists to smear Sergeant McCabe?
A. Absolutely not, Chairman. And what was, I suppose, very hurtful from that particular one was the newspaper articles and the commentary that started appearing linking me with a sex smear.
94 Q. I think there were several newspaper articles, both I think in this -- sorry, newspaper and media articles, I 11:09 think both in this country and indeed in britain linking you with a smear campaign, is that right?
A. Yes, Chairman. And I constantly had people referring to them.
95 Q. Now, just to bring you on then very briefly; I think it 11:09 was also on 9th February Deputy Howlin went on Morning Ireland and then later that evening Prime Time revealed the Tusla notification and allegation that had been made incorrectly, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman. Yes, Mr. Howlin, Deputy 11:10 Howlin went on Morning Ireland, repeated the allegations on Morning Ireland and he -- then on that evening there was a Prime Time programme, which covered the Tusla allegations and linked me to a meeting in relation to the false allegation made in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
CHA RMAN what meeting are we talking about?
A. It was a meeting that was supposed to have taken place, I believe, in 2014 and which I was supposed to have
attended.
CHA RMAN Was this the car park meeting?
A. No, Chair, it was in relation to the Tusla allegation. CHA RMAN I don't get it. what -- sorry, explain a bit more if you wouldn't mind.
A. So the allegation, Chair, was that Sergeant McCabe had been made aware of information from Tusla and that contained in that information was a reference to a meeting that was to be held with the Commissioner - I just can't recal1 the date, but $I$ can confirm the date - in 2014 and the suggestion was that that meeting was with me. And as it transpired, it wasn't with me at a11, but the suggestion was that it was to be with me and, as such, tried to, attempted to link me with the false allegation made against Sergeant McCabe.
CHAN RMAN We11, there's no procedure for the social workers to contact the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána, it's direct reporting to the local Garda station.
A. Yes, Chairman, I --

CHAN RMAN Was that the allegation that --
A. No, the allegation was that the local superintendent, Superintendent McGinn, had informed a social worker that he was to have a meeting with the Garda Commissioner in 2014. And as it transpired, the Commissioner was actually, the assistant commissioner was in his region was Assistant Commissioner Kenny. But that was never clarified.

96 Q. MR. DI GNMM There was then, I think, obviously the
revelation of this Tusla notification was a huge source of commentary and controversy, correctly so, and that then dominated the airwaves and the print media, I think, for a period of time. I think on 10th February RTÉ's Six-One News also revealed a story about another whistleblower, who we now know to have been keith Harrison. And then I think over the weekend of Saturday 11th and 12th February it raged then as a political controversy. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, I remember that.

97 Q. I don't want to get into the politics of it, but do you remember it being a political controversy?
A. Yes, I remember being right in the eye of the storm.

98 Q. And I think then on Monday 13th, Sergeant McCabe and Mrs. McCabe issued a public statement calling for a public inquiry rather than a private commission. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, Chairman, I do remember that.

And I think then on Tuesday 14th this Tribunal was announced.
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.
Q. And do you remember on the Six-One News that evening that Deputy wallace said that everybody in Headquarters knew about the campaign against Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes, Chairman.

101 Q. And were there any further calls for your resignation around that time?
A. Yes, Chairman. As I say, there were constant and repeated calls for my resignation. The intensity of
these polls and whether I was fit to stay in office or not, the Dáil debates in relation to it, it was just constant and never ending and it just continued right up to -- I suppose if I put it this way, Chairman: It continued and was so intense all the way through 2017 that I found myself in October 2017, for the sake of the well-being and health of my family and myself and in the interests of An Garda Síochána, such was the impact on An Garda Síochána, that I retired.
Now, do you consider -- sorry, this Tribunal, I think, as a matter of fact this Tribunal came about because of the protected disclosure of Superintendent Taylor. It's obviously looking at other issues also, but came about because of the protected disclosure of Superintendent Taylor. We've just looked at two particular periods of time where the allegations made by Superintendent Taylor were front and centre in the national airwaves, print media and political commentary. Does it give you any comfort to be told today, 30th May, that in fact much of what was being said is now no longer being maintained by Superintendent Taylor?
A. Absolutely none, Chairman, absolutely none, when I bear in mind the impact that it has had on, as I say, myself, my family and, most importantly, public confidence in An Garda Síochána.
103 Q. Now, Superintendent Taylor has, still maintains the case that you were involved, through knowledge rather than, $I$ think, through activity, in an alleged smear
campaign that he was directed to carry out in respect of Sergeant McCabe. You make the point in your first ever statement to this Tribunal that you have no, you've been given no details by Superintendent Taylor of your involvement or your awareness or knowledge of that alleged smear campaign. Was it your hope, coming to the Tribunal, that if that allegation was true, that Superintendent Taylor would at least be able to give a minimal amount of detail of his allegations against you?

CHA RMAN Well, whether true or not, that there would be some -- the detail that has been given, Mr. Dignam, is to the effect that on occasion he walked into your office and spoke to you directly about it and you didn't demur. He doesn't give any reaction in terms of 11:16 you looked shocked or you sat down or you said 'Isn't that great?' Nothing like that. Simply that you had with him a face-to-face conversation, at least one, probably, on his evidence, more, but it's hard to say, to the effect where he was telling you that this was what was going on. That is the allegation. Now, whether true or not, that's the allegation. whether surrounded by detail or not, that is the allegation.
A. Well, Chairman, it's absolutely and totally untrue. And anybody that knows me knows that I do not not react 11:16 when I'm told something, or in response to something I will always react. And I would react in a very forthright way.

104 Q. MR. DI GNM For good or bad?
A. Good or bad, yes, Chairman.
Q. Yes. And that information was disclosed to the Tribunal?
A. Oh, yes, Chairman.

MR. DI GNAM okay, thank you.
A. Thank you, Mr. Dignam.

## THE WTNESS WAS RE- EXAM NED BY MG. LEADER:

107 Q. MS. LEADER: Just to clear up the issue with the phones, if page 4494 could be brought up on screen please. Now, during the relevant time period, I think you had six phones in all, is that correct?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes. family members and was made available to the Tribunal for forensic analysis, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

109 Q. And that's the Apple iPhone 4?
A. Yes, Chairman.

110 Q. And in relation to the other five phones, you were unable to locate those phones?
A. Yes, Chairman.

111 Q. Yes. And searches were made in Garda Headquarters and in your own home for those phones?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

112 Q. Now, in relation to other phones, you made available to the Tribunal an iPad, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

113 Q. And I think there was a second iPad which couldn't be operated because it was beyond repair?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

114 Q. And there were two other phones which came outside the terms of reference, both Samsung phones, which you made available to the Tribunal and offered them without being asked, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman.

115 Q. And they're both Samsung Edge phones, I think. And 11:19 they were operable in 2016?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

116 Q. Now, in relation to those two phones, they're the subject of the Forensic Science of Northern Ireland looking at them, they refer to them as SM12 and SM13.
Now, you've been referred to certain texts to Paul Reynolds which a claim of privilege exists over them, but you're aware of the contents of those texts, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman, I am.

117 Q. Now, they're not relevant to the terms of reference, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

118 Q. But in relation to the tone of those text messages, your relationship, if I can put it that way, with Mr. Reynolds is described as personable, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

119 Q. And I think that's correct to say the tone of those texts are personable in nature?
A. Yes, Chairman.

120 Q. If I could turn to you a text exchange with Mr. Brett which is at 4645 of the materials please. It'11 come up on screen. This is just by way of putting a date on 11:20 an exchange. Mr. Brett has told us that he inquired with you was his phone under surveillance or being listened to by the guards, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

121 Q. And you told him that it wasn't. And we see at no. 21 --
A. That's correct, Chairman.

122 Q. -- and 23 that he's running something by you. And at text no. 23, on 12th November 2016, what he's saying is:
"Nói rín, RTÉ are pl anning on runni ng that itemtonorrow and this week. They say it's not a big pi ece but may be mentioned. I have gi ven the statement bel ow. Can
you keep this text bet ween you and I. Thanks, Noel B."

And then the statement is:
"While it may have been inf ormally suggested that I
needed to be caref ul in my interactions with whi stlebl owers when I was not working of CAO of the Road Safety Authority, I amtotally satisfied that my tel ephone was not intercepted and I did not deemit necessary to change my phone number, phone provi der or tel ephone usage behavi our."
A. Yes, Chairman, that's correct.

123 Q. So do you think it was around that time that you checked the matter out for Mr. Brett?
A. Yes, Chairman, it would've been.

124 Q. Around November 2016?
A. Yes, Chairman.

125 Q. Al1 right. Now, in relation to your dealings with journalists, if page 921 could be brought up on screen. And I don't think you need to look at it in detail, Ms. O'Sullivan, but I think you can confirm in open hearing to the Tribunal that on 20th Apri1 2017 you signed a waiver confirming to the Tribunal that you don't claim and have not claimed any privilege should you be identified as the source of any information, briefing, allegation or belief communicated to journalists in the print, broadcasting or other media directly or indirectly relating to Sergeant Maurice McCabe.
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

126
Q. And that still is the position --
A. Yes, Chairman.

127 Q. -- is that correct? Now, I want to bring you to your contacts with Mr. Williams in February 2014. Now, as I understand it, these contacts have now been explained yesterday by reference to security matters; I think that was your evidence yesterday?
A. Yes, some of those contacts, Chairman, yes.
Q. Yes. And in relation to those security matters, as I understand it they're security matters concerning Mr. Williams' personal security, is that right?
A. Yes, that would be correct, Chairman, yes.

129 Q. Al1 right. And this morning, in answer to Mr. Dignam, you said they may have been in relation to pressing Garda matters as well, in particular the GSOC bugging issue?
A. Yes, Chairman, there -- yes.

130 Q. All right. Okay. So if we look at those contacts. First of all we have the February ones on 21st, two on 21st, one on 24th. Then we have the March ones, one on 11:23 22nd March, which is a month later, and 31st March, and then the ones at the beginning of April. I'm sorry, I don't have the page.
CHA RMAN We can get it on the screen. 1019, is that it?

MS. LEADER: 1019, I beg your pardon. CHAI RMAN okay. Thank you.

131 Q. ME. LEADER: It's volume 3 I think.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Sorry, do you want to go through it again? MS. LEADER: Yes.
A. Yes, Chairman, I have that here.

Sorry, I'11 just go through them again. So we have the February contacts which begin at page -- at line 24.
A. Yes.

133 Q. So prior to that, the last contact was Apri1 2013. You see that?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

134 Q. Then we have the February 2014 ones, which are 21st, 21st, 24th February. Then we have the march ones, 22nd, which is after the Ms. D interview, because the interview was on 8th March as I understand it. Sorry, so we've March, 22nd March and 31st March. And then we have 4th April, three contacts and on 12th March a text, which is the day the Ms. D interview appears on the Independent.
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. Now, I may be slightly incorrect about this, but as I understand it, yesterday in your evidence you said those contacts were in connection with security issues dealing with Mr. Williams' personal security?
A. Yes, Chairman, the February contacts, certainly there was ongoing reviews of Mr. Williams' security arrangements.
136 Q. Mr. Williams's security?
A. Yes.

137 Q. And this morning, and maybe -- my understanding of it is you explained those contacts by reference to the
bugging of GSOC. Am I correct in that?
A. Chairman, what $I$ was saying was that one of the pressing issues for the month of February was the bugging, was the alleged bugging of the GSOC offices.
Q. Yes.
A. And what $I$ said is that perhaps some of the contacts may have been to do with that. But I am pretty certain that the February contacts were to do with a review that was happening at that time.
139 Q. A review of Mr. Williams' --
A. Yes.

140 Q. -- personal --
A. Yes, Chairman.

141 Q. -- security matters? Now, what I want to ask you about that is, when you were asked about that last year, which is November 2017, by our investigators - and it can be brought up on the screen in front of you - at page 846 of the materials, at line 858 the question is:
"I have now been referred to billing records pertaining 11:26
to my contacts with Mr. Willians in the rel evant period. Specifically it has al so been brought to my attention that my contact with Mr. Wilians in this period incl uded tel ephone calls made by me to himof varying duration, incl uding calls of 20 minutes'
duration. I have ther ef ore been asked to expl ain my tel ephone contacts with hi min February, March and April 2014."

And your answer to that is:
"A. At this renove in time l have no recollection. However, as previ ously stated, I have never had any contact with journalists, including Mr. Willians, in rel ation to the terns of reference of the Tribunal. Any contacts were strictly in a professional capacity."

So, I'm now asking you what caused you to remember what those contacts were about?
A. Chairman, there was something in my mind at the time after I made the statement to the Tribunal
investigators that there were security issues happening in and around that time, there was a general review of security issues on individuals, and I caused inquiries 11:27 to be made with my former office just to make sure that I was correct in my own memory. And, yes, I am correct in my memory.
142 Q. All right. Because it's not something that's put forward either by Mr. Williams as an explanation for those phone contacts, if you understand what I'm saying?
A. Yes, Chairman. But as I say, I would know Mr. Williams for over 30 years, so I would again, no more than Mr. Reynolds, we would have, I'11 call them personable 11:28 contacts. But in relation to that -- because what struck me was the gap between 2013 and 2014. And that's what -- I knew there was something happening that would have triggered that and that's what I
believe it was.
143 Q. You see, well, that's what I was going to ask you about; in view of the gap, it might've been immediately obvious to you when you were asked about it in November last year, what caused the sudden contact with Mr. Williams, it's something maybe that would've been immediately available to you as a reason for those contacts?
A. No, Chairman, I didn't recall it at the time and I had no recollection. And it's a long time ago, I just had no recollection. But as I say, I caused inquiries to be made and that's what I discovered.

144 Q. Okay. Did you have any responsibility for security matters at that time?
A. Yes, I would've had responsibility as the deputy commissioner in charge of operations.

145 Q. In February of two thousand and?
A. Fourteen, yes, Chairman.

146 Q. And in relation to the April 2014?
A. April 2014, I can't say definitively what Apri1 2014.

To the best of my recollection it would have been -- it could've been an ongoing issue, the security arrangements were an ongoing issue. But I can't say definitively for the other calls. The other thing that would've been going on in April 2014 is, as we would cal1 it, conference season, so there would be a lot of GRA, AGSI conferences and various different things. But I cannot say definitively, because I just can't recall at this remove.

147
Q. February and March, were security issues not something which you might perhaps delegate to a superintendent and chief superintendent?
A. Not in relation to the -- if people had concerns, as I explained earlier, if people had understandable concerns about their own personal security arrangements and particularly if arrangements had been reviewed, they may wish to have contact. And that is something -- and again, as I say, I also would've known 11:30 Mr. Williams and I would've felt that we had somewhat of a duty of care to him in terms of security arrangements as well.
148 Q. A11 right. So just bringing you to the publication then on 12th April 2014 in relation to Mr. Williams' interview with Ms. D. This was something, I think, in your evidence yesterday that you would've seen and wondered about it from an organisational point of view insofar as it was saying something wasn't properly investigated because it was a member of An Garda Síochána who was under investigation. Keeping in mind that you had recently begun to communicate with Mr. Williams again after maybe almost a year's gap and that you had been in relatively frequent contact with him since the month -- two months before, is it not something you would have discussed with him as to what was he writing about this at this time for now?
A. No, Chairman --

149 Q. In the natural course of events?
A. No, Chairman. I would have absolutely respect for Mr. Williams as a journalist, but we would have professional boundaries and it's not something that I would discuss with him. And I wouldn't discuss it, as I say, with anybody.
Q. Yes, but I suppose you speak about professiona1 boundaries there, but Mr. Williams was able to pick up the phone to you, or you to him, in relation to his personal security matters which maybe other people wouldn't have been comfortable in doing so. what I'm suggesting to you it would be a natural thing for you to ask Mr. Williams 'How come you are writing this story at this time?'
A. No, well, Chairman, I didn't. And a number of people that I would know for a very long period of time, I would be open to people ringing me if they had concerns and, yes, sometimes I would delegate it down and as would happen in the ordinary course of events, there would be local people assigned to maintain contact with individuals. But I would have no problem with
individuals that $I$ know, if they had a concern, picking up the phone and ringing me and speaking to me about issues.
151 Q. I want to ask you about something Superintendent Taylor says he told you about, and that is the visit of Ms. McCann and Ms. Murray to the D household, we think in late February/early March 2014. And what Superintendent Taylor, as I understand it, says about that visit is that he was aware he was -- they were
going up there, he didn't discourage it at the time and that he was told that they called to the house in relation to both of the visits by Ms. Murray and Ms. McCann and that he would have texted the former commissioners to update both of you in relation to the visit to the D household from Eavan Murray and Debbie McCann.
A. That absolutely never happened, Chairman.
Q. When did you find out about that visit?
A. I would say at the start of these proceedings. I didn't know anything about Ms. McCann or Ms. Murray having attempted to interview Ms. D.
153 Q. Now, in relation to the Gerald Kean matter and his presence on the Marian Finucane show in late January 2014, did former Commissioner Callinan ever discuss that matter with you?
A. No, Chairman, never.
Q. When did you become aware of his discussions with Mr. Kean and his subsequent drafting of letters?
A. During these proceedings, Chairman.

155 Q. Okay. And did Mr. Walsh ever mention it to you?
A. No, Chairman, never.

156 Q. And were you aware of the correspondence that was held in Garda Headquarters in relation to that matter?
A. No, Chairman, the first I became aware about it, my counsel asked me had I any knowledge of it when it had been discovered.

157 Q. All right. Now, just generally, Ms. O'Sullivan, in relation to the evidence that the Tribunal has heard in
relation to former Commissioner Callinan, on one view of it it would appear that former Commissioner callinan was very happy to tell anybody who would listen any -the negative story about Sergeant McCabe, that being that he had been investigated in relation to an allegation of child sexual abuse or sexual abuse, if we put it -- take the child part out of it. So that is the evidence that the Tribunal has heard. The Tribunal has also heard evidence that those rumours were common currency around Leinster House, with the exception of the former minister, Mr. Shatter, who didn't hear them. So what I'm suggesting to you is that you knew about those rumours, that you knew they were coming from the Gardaí, that you suspected, if not knew, that former Commissioner callinan was putting that story out there and that the -- that Superintendent Taylor knew about that and you didn't approve of it and didn't want anything to do with it -- of it -- with it, but, at the same time, it wasn't within your power to stop it.
A. That's not correct, Chairman. I never heard the rumours in relation to Sergeant McCabe. My knowledge is as I have set out to this Tribunal, when I became aware and what I became aware of it. I would not condone and I would not support and I would certainly react to any campaign that I became aware of or any such rumours being circulated in the manner in which it's described.

158 Q. All right. Well, when it comes to the Tusla notification, we know you didn't react to that,
although you have an explanation for that?
A. Well, Chairman, as I say, I would react -- if I knew something or if I saw something, I know I would react.
159 Q. All right. Now, when you took on the job of Acting Commissioner at the end of March 2014, you were determined to do things differently, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman.

160 Q. You have spoke of your commitment to government, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman.

161 Q. And we know from material that has been retrieved from your ipad that you discussed the matter open7y with Ms. Prone in respect of your vision for An Garda Síochána?
A. I would have discussed the matter with a number of people, including my own management team and generally within the organisation and with a number of people, including a number of public conferences, yes.
Q. Yes. And we don't need to go into it in detail, but the exchange with ms. Prone appears from page 4755 of the materials in volume 17.
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. And you see that you've extensively set out your vision for the organisation and the changes you were going to make to the organisation?
A. Yes, Chairman.

164 Q. And that is a reasonably long email. And in relation to what seems to be the beginning of those exchanges on 30th march 2014, days after you were made Acting

Commissioner, at page 4758 of the materials --
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. -- you see you say:
"Terry, my initial thoughts --"

And in relation to your initial thoughts on being made Acting Commissioner.
"-- at this point, don't specifically mention coalition 11:38 exercise or Maurice McCabe issue so as not to make it the bi g i ssue."

But certainly it was a big issue and you were going to change the organisation but not specifically mention Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman, that's right.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

167 Q. And that's what you set about doing?
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. And you took a number of steps in relation to Sergeant McCabe, in relation to the Pulse matter, which was undoing something the former Commissioner had put in place in relation to Sergeant McCabe's access to Pulse, 11:39 isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

169 Q. You also set about meeting Sergeant McCabe, which, in the former Commissioner's evidence to the Tribunal, he
didn't think would be helpful to the situation.
A. Yes, Chairman.

170 Q. A11 right. And all of that was working through the system. And you also appointed Chief Superintendent o'brien specifically to deal with the Sergeant McCabe issues?
A. Yes, Chairman, and to address any of Sergeant McCabe's concerns that he had.
Q. So you were dealing with a matter differently from the former Commissioner Callinan.
A. Yes, Chairman. And not just in relation to Sergeant McCabe, as I said in my previous evidence to the Tribuna1, it was to set the tone from the top in terms of making sure that people were encouraged to speak up and to bring forward their issues.

So into the middle of that process the Tusla notification arrives in the Commissioner's office?
A. Yes, Chairman.

Now, I just want to refer you to a little bit in relation to what Frank walsh says about that, and I think you have a copy of his statement in front of you.
A. Yes, Chairman, I do. So the first thing that arrives into the Commissioner's office is the notification itself; yes?
A. Yes.

175 Q. Superintendent McGinn's summary of it, and his suggestion that the investigation into Sergeant McCabe in relation to the Ms. D allegation be reviewed?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

176 Q. That is the next document.
A. Yes.

177 Q. And then we have Chief Superintendent Sheridan's letter to you recommending that matters should play out with Micheá 1 Martin and the Garda Síochána Ombudsman Commission before a review of the investigation took place?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.
Q. A11 right. And what Superintendent walsh says about bringing that to your attention, and it's set out at page 3218 of the materials, is that:
"On that day, the Commi ssi oner was avai I able --"

I don't know if you have it in front of you?
A. Yes, I have it here.

179 Q. You have it in front of you.
"-- and I brought the file to her attention. As per usual practice, $I$ would have gi ven the Commissioner the 11:41 actual file to read while giving a synopsis of its main contents orally."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that.

180 Q. So two things would have been going on at the same time: you were reading the matter and he would have been summarising the matter to you, but you don't have a memory of that --
A. No, Chairman, I do not.

181 Q. -- is that right? He didn't understand that the
notification was different from the original
allegation, you see that from the statement?
A. Yes, I see that.

And then what he says:
"Foll owing on fromshowing that to you, he wrote back to the assistant commi ssi oner of the Northern Regi on stating that the content had been noted by the
Commi ssi oner and it was noted that you were consi dering this matter and that you will keep the Commissi oner i nf or med of devel opments."
A. Yes, Chairman, I see that.

183 Q. So yesterday in your evidence, you suggested, as I 11:42 understand your evidence, that the matter went in to some sort of automatic procedure of reminders thereafter, is that --
A. I would imagine so from the type of reminder that was generated, yes, Chairman.
184 Q. All right. So when it comes to the reminder of the 17th July, what you have had at this stage in your office is a letter from Mr. Kenny, Assistant Commissioner, saying he's considering how to deal with the matter and he will keep you informed of the developments?
A. Yes, Chairman.

185 Q. That is lying there in your office. And what Mr. Walsh says then is, he sent a reminder on the 17th July and
he doesn't specifically remember consulting you about that reminder?
A. Yes, Chairman, and that would be normal, if there was a reminder to be sent from the office, yes.
186 Q. So you may not have had an input into that particular reminder?
A. Yes, Chairman, that would be normal practice.

187 Q. So as a result of the reminder, which is on the 17th July, Mr. Kenny writes in on the 28th July saying what will happen in relation to the matter, that Mr. Ruane
will be consulted, and thereafter there is -- and liaison with the HSE, which never actually happened?
A. Yes, Chairman, I see that.
Q. So you are given an answer to that query. And in reply, what Mr. Walsh says is that he brought that to your notice and that he didn't recall having any issues with the update, didn't recall you having any issues with the update, "other than to seek a further report once these consultations was compl eted".

So his evidence is that you asked him to get a further report once the consultations was -- were completed, and that is what he did, he wrote on the 31st July and he said:
"Pl ease report further following consultation with the head of legal affairs and the HSE."
A. Sorry, Ms. Leader, where is that?

189 Q. I beg your pardon. 887. And it's at the very bottom
of Mr. Walsh's statement at page 3218.
A. 3218, yes.
Q. 3218 .
A. Yes, Chairman, I see that here.

191 Q. Okay. Yes, you see that?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN It's not what is coming up on the screen, by the way. This is clearly a radio interview.
MG. LEADER: 887 is the actual reminder, and
Mr. Walsh's statement isn't on the system because it forms part of the Tusla materials.

CHA RMAK Oh, yes. I get you.
Q.

M5. LEADER: So if there were a system of automatic reminders, one would expect one to follow on from that, 11:45 if that was actually the case, but it never did?
A. Yes, Chairman, I would expect that would happen.
Q. But it never did?
A. I understand from Superintendent Walsh's evidence it never did.

195 Q. Yes, yes. So what I'm suggesting to you is, in view of you wanting to make a change and deal with the Sergeant McCabe issues differently, al1 right, and that's what you were doing at this very time, it was at a time when you were going to be meeting Sergeant McCabe the week after all of this, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes.

196 Q. That you were happy, maybe because too much attention had been given to the $D$ investigation and the
allegation of sexual assault made against Sergeant McCabe, to leave this matter sit there for the time being because that potentially would mean that you would be associating yourself with the Tusla -- with the old investigation into the D allegations, and that is something that would possibly cause problems in you building bridges and reaching out to Sergeant McCabe next week or into the future?
A. That is not correct, Chairman. I would never shy away from anything that was put in front of me. I would always deal with it, irrespective of what else was happening, so that is not true and I completely reject that assertion.

197 Q. Okay. But in one way it has the appearance of being dealt with because the matter is being left with the head of legal affairs and leaving it with the HSE, but you were going along dealing with Sergeant McCabe in relation to building bridges or reaching out to him; as you have said, you were going to change the way matters were dealt with?
A. Yes, Chairman, but $I$ would still deal with matters that were in front of me, and, as I said in my evidence yesterday, if this had been brought to my attention in the way it is suggested, I know that I would have actioned it.
198 Q. Okay. And is there any sense, I will have to suggest to you, that you were aware that maybe a wrong had been done in relation to spreading this story about Sergeant McCabe and you didn't want to be any part -- have any
part in that wrong?
A. Absolutely not, Chairman. If I was aware that any wrong was done to Sergeant McCabe, I would be telling the Tribunal about it and I would have actioned it long before this.

MS. LEADER: Thank you very much.
A. Thank you, Ms. Leader.

## MG. O SULLI VAN MAS QUESTI ONED BY THE CHA RMAN

199 Q. CHA RMAN I just have a couple of questions for you. The first is, why was the David Taylor discipline investigation stopped/dropped?
A. I have no knowledge of that, Chairman. It happened after my retirement.
200 Q. CHA RMAN We11, was it just pressure of circumstances, he was coming out ostensibly as a whistleblower and the bad Garda Síochána Headquarters were taking action against him and that just didn't sit with whatever PR --
A. I imagine that may have a bearing, Chairman, but the disciplinary proceedings were still pending while I was serving Commissioner.
CHA RMAN A11 right. I just want to go back to the D allegations, and I just want to make it -- something
absolutely clear: I'm not entitled to reach a view one way or the other as to whether there was an encounter on the couch fully clothed, et cetera. But in the course of your career as a detective, you dealt, I
presume, with a number of sexual assault, rape cases and --
A. Yes, Chairman.

202 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. And there was certainly a time when, I think in the '80s to '90s, when women were being recruited more and more to the Garda, that -- and they were becoming more and more involved in those kinds of investigations and indeed made a big contribution in that regard?
A. Yes, Chairman, that's correct. I was personally, probably only had minimal involvement with sexual investigations because I was working in a different area, but, yes, that would be very true.
203 Q. CHAN RMAN I don't know whether you ever -- you are possibly aware of the fact that, it is almost an idealogical thing, but if I lay my cards on the table, I think that the vast, vast majority of allegations of sexual abuse, rape, are, in fact, correct, that would be my experience?
A. Yes, Chairman.

204 Q. CHA RMAN But there may well be a very small number where they are not. I don't know if you have a view, because, I mean, the plain reality of it is that there is a view out there, women will not complain unless there has been an offence, and then there is another view, which was certainly more prevalent in the 1970s, and indeed appears in forensic textbooks, that the majority of allegations of sexual assault or rape are, in fact, invented. Now, what is your view, I mean,
sensibly, from working as a police -- in the police, having at least a knowledge of these, discussing them with colleagues, as to whether false allegations can occur?
A. I think, Chairman, in my experience, the majority of who come forward to make complaints, and particularly with the supports that are in place through the Rape Crisis Centre and other agencies, the majority of people who come forward to make complaints of sexual violence and sexual assaults in previous days are genuine cases and they genuinely feel that something has occurred which has interfered with their integrity in some way. I think there are a number of people who come forward and they do make vexatious complaints, let that be because something has either happened that they may have consented to and then changed their minds, or whatever, but I do think that the vast majority of people who come forward are genuine cases and, as I say, particularly with the supports that are in place through the NGOs, that is actually a system that works 11:51 very well because people feel they are supported.
205 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. So, I mean, there are vexatious complaints. I mean, we know, just historically looking at it, there was a case in Cyprus involving Irish soldiers; there was a case which I think went as far as 11:51 the Court of Appeal, involving an allegation where there was a dispute between families in relation to land. But in the course of your career, I presume through conversations, and this is perfectly proper to
discuss and to share knowledge, you would have come across perhaps others?
A. Yes, Chairman, we would have come across some vexatious cases and, as I say, yes, there would be the majority. But from An Garda Síochána's point of view, we always ensure that the case is investigated thoroughly to get to the truth of the matter.

206 Q. CHA RMAN No, and I appreciate all that and I am taking that as a given. But when you first, therefore, heard about the D allegation which was going back to 2008, because of the summary made in relation to a whole load of things by Chief Superintendent Terry MCGinn up in Donegal, did you have a view one way or the other? Did you say -- and clearly you are not deciding this, I am not deciding this, but did you look 11:52 at it in any detail and say, what is this? what is the background? How strong is this? Even in terms of strength, on a scale of one to ten how strong would this -- strongly would this come over if it were to be ventilated in a court or --
A. No, Chairman, as I said, the -- the extent of my knowledge of it was the synopsis that was provided by Chief Superintendent McGinn. What guided me in my thinking in relation to that, having read the file, was that the DPP had directed there was no basis for a prosecution and, as such, to my mind, that meant that the case was closed, this had been investigated, directed upon and, therefore, Sergeant McCabe had no case to answer. understand it, the Cunningham file?
A. No, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Yes. There is a reason for me asking these in terms of preliminary questions, because it is curious, and Ms. Leader has asked you about this. So, in 2008, you had the Terry McGinn summary, and then in -- I think it's the 17th May 2014, you had the Tus7a thing. Now, did you actually hold in your mind all through those years, so we are talking about six years, what exactly the nature of the detail was? Are you the kind of person who kind of holds details particularly in relation to something we would all find very difficult, as in a lot of crime, to internalise, to remember? Do you actually hold those kind of details in your head?
A. No, Chairman, what I would have held in my head in
relation to that in the intervening period was the fact that an allegation had been made against Sergeant McCabe but the DPP had directed no basis for a prosecution, so in my head there would have been a historic allegation and there was no basis for a prosecution. That would have been the sum total of it.
CHA RMAN Yes. But, you see, here there has been a lot of emphasis, and indeed I have emphasised it myself, between, if you take the Professor o'malley formulation in relation to sexual abuse, the ladder, the ten steps, or whatever, and how bad things get, and indeed that is a principle of sentencing as well, as you will know, but is it possible that when -- if someone had drawn your attention to the fact that this was digital penetration or, going even further, digital 11:55 penetration, alleged, of the vagina and anus of this 14 -year-old gir1, that it wouldn't have jumped out at you and you wouldn't have said, well, that is not what was alleged in 2008, or would you have been able to make that comparison on the basis of your limited information?
A. I think, Chairman, if I had seen the document, I would -- as I said, I would have contacted Assistant Commissioner Kenny to see why this is being raised now.
212 Q. CHAD RMAN No, I think the point I am trying to ask you 11:55 about is alarm bell. So somebody says, six years ago, that what happened was an encounter on a couch, fully clothed, one person behind the other, went on for a number of minutes, somebody walks down the corridor,
and then six years later somebody says what happened was clearly there had to be some clothing removed, probably a lot of clothing removed, digital penetration, okay, of orifices, it's all very unpleasant, but would you have remembered what was alleged in 2006 in such detail as if, in fact, you read the stuff coming from the HSE and if the superintendent had, in fact, summarised it to you in May of 2014, would you have remembered it to such an extent that an alarm went off in your head and you said to yourself, oh, there is something odd here, why is this suddenly different? Why is this a completely different step on the ladder?
A. Yes, Chairman, I think an alarm bell would have gone off in my head, because such was the gravity of the offence that was alleged in the 2015 paperwork, that it would have been so different and I would have -- the alarm bell that would have gone off in my head is, has some new evidence come to light or why did the DPP say no basis for prosecution in such a serious case? And that is the type of alarm bell. So I would have actioned it in a different way.
213 Q. CHN RMAN Is it possible that you simply don't like this kind of stuff, it was a natural human reaction, and when someone starts to talk to you about it you kind of close down your mind? I know I am accused of that at home, zeroing in and zeroing out of conversations. Do you understand what I mean?
A. No, Chairman, I very seldom zero, but certainly in
terms of investigations and investigative practice, I have dealt with far more gruesome issues than this very serious type of issue. But, no, so I don't shy away -CHA RMAN I know that. But, you see, the strange thing about it is that you actually sat across the table from the man against whom this was alleged and actually shook his hand the following week. And given that a reasonable person, and you are clearly a reasonable person, would be of the view that, you know, the vast majority of sexual assault allegations are true, this is a very serious sexual assault allegation and it has been drawn to your attention the previous week, so surely you would have held it in your mind, would have been reacting to him or at least being wondering about things?
A. Chairman, I have absolutely no memory whatsoever of Superintendent walsh showing me the file, the Tusla allegation file at all.
Q. CHA RMAN So when you met Sergeant McCabe, it was, this is Sergeant McCabe, and the worst you could have thought about him was possible allegation of possible encounter on a couch, fully clothed, all of -- it's about 12 years ago, actually, at that stage?
A. Yes, Chairman. And as I say, the historic issues were the historic issues and the purpose of the meeting with sum total of my knowledge in relation to Sergeant McCabe.

216 Q. CHA RMAN Did it run through your mind when you were
reading meeting him at all?
A. The previous allegation?

217 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. No, Chairman.

218 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Did you ever ask yourself the question, and, you know - we11, maybe a preliminary question might be useful; what was your reaction when you read the O'Higgins Report?
A. I was extraordinarily disappointed. It didn't come as a surprise because, as I said, we had the Guerin Report 11:59 prior to it and we'd also had the Garda Inspectorate's report, so it mirrored a lot of those findings. I was extremely disappointed that here again An Garda Síochána was being criticised, but I was also confident that we had started taking steps to address the deficiencies and the failings in the investigation. I was also confident that the measures we had taken would be seen to be that and that is why I was able to accept the findings.
219 Q. CHA RMAN Anyway, nowadays, unfortunately, in every 11:59 walk of life, there is a great deal of emphasis on public relations, and, really and truly, what actually is happening matters more than telling people that things are wonderful. So, I mean, your reaction was you were disappointed because the Gardaí were being criticised, or were you saying, well, we are being criticised but it's completely justifiable and we have got to do an awful lot better than this kind of nonsense?
A. Completely, Chairman. What I was -- what we had done in the intervening period, particularly around -- the striking thing for me was in relation to our failure -failing to service victims appropriately and that victims had felt left down and let down by An Garda Síochána.

CHA RMAN We11, they didn't just feel it. They were.
A. They were. Oh, no, they absolutely were, and that was the disappointment.

221 Q. CHA RMAK I mean, there wasn't effectively a police service at all in relation to these matters. It was messing and it was lack of attention to detail, it was lack of attention to duty and it was sheer and utter laziness, and, as a commanding officer, clearly you would have had to deal with that during your time?
A. Yes, Chairman.
A. And what we had done was, what was very clear to me in the O'Higgins Report, we had let down victims of crime. What I was confident we had done was, we had actually started to take measures to listen to victims of crime. CHA RMAN Well, yes, listening is fine, but getting people to do their job is the basic role of any manager of any kind, whether you are a sergeant or anything else?
A. Yes, and the supervisory aspects. What we had done, Chairman, in relation to the victims of crime in the intervening period between the Guerin Report and the O'Higgins Report, was worked with the NGOs about
setting up victim services offices and putting in measures in place --

224 Q.
CHA RMAN I mean, all of that is touchy-feely, and that is fine. But the plain reality, someone reports a crime, it should be investigated and investigated properly?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Both may be important, Commissioner, but the police have to do their job.
A. Yes. And in relation to the supervisory function in terms of investigating crime, we were addressing that as we11. But if I can just say, I felt it was much more than touchy-feely. It was actually, particularly with the Victims' Directive and the Istanbul Convention, it was absolutely imperative that we would have systems and structures in place to make sure that we were dealing with victims of crime and giving them the service, including, of course, having their investigation investigated properly, thoroughly and appropriately.

227 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. No, I do see your point. And in the event that victims are involved and are aware of the steps that are being taken, well then the police may we11 be more likely to do a proper job and get on with
things?
A. Yes, Chairman.

But were you a bit shocked then by the Paul Reynolds reports that I am required to investigate into? would you not have thought that maybe, and I am not saying this at all, that maybe the tone might have been something like, yet again the Garda Síochána have let us down, as opposed to, if only there was an inspector in place none of this would have happened? I mean, what was your attitude? Did you think it was good from 12:02 a PR point of view? Did you think anything of it from the point of view of where the truth actually lay in terms of informing the people of Ireland? And again, I am taking no view; I want your view.
A. Okay. well, Chairman, I will give you my view. My 12:02 immediate reaction to hearing Mr. Reynolds' report on the 9th May was to know where did this come from, because I didn't think it was doing An Garda Síochána justice insofar as my view was that we needed to apologise to the victims of crime, we needed to apologise to the community and we needed to do, as I have said, reassure them. So my approach would have been very much different and is evidenced in my subsequent statements that I issued, not just in relation to the fallout but making sure that we reassured people that we were doing something. I felt that the focus of Mr. Reynolds' article -- not articles, media coverage, was actually giving the wrong tone and not the tone that I would have wanted to give
in terms of accepting our failings and our wrongdoing. CHA RMAN why did you think Sergeant McCabe was at what he was at? I mean, basically, what did you actually think during all this time dealing with all this stuff, it escalating? Okay, it's more and more trouble, there is more and more firefighting, but why did you think he was at what he was at?
A. I think Sergeant McCabe was genuinely motivated to bring forward cases that he felt and issues that he felt were not being dealt with. I think it was very difficult at times because for the simple reason is that when Sergeant McCabe would bring forward issues, they would be dealt with, but then what we found was that we would have to deal with them not just internally but they would be dealt with in a particular 12:04 forum and they would escalate into big political issues that actually made it very, very difficult then to deal with. But I feel that Sergeant McCabe was genuinely motivated in bringing forward the issues. I think his desire was to improve policing practices. I think that, in my experience, a lot of Sergeant McCabe's issues led to a lot of improvements in the FCPN but also in policing practices in Bailieboro and other issues, and I have publicly acknowledged Sergeant McCabe in terms of even the contribution to the victim 12:04 service offices, that wouldn't have happened except for what Sergeant McCabe brought forward to Guerin. CHA RMAN So you didn't think he was a bit windy, as you say, within the police force?
A. No, Chairman, no.

231 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. The last thing I wanted to ask you about was this: Look, if you look at the video of Martin Callinan before the Public Accounts Committee, it's clear that at a particular point he becomes upset. 12:05 Now, he says the two of you travelled back to Garda Headquarters together after that. Now, you seem not to be able to remember that. But I would have thought that that would be an opportunity for him maybe to pour out his heart to you, or maybe he would just simply stare out the window like in a French film and say absolutely nothing, I don't know. But did you go back to Garda Headquarters with him?
A. I have been trying to recollect that. It's quite possible, Chairman. We would often travel back together and then on occasion -- but it is quite possible we travelled back together, yes.
232 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. But, I mean, did you ever kind of take him aside and say, look, you are getting too upset about the Maurice McCabe issues and the plain reality is, if we deal with them, if we keep the train on the tracks and if we keep moving forward we'11 get to the end of them, so, you know, go home, relax, dig the garden, play a game of golf, or whatever, we need to get you in a proper state of mind? Did you ever have any such conversation with Martin Callinan?
A. I would have had conversations with Commissioner Callinan around exactly what you say, look, let's focus on the positives, and indeed it's recorded in some of
the minutes of the meeting, let's focus on the positives, let us make sure that we are actually addressing the issues and let us make sure -- and I would have advised Commissioner callinan on occasions not to be so immersed in some of the issues that were just constantly bombarding all of us and -- but Commissioner Callinan wouldn't be -- the relationship we had, he wouldn't be pouring out his inner feelings to me, but I would have advised him, from my observations, that it was necessary that we just step back from everything that was going on for a while to deal with the issues, and that is what I felt, to be fair, that we were doing, we were dealing with all of the issues and trying to fix, for example, the penalty points system and trying to make sure -- and for his own sake -- I do recall that he used to spend very, very long hours in the office, he would be very immersed in all of the very finite detail of all of the reports of all of the day-to-day issues that were going on but particularly in relation to these matters, and I 12:07 felt he needed to step back from it. CHA RMAN Yes, but he clearly took a view, on no matter what view of the evidence you take that has been given, and there is various possibilities in terms of the way things might be decided, but he clearly was of the view that Maurice McCabe, whatever, whether he was right or wrong, was going about things the wrong way; you go to your commanding officer, you go to o'mahony, you follow up the structures. You don't take a whole
load, a big box-load of Pulse printouts and deliver them over to various public representatives or interested parties; you do things in accordance with the book, and that seems to have been the main source of upset. Was -- did you actually talk about that, that Maurice McCabe was, as far as Martin Callinan was concerned, was going about things completely and utterly the wrong way?
A. Yes, Chairperson, we did, and Commissioner Callinan was very concerned, and I would say legitimately concerned, about the manner in which particularly information in relation to citizens was being put into the public domain. He absolutely expressed that, loudly and clearly. He went so far as to get advices from the Data Protection Commissioner and the Attorney General in relation to it, and he was very open about his views on that, and I have to say, it's a view that I shared; it was something completely new to An Garda Síochána. You know, we take our responsibilities around information in relation to citizens very, very seriously, and here we had something that we were -that we did not have control of in terms of the manner in which this information was being put into the public domain, and I know for a fact that commissioner Callinan was very concerned about that.
234 Q. CHA RMAN The last thing I wanted to ask you was this: I mean, it may be that there has been overemphasis on this, it may be that a particular line is being followed to create a particular impression, but just
looking at the evidence, but looking at evidence that is independent of David Taylor, it would seem that he was in and out of the Commissioner's office an awful lot and that they were terribly close to one another and having long conversations about this, that and the other. I mean, what was the nature of the relationship, as you saw it? And the second question: you clearly thought there was something unhealthy about David Taylor and you wanted him moved as soon as you got in, so maybe you'd tell me your impression of that time and the relationship between the two of them, please?
A. I think that my observations were that Commissioner Callinan and Superintendent Taylor did indeed work very closely together. I wouldn't have thought that they had a personal relationship, but they certainly had a very close working relationship. My observations were that I felt that Superintendent Taylor, to use a phrase, inserted himself in around commissioner Callinan, Commissioner Callinan came to rely on him quite a lot, but that is understandable because the role of Press Officer and Commissioner is a very close role; you have to be able to interact on a daily basis, there are always things that have to be done. So I felt, yes, that they had a close working relationship, 12:10 but I would never have thought that they had a personal relationship at all, but they were closely working together. In relation to my concerns in relation to David Taylor, I did not feel comfortable in his
presence. I felt that he, at times, to me, appeared to be a divisive individual. I certainly felt that he was not, from my observations, respecting the role of Mr. McLindon as the director of communications and respecting his professional expertise and opinion, and I also sensed, even though I had never worked in the Press office, but I sensed that there was division and I sensed that the office wasn't working well together, and I felt that it was very important to be able to build on that and to be able to have a media, a strategic communications and media unit that would work well together and, most importantly, that would work we11 together with the operational field and that we would be able to --

235 Q.
CHA RMAN I will take all of that as a given. I mean, that is a given. You were uncomfortable as a woman, is that what you are saying, around David Taylor, or what? I don't know what you are saying.
A. Well, as a person, $I$ just -- I didn't like his style. I felt that -- I don't -- I can't put my finger on it, I just was not comfortable in his presence. It wasn't just as a woman. There are people -- just as a person, I didn't feel comfortable in his presence. I felt that, as I say, that his -- he was undermining not just Mr. McLindon but me as wel1, and I felt that he was not -- I mentioned a phrase earlier, he did not have my back. And I felt that, for those reasons, I could not see myself working with him in the capacity as Press officer.
Q. CHA RMAN But you would rather not have him working around you at all?
A. Yes, Chairman.

Or in Headquarters?
A. Yes, Chairman.

CHA RMAN And that is woman's instinct but it's not more than that?
A. I think I would say it was intuitive, that I felt that I would prefer that he was working some place. I also would prefer that he was working with somebody who was an experienced chief superintendent and that there was an appropriate structure in place that he could work in and contribute to.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
A. Thank you very much, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MS. LEADER: The next witness, sir, is Ms. Anne Harris. Her interview with the Tribunal investigators is in volume 14 at page 3543 of the materials.

## MS. ANNE HARRI S, HAV NG BEEN SVDRN, YAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY ME. LEADER:

MG. LEADER: Ms. Harris, I think you are now a freelance journalist, is that correct?
A. That's right.

240 Q. If you'd outline your career path to date to that
position, please.
A. Well, Chairman, I began as a freelance journalist, and for most of my adult life I have been a journalist, and for 30 years $I$ worked for Independent News \& Media, where I was various editors - features editor, deputy editor and, finally, editor. For the last -- for the three years from the beginning of 2012 to the end of 2014, I was editor of the Sunday Independent.
241 Q. And I think you were appointed to the post of editor on the 3rd February 2012?
A. That's correct.

242 Q. And you left at the end of 2014?
A. Yes, I had a three-year contract and I served it out.

All right. Now, if you would explain the structure and reporting line of the Sunday Independent, please, as you have set it out to the Tribunal investigators earlier on.
A. Well, in my time, the three-year time, there were two basic reporting structures. The first one was a very traditional editor in charge of a title. In -- all of the titles in INM were standalone titles, Chairman, like the Irish Independent had its own editor, the Evening Herald had its own editor, the Sunday world had its own editor and the Sunday Independent had. So, for the first 18 months that I was there, that was the structure, and so I had a team that had been recruited specifically for the Sunday Independent, who reported directly to me as editor of the Sunday Independent. And then sometime -- or exactly halfway through, at the
end of June 2013, the structure was changed, an editor-in-chief was appointed. If I could describe it as it was shown to me, I was shown a pyramid, and at the top of the pyramid was an editor-in-chief and at the bottom of the -- the baseline of the pyramid was a number of group editors who were about to be appointed at that point, and there among that group was a person called the masthead editor, and I said, 'what exactly is that?' And they said that is actually traditionally the editor. So from -- basically from -- the structure 12:16 changed, but I had to be very clear that I was always the editor, despite the now-different structure. So what the structure then entailed after that was, that there was a -- the staff who and my team who had been hired specifically for the Sunday Independent was then sort of dismantled and spread across a number of titles, so that meetings, editorial meetings were slightly changed after 2013.
244 Q. A11 right. So before June 2013, you reported to the board of the Independent?
A. No, I reported to the CEO.

245 Q. CEO, the Chief Executive Officer?
A. Yes, yes.

246 Q. And after June 2013, you reported to an editor-in-chief?
A. Yes.

247 Q. And that editor-in-chief was?
A. Stephen Rae.

248 Q. A11 right. Now, in relation to the journalists who
contributed to the newspaper, I wonder could you explain their terms of appointment or engagement with the newspaper?
A. We11, newspapers are made up of staff journalists, who are hired and in permanent and pensionable positions, and freelance journalists, who generally attach to one particular title because they, as their careers continue, they serve that title very well, their identities are close to the identity of the title, they would be reliable, reputable people with good reputations, long-standing journalists associated with newspapers, and they would form a part of the team as we11, even though they would not be -- they would not be in permanent and pensionable situations with Independent Newspapers.
249 Q. All right. And in terms of numbers of journalists reporting to you, I wonder could you assist the Tribunal about how many there would be?
A. The Sunday Independent was always a very tight ship. It had quite a sma11 staff and a very small core team, and I suppose you would have about a dozen who would consist of reporters and -- as the years went on and cutbacks happened, the number of reporters, you know, decreased, and the number of freelances increased, and then you would have people with specific areas of interest in a newspaper. The correspondents, you would have political correspondents and a political editor, crime correspondents, security correspondents, mainly -- well, obviously a lot of sports
correspondents and features people. But politics and business and crime and security were sort of core areas in any newspaper, chairman.
And in your interview with the Tribunal investigators, you say that during the relevant time period, that is 2012 to when you --
A. Retired.
-- retired, there were about a dozen journalists that you would have had dealings with?
A. On a regular basis, roughly about a dozen journalists. And then, of course, outside that, as in other newspapers, like The Irish Times, you would have a number of analysts and columnists who would write regularly, and indeed you would talk to them every week but they would never come into the office. It's -- I
think that is just -- they would be leader writers or opinion op-ed page writers, and generally they would be commissioned, because there is very few of them that just decide what they are going to write about by themselves every week. So if you have a theme or a topic on the newspaper on any given week, you might speak to one of the columnists and ask if they would have something to contribute on that particular debate.
252 Q. All right. Just in very general terms, leaving Sergeant McCabe out of the picture just for the minute, 12:20 I wonder could you explain to the Tribunal how the business of the newspaper comes about, how a story gets published in a newspaper.
A. Well, Chairman, the first thing to remember is that
journalists only know things because people tell them things. Information doesn't come out of a tap, so somebody has to have told a journalist something first before they can even put in a Freedom of Information request. So somebody has to have said something that, you know, tweaked their curiosity and made them want to take a story further. So I can only speak about a Sunday newspaper because I worked in a Sunday newspaper for 30 years. Daily newspapers would have different routines and different rhythms. So, in the Sunday newspaper, the first thing, every week, was a very big editorial conference, to which all of the reporters came, and that particular conference had to be a place, in my view it had to be a safe place where journalists could bring anything they had heard, rumour and innuendo, ephemera, no matter what it was, they had to be able to bring this into the editorial conference, secure in the knowledge that this would not go any further, because if you think about it, and even anybody thinks back, the number of urban myths we have all heard over the years, of stories that people swore were true, which were absolutely not true, and if these stories had progressed out of editorial conferences, well it would have been disastrous. But at the same time, if journalists weren't free to come to editorial conference and say that they had heard something and they thought it was worth investigating, then you would have no newspapers, if journalists didn't feel that they could come to conference and talk about anything
they had heard, Chairman.
253 Q. Al1 right.
A. So the first thing that happened was, you would have a conference and it would be a loud and kind of important discussion where everything is discussed. Now, so much 12:23 so was the sort of in lodge part of this editorial conference, unofficially regarded, that sometimes at conference you would call a lawyer. We had regular libel lawyers on hand all the time, and you might call one for a bit of advice on how you might progress a story, and how you might proceed with a certain story. Those lawyers would know, and can confirm, that they could be called in to discuss a detail and then they might be asked to leave immediately because it would not be for their ears, the rest of what was being discussed at the conference. And then --

254 Q. So various journalists would come to the conference at the beginning of the week with ideas?
A. With ideas, yes.
or looking for guidance. And what would happen thereafter?
A. They come with their ideas and I come with my ideas, and obviously we are all in the news business, and so, Chairman, people have -- people are wanting to take the stories that are in the news of the day, progress them 12:24 further on that week. Also, they will have new things. Above all, in a Sunday newspaper, you will want to be following your own inquiries about things, you want something different for the Sunday, not just a
summing-up of the week, so journalists bring stories to the editorial conference first thing, and the first editorial conference of the week is a big one. Sometimes, but very rarely, a columnist might attend. It's mainly journalists with ideas seeking to find out how they can take these ideas further and develop them as news stories. They speak to you in lodge, in confidence, and, by the end of that meeting, which usually took a few hours, you would have sort of an agenda for the week, just rough notes might be taken. There were -- this was an internal matter, they weren't minuted; these meetings couldn't be minuted because it was entirely for the purpose of just doing the newspaper on the week, and, if you think about it, the newspaper itself was the record of what had taken place 12:25 at the big editorial meeting, because what had been worth proceeding and what had been found to be verifiable would appear in the paper, fully legaled, not defaming anybody, one hopes, and that was the record that you needed. So those meetings were never 12:25 minuted. And that is how the paper was first shaped up. The week followed with meetings most days. If you want me to --
256 Q. And journalists would develop their stories?
A. Well, you would develop you stories. You would have 12:25 catch-up meetings as the week went on. Wednesday was usually a day for talking to columnists, seeing that there was a shape coming to the paper, that there would be possibly, and particularly in the Sunday Independent
there was very often a theme to the week and columnists would be commissioned along those lines. The Thursday meeting was invariably what is called a dummy meeting; I don't know if this is the slightest interest to the Chairman, but it's a meeting where production people and department heads come and the newspaper has a template --

## 257 Q. It would be put together?

A. It's put together. The pages -- you learn to imagine the pages and decided orders of priority, what matters, what is working out, what is to be discarded, and it's just very much -- it's more than a technical meeting, it's because in the -- the shape, very often, as everybody in this business knows, a shape can dictate a story, and so the shape of the paper -- the paper is shaped, by and large, on a Thursday, and you also know that if you are not really well dug into your stories by Thursday, you are not going to be at the races. And Friday afternoon was always a very big meeting, news meeting again, to go over what had worked out, what hadn't worked out, again -- and emphasising page 1, pages 1 to 5 would be the big topics on Friday, again bringing in lawyers at that stage to see what is working out and what isn't and more news meetings on a Saturday morning.
258 Q. Right. okay. Now --
A. Lawyers might have more involvement on a Saturday morning.

259 Q. Okay. So to those meetings did any journalist come
with stories about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Another thing that happens in newspapers, Chairman, is that journalists, I won't say they take ownership of stories, but they do need to know and be familiar and fluent with certain stories in order to be sure that you are getting -- that they will be familiar with them and not fall into traps, or anything. So we had some reporters who were we11-versed in Maurice McCabe's concerns about Garda malpractice, and on May the 5th in 2013 we had a story by Philip Ryan, who was one of those journalists who always faithfully followed the Maurice McCabe stories. He was always accurate, a reputable, reliable journalist with a -- and he -- and he was very good on following these stories, and he had a story, which was to the effect that subsequent to Sergeant McCabe's reporting on the quashing of penalty points, that some of those people who had had penalty points quashed had gone on to commit fatal accidents, and so this was a story that we had and it was given prominence in the Sunday Independent. And immediately
subsequent to that, at one of the next big editorial conferences on a Tuesday morning, a freelance journalist raised the issue of Maurice McCabe to the effect that I didn't really know the whole story, and proceeded to give me a different story about Sergeant Maurice McCabe and that story was the well-worn one about the -- about -- what was given to me was that there was a colleague of Sergeant McCabe's who was driving along with his daughter in the car and she
said, 'daddy, daddy, that's him, that is the man'. And her father looked and saw that it was Sergeant Maurice McCabe, and she was referring to something that had happened in 2006 when she was much younger and it was vague what had happened, but the inference was that it was something to do with a child, inappropriate behaviour. So I was -- I didn't like that kind of thing being raised -If I could just stop you there. Was that the first time you heard it?
A. That was the first time I heard it.
A. So I thought about it and I -- since we had continuous coverage of sergeant McCabe and his, what I thought very important and in the public interest concerns about malpractice in the Gardaí, I decided I should find out, Chairman, if these -- if there was anything to this. So I used my own sources and I set about inquiring what -- if this had ever reached any sort of further currency or further -- if there had been anything further on it, and I discovered that the DPP had looked into it and had discovered that this matter had been groundless. So I was satisfied with this and I was more than happy to continue with the -- with just proper, appropriate and prominent coverage of sergeant ${ }_{\text {12:31 }}$ Maurice McCabe's concerns.
262 Q. All right. Just in relation to your own inquiries made in relation to the story you had heard from the freelance journalist, did you get any of that
information from either Superintendent Taylor, former Commissioner o'Sullivan or former Commissioner Callinan?
A. No, no, Chairman, I never had any dealings with any of -- either Taylor or Commissioner o'Sullivan or Commissioner Callinan.
Q. Do you know them?
A. Only through media. I have never met any of them, I have never spoken to any of them.
All right. Now, did anybody else come to you with that ${ }_{12: 31}$ story in relation to Sergeant McCabe; was it one journalist or was it more than one journalist?
A. That story was raised one more time by the same journalist, but this time I shut it down and said that I had investigated it and I had -- now knew that it had 12:32 been groundless and I didn't want to hear it any more in my office, and that journalist never raised it again.
265 Q. okay.
A. And I am not 100 percent sure, Chairman, but I think that the purpose in raising it was never to try to get the Sunday Independent to publish anything of that order, because, just basically, it would have been so difficult, in my view, anyway, to publish anything like that, but I think it was intended as a warning, a sort ${ }_{\text {12:32 }}$ of a chilling thing to think twice about this particular -- the complaints of this particular sergeant.
CHA RMAN All right. Ms. Leader, you probably want to
get away before lunch, but I am sorry, I have to take a break, and in an hour's time we will continue. Thank you. AD OURNMENT:

MS. LEADER: Ms. Harris, please.
266 Q. Now, before lunch, Ms. Harris, you were telling the Tribunal about information that was given to you by a journalist in the Irish Independent in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
A. Yes.

267 Q. And as I understand it, that information came to you following publication of an article on the 5th May 2013?
A. That's right.
Q. Yes. And it was presented to you in the way that there's another side to this story, is that right?
A. That's right, Chairman.

269 Q. And also, as I understand it, it wasn't presented to you as a story you should yourself publish, is that right?
A. No, it wasn't, Chairman. It was just, I felt, a warning.
Q. A warning?
A. Yes.

271 Q. Now, I just want to be clear about this; was it one journalist or more than one journalist that was coming to you with this information in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. At that time it was one journalist, but that was May 2013.

272 Q. May 2013.
A. And it was the first I heard of this.

273 Q. okay.
A. But thereafter, I have to say that you would hear quite a lot of this nudge-and-wink stuff around the place.
274 Q. okay. Well, if we can go back to the first journalist that told you about it; how many -- you said before lunch that they came to you a second time in relation to the same story, is that correct?
A. That's right.

275 Q. And was there a repeat again by the same journalist of the matter after the second time?
A. Never again after the second time.
Q. Al1 right. And can you pin that down in terms of time in any way?
A. It was in the same timeframe, I think, around May and June of 2013 --

277 Q. Right.
A. -- that it was repeated.

278 Q. okay.
A. But I think that it was given up after that.
Q. All right. Now, and that related to the story of the confrontation in the town --
A. That's right.
Q. -- in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

281 Q. Was there any variation in that?
A. There was slight variation in the telling of the story. In one version, the alleged incident had taken place at
a children's party, and in the other version it was vaguely something to do with babysitting. But I suppose some people would see a children's party as a babysitting, do you know, so it wasn't a huge difference in detail.

282 Q. And was that variation coming from the same person?
A. Yes, it was.

283 Q. All right. So thereafter, you think you heard murmurings, am I correct, or echoings of that general story?
A. Yes, you would hear it around the corridors. It was pervasive in the offices of INM, I think it's fair to say. People talked about it without actually talking about it, if that sounds strange. They would sort of talk about, you know the thing, or there was sort of a lot of innuendo. I never engaged in conversations with it and I generally shut it down, but it was quite clear that it was talked about. And then you'd meet people from the political spectrum and it would be, you know, you would hear the same sort of -- it was rumour and innuendo, and all of this rumour and innuendo, as far as I could see, had one purpose, which was to detract from the character of a man who was doing something which had the explicit purpose of bringing something to the public interest which largely affected the public.
284 Q. okay.
A. Garda malpractice.

285 Q. Did you know the source of this information that that journalist gave to you?
A. No, I didn't know. I asked for it several times, but I didn't get the information.
Q. Okay. Did you get as far as establishing was it a Garda source or another source?
A. I didn't ever manage to establish the source, but I suppose I just formed the view that it probably was a Garda source. It seemed to -- you know, when you look at what purpose a particular rumour is serving and cui bono and it definitely seemed that the purpose of this was to stop Sergeant Maurice McCabe, to stop him raising these concerns, to stop media from covering his concerns. So I myself, but with no specific information, just formed the view that it probably was emanating from the Gardaí.
287 Q Now, in relation to other rumours that were in the corridors, it wasn't something that was being spoken about every day, was it, or was it?
A. No, it wasn't spoken about every day. But what struck me about it, Chairman, was the casual nature of it. It was careless talk, it was casual calumniation, it was just: doesn't everybody know this about Sergeant Maurice McCabe?

288 Q. And that talk, was it amongst other journalists or was it other editors or other employees of the newspaper? Can you specify that?
A. I never discussed it with other editors, and, yes, it would have been with other journalists.

289 Q. okay. And was there anything specific in that other talk in relation to the rumours that were being spoken
about?
A. No, nothing specific. No more specific than I have already said.
okay. Was it a version of the same story about a confrontation in the street with Sergeant McCabe?
A. In as far as $I$ ever discussed it. But, you see, I always shut it down and I always said, I looked into this and there is no basis for it, so I always shut the conversation down. And after those two incidents at the editorial conference, I didn't really allow it to be raised at an editorial conference, because, as far as I was concerned, it wasn't true, we shouldn't be discussing it and we shouldn't be wasting our time discussing stuff that has no basis in truth, chairman.
291 Q. All right. Now, if we can go forward to 2014. You said in your second statement to the Tribunal that the talk became more specific, and I wonder could you elaborate on that, please?
A. Yes, well, a lot had happened in relation to Sergeant McCabe --

292 Q. Yes.
A. -- over that year, and, in particular, I'm thinking about February 2014, when Mary Lynch went very public with the fact that she considered that Sergeant -- Mary Lynch was the woman who had been abducted and assaulted 13:40 by a man called Jerry McGrath, who had been released from Bailieboro, I think, Garda Station, and he had gone on to abduct a child and murder a woman in a hotel in Limerick. And Mary Lynch, who was the victim of
this abduction and assault, had apparently been told that Maurice McCabe was the sergeant who had released him to commit these other terrible crimes. So she came out in February 2014, I think it was around the 21st was the date of the publication, and she wanted to vindicate Sergeant Maurice McCabe and she wanted to say that she felt he'd been scapegoated and she had subsequently discovered that he had not released the criminal and she had been told and she had held for a long time very negative feelings about Sergeant McCabe, 13:41 and now she found out they weren't true and she wanted -- so all of this we covered extensively, and other matters. And also, there was the Sean Guerin investigation in that period, the GSOC bugging. And so there was quite a lot going on. Then in September of that year, when the Dáil reconvened, we had -- things go quiet in the summer, the Dái 1 is calm or there's nothing going on and the newspapers become slightly different in the summer. And in September it's all back again. Late September, the Dáil has reconvened.
Alan Shatter, of course, had gone before that summer recess and he -- so the Dáil has reconvened, Sergeant McCabe is being discussed again with the new Minister for Justice, the Guerin Report is now the subject of some controversy with the Garda sergeants complaining through the Garda, through their representative body and through their review, that they felt they didn't get a fair crack of the whip from Seán Guerin, and the GSOC, the investigation into the bugging and the Sunday

Times leak is being published and there's a great deal of talk about Garda matters and Sergeant Maurice McCabe in late September 2014. Am I making --
293 Q. Yes.
A. Painting a picture.
A. So editorial discussions would concentrate on these matters.
Q. A11 right.
A. And one -- after one particular editorial conference, where we had been talking about Sergeant McCabe and where we had determined how we would cover these matters, the conference finished and, by that time, the structure of the Sunday Independent had changed and we had now group editors present. And the group political editor was Fionnan Sheahan, with whom, at that stage, I have to say, $I$ had an excellent working relationship. I respected him hugely as a political commentator. He had encyclopedic knowledge of politics. When I look back over what he was doing, he was alert to the grumblings about Enda Kenny, the leadership bids of Leo Varadkar. He was writing about the fact that an abortion referendum would be in the offing. So he was incredibly alert and a political editor whom you would respect, whom I respected.
296 Q. Yes.
A. I make no secret of the fact that we had difficulties at the beginning. I was the editor, nonetheless, and Fionnan Sheahan was the political group editor. I
commissioned him to write a great number of articles in that period. Between the end of August and the beginning of october he had five major articles in the Sunday Independent. They would not have been there, I cannot emphasise this enough, they would not have been there had I not commissioned them, and there were also features which he suggested, he had ideas for features, and I commissioned those as wel1. So I had a very good working relationship with him.

At the end of the conference, towards the end of September, everybody had left, he'd gone out the door, he turned back, came to the office and said, because the last conversation had been about, at the conference, had been about Sergeant Maurice McCabe and he said he's a paedophile, McCabe's a pedophile. And I was -- I was shocked.
297 Q. All right.
A. Because up until then there had been a year of talk, all vague, all in typical Irish euphemisms, all talk about, you know, interfering with children or inappropriate or -- it was always said like that, an inappropriate interest in children. It was never said like that before. And so it was -- the scale had suddenly upped and accelerated.
Al1 right. Now, when --
CHA RMAN Yes, I was wondering when that was?
A. All I can do is, Chairman, is date it to my recollection of matters associated with it. So at the
end of September we had features about the Dáil resuming and all of those things that $I$ mentioned, the GSOC inquiry, the Guerin, the Garda sergeants and the Guerin Report and Alan Shatter's interaction with Frances Fitzgerald, they were all in the paper. And that was on the 21st September, I think. And there was one other thing which $I$ can date it to and associate it with and it might sound ephemeral and inconsequential to the Tribunal, Chairman, but I'11 mention it because it is an associative thing for me. As I said, a measure of how well I got on with Fionnan Sheahan at that time was, he had an idea for a feature. Now, features were nowhere near his interests, but he'd suggested a feature on men marrying up, and he said it's a new phenomenon, men marrying up, George Clooney has married up, Amal, she's a great kind of catch for George Clooney.
CHA RMAN Do you mean men marrying women who are much more intelligent than they are?
A. Exactly, that is the point he was making, you've got it, Chairman.

CHAN RMAN Is that what it's called?
A. It's called men marrying up.

CHA RMAN I did that.
A. Lucky you. And so that feature appears in the Sunday Independent on October the 5th. So I know that it was in that timeframe that Fionnan Sheahan said that. That's the best $I$ can do with dating it. CHA RMAN And was this all about poor George Clooney
or --
A. It was lucky George Clooney.

CHA RMAN I am afraid I don't get the nuances of these things, but anyway, that's --
A. It was that, yeah, that George Clooney would be royal wedding, you would see that he was.

CHA RMAN I'm sorry, we're now rowing our canoes in waters that are unfamiliar to me, but there you go. MS. LEADER: okay. So it was between the end of September 2014 and the beginning of October 2014?
A. I would say around the third week in September, yes.

300 Q. A11 right, that that conversation took place?
A. Took place, yeah.

Now, you've referred earlier on to conversations in the line of gossip and in that type of vein in relation to
Sergeant McCabe. Did you think Mr. Sheahan was gossiping with you, or what did you think the purpose of all of this was?
A. I absolutely did not think he was gossiping.

302 Q. Yes.
A. I thought that it was a sort of a gesture of collegiality, that he thought because we had been discussing Sergeant McCabe, I think he thought that perhaps I'm a bit naive, she doesn't really know the
score and that he was tipping me off.
303 Q. okay.
A. And that was what I thought at that time. And because I was quite familiar with that particular approach and even though I was very shocked at the use of the word, because I had never, ever heard it used in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe before, I thought that Fionnan Sheahan is trying -- is doing what many others have sort of done, which is trying -- to other people, tipping people off, because that's usually how it was represented: you should know there's another story here. That's really how it was represented. And I thought that Fionnan had chosen the most extreme word so that I could know how serious it was. But I certainly saw it not as gossiping; he never was a gossip, actually. Now, he was very good at political interchange and all that, you know, he knew a lot. He had knowledge -- I used to call him a latter day Ted Nealon, which gives my age. But he was extremely knowledgeable about every nook and cranny of the country in politics, and he didn't -- he wasn't one for gossiping.
304 Q. All right. We11, you are aware that Mr. Sheahan denies that he said that about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

305 Q. And he also said you weren't on good terms at the time. But he is represented here today and will -- his representation will be able to deal with that. But saying the conversation took place from your point of
view, did you ask him many questions about it?
A. No, I didn't. But in relation to my working relationship with him, I want to emphasise that I was the editor. People weren't in -- the group editors generally attended my meetings for the purpose of taking notes of what I was doing. The journalists attended to pitch notes, to do stories, you know, they had ideas, they wanted to get them into print, they were in the business of -- the group editors attended and they took notes of what I was saying. They didn't normally contribute in the way that the journalists present, be they staff or freelance, they didn't contribute in that way, except for Fionnan. He was quite -- he became -- as time went on, he became very enamoured, I think, of the Sunday Independent, because I think he published more articles there, if you consider -- pro rata, if you consider that it is only a once-a-week publication. As I said, from the last week in August to the first week in October he had five articles in the Sunday Independent. Now, that could only have happened with my agreement and my total respect for him, because I could stop, I could -- I didn't have to take articles from Fionnan Sheahan. He was a group political editor, he was responsible for other titles and he liked to bring some of his ideas to ${ }_{13: 52}$ the Sunday Independent, and I liked to accept them, because I thought they were good. And that is the measure of respect.
306 Q. All right.
A. And also, as I said, the fact that he had feature ideas accepted as we11.
307 Q. Yes. So just going back to the question, did you ask him anything else --
A. No, I didn't.
Q. -- about that?
A. No. I have to say I was taken aback and I didn't.
Q. And did you challenge him in any way about it?
A. No, I didn't, because this was the currency for a long -- at this stage, this had been the currency in INM for a long time. You know, they had -- I mean, the Paul williams articles could hardly have been published without there having been a certain amount of chat -310 Q. Yes.
A. -- do you know, in the corridors. And it just stands to reason that they would have been, and I'm not saying anything out of the ordinary in that. So it was the -and the worry about it from my point of view was and the reason that $I$ felt it was worth talking to the Tribunal was that journalists are relied upon to bring the truth to the people, but if they are talking about this in their own corridors internally and perhaps outside, then it gives credence and currency to it outside of the court -- the -- it's not just the talk on corners in the newspaper office; it becomes more than that.
311 Q. Okay. Well, maybe if I could just contrast what you did in relation to the journalist telling you about the story, you went off and did your own research and cut the talk off?
A. Yes.
Q. And in relation to Mr. Sheahan saying, using the word 'paedophile', you not cutting it off at all, can you just explain that?
A. Oh, he just said it and left the office.
A. It was over in a flash.
Q. Okay.
A. There wasn't really time to say anything.

315 Q. Al1 right.
A. And I had repeated at many editorial conferences that, you know, that there's no substance to this so we're not going to talk about this.
All right. Have you spoken to Mr. Sheahan about it since?
A. No, no. I left on the 21st December 2014. I had finished out my contract and I had, I thought, acquitted myself there and I was very happy to leave at that stage. I was a happy editor.

317 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

318 Q. All right. Now, in relation to anybody else talking about Sergeant McCabe, there's one other person you have named in your statement and I wonder could you
A. Again, it was less of an exchange. You're talking about Ian Mallon --

319 Q. Yes.
A. -- who was group news editor. He came in -- very busy, and came in and out of meetings, usually to give some message and then out again. And we were talking about McCabe and it was -- it wasn't a very big Tuesday conference, it was a different one, to the best of my recollection, and he just said the same sort of thing, he said: oh, you know, we have to bear in mind that he's -- that there's more to this than -- there's more to Sergeant McCabe than meets the eye. And that's all that was.

320 Q. A11 right.
A. And I did think long and hard about that.

321 Q. All right. So did he go further in saying there was more to Sergeant McCabe than --
A. He said, you know about McCabe and children.

322 Q. And children?
A. Yeah.

323 Q. And was that on one occasion or more?
A. Just one occasion, yeah.

324 Q. All right.
A. Because I think I did manage to get out before he left the room, that I didn't -- I knew it wasn't true.

325 Q. And you said you reacted to it on that occasion?
A. Yes. That's my recollection.

326 Q. Yes. Can you time this at all, year or time of year, part of year?
A. Just that it would have been 2014.

327 Q. 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.
A. I just read it in the papers, in the Irish Independent. And I just -- I would consider, though, definitely, my memory is that it was after that.
331 Q. A11 right. So he was -- he may have been repeating to you something which he found out via Mr. Williams as far as -- do you think that was possible?
A. It was possible. Well, it's possible and likely.

332 Q. Okay. Do you have any information to give as to any other source he may have had for that piece of information?
A. No, absolutely not. And I found about Ian Mallon, that he was -- he had many of the attributes of the hungry reporter about him, and he, if he found there was a story, that he was -- he was generally on the business of being a group news editor, but he was, I think -- he 13:57 and a colleague in the Irish Independent, Michael Brennan, who left after the restructuring, they managed to track down the garda who had stopped Alan shatter for the famous breath test which -- and I think every
newspaper in the country was trying to track down that garda to ask about the breath test, and Ian Mallon actually did it.
Q. Yes.
A. So he was -- that was a fairly intrepid reporting job, Chairman.

A11 right. And I just want to correct myself slightly. I think what Mr. Mallon says is, his first knowledge that any accusation concerning Sergeant McCabe in relation to an alleged sexual assault was in March 2014 13:58 and he said he had no role in making the arrangements for the interview, but he found out about it --
A. Yes.

335 Q. -- in or around the Paul williams interview.
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. And you think it was after that he said something to you?
A. Yes, I do, I'd be fairly certain it was after that.

337 Q. And it was on one occasion?
A. Yes.
Q. A11 right.
A. Exactly, yes.
Q. Now, you've named Mr. Mallon and Mr. Sheahan as people who have been speaking about Sergeant McCabe in relation to paedophile and a sexual assault and you haven't named any journalist, and I just want you to explain why you have treated those two categories of people differently.
A. Well, for a start, $I$ have explained that $I$ do sincerely
believe that an editor -- I said it in my first letter to the Tribunal, that $I$ believed that certain, and I have no knowledge of any kind of legal phraseology, but that I felt that editorial conferences had to be what you call in lodge, that there had to be some sort of a privilege attached to them. If there wasn't, you really would have no newspapers, because people -- as I said, journalists only know things because people tell them things from there, and it's at that point that journalists bring stories to an editorial conference, it's at the point at which they are -- journalists don't go off and look for Freedom of Information before an editorial conference; Freedom of Information costs money, they have to get it, permission from their editor. Everything is consequent on the first bringing 14:00 of it to conference. And as I said, it can be rumour, it can be anything, it's ephemeral. They have to be prepared to bring everything, because the smallest things, you know -- sometime, 25 years ago, some woman in a diocese in Ferns said a child was probably abused, 14:00 and everybody thought this was awful, or somebody brought to a conference that a cabinet minister was gun-running to the North, and it sounded crazy and it took a lot of time to stand it up. This is the nature of editorial conference. You have to be sure that it won't go beyond the four walls of that conference, that is the point of it. So, in the first instance, the freelance who brought that story was at editorial conference. I didn't -- I shut it down as quickly as I
could. I established the facts to the best of my ability and I stopped that talk. So that is one of the things. The second time was not at editorial conference, Fionnan Sheahan was not at editorial conference. But having said that, I do believe it was said to me to warn me about taking -- being too innocent in the coverage of Sergeant Maurice McCabe. They would have seen a kind of a naivete about me and wanted to -- and there was different -- the Irish Independent and the Sunday Independent were taking, clearly, two very different approaches to Sergeant Maurice McCabe. So it was more important, therefore, for the group editors to try to warn me, because we were giving a lot of coverage --
340 Q. Yes.
A. -- to Sergeant Maurice McCabe. So there were two group editors who brought it, one of them a very casual remark, that's Ian Mallon, and the other one a very stark remark, and that one was not at an editorial conference, Ian Mallon was. But as I said, the group editors were not there to give stories; they were there to take notes.
341 Q. A11 right.
A. So I sort of felt that it was important to say they were also people in positions of power with, in INM, group editors in INM, they are powerful people, they have -- they are in a position to influence other people, and contrast that with a freelance who is pitching stories, living from hand to mouth. It's a
very important distinction. It might not sound -- to me, it's an important distinction. But the biggest point was that one was at editorial conference and the Fionnan Sheahan remark wasn't.
342 Q. okay. Now, in relation to naming anybody after an editorial conference, do you think that would have any consequences for the way papers do their business and journalists come to editors with stories if you named the journalist? Do you think it would have consequences for that process?
A. For that journalist?

343 Q. Well, for the process itself?
A. I don't really understand.

344 Q. For the procedure?
A. If I had named the journalist?

345 Q. Yes, yes.
A. Yes, I do think so, yes.

346 Q. okay. And would those consequences be good or bad consequences and damaging or not damaging?
A. It depends. Everything is context. And I think that 14:03 for a freelance journalist to be named, it would be very dire consequence. But for somebody in a position of power, it would be less so.
347 Q. All right. Now, finally, Ms. Harris, the Tribunal investigators asked you to offer an opinion to the
Tribunal, given your background, in relation to whether or not it is appropriate for journalists, broadcasting personne1, media personnel, to invoke journalistic privilege over their contacts and, therefore, not to
co-operate with the Tribunal in circumstances where some sources have waived journalistic privilege and asked that there's -- that people co-operate with the Tribunal.
A. We11, I think to answer that, you go to the Press Code. 14:04 I mean, there's a principle in the Press Code which says that journalistic sources are confidential and sacrosanct and must be protected. But there is also a principle in the Press Code which says that every individual has a constitutional right to their good name. And I think that when you know that somebody's good name is being calumniated and detracted from and you know that journalists have been used, or appear to have been used, because this talk has to have come from somewhere, there has to have been an original cause of it, and I came to the conclusion that journalists were being used to spread these rumours and innuendo. And so therefore, when journalists are being used for nefarious purposes and to take from somebody's constitutional right to their good name, to my mind that, in itself, is an abuse of journalistic privilege. And to use sources in that manner and to claim privilege is -- I think it's wrong.
MS. LEADER: A11 right. If you would answer any
questions anybody else might have for you, Ms. Harris.
MR. MEDOVELL: No questions, Chairman.
MR. FANN NG Chairman, $I$ have a number of questions if none of my other colleagues who are ahead of me in the sequence do.

M. HARRI S WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR FANN NG

348 Q. MR. FANN NG Ms. Harris, my name is Rossa Fanning and I appear on the instructions of Independent News \& Media, and for the purposes of your evidence I also represent the interests of Fionnan Sheahan, who is currently the editor of the Irish Independent newspaper, and Ian Mallon, who is a former executive with INM also.

If I could just first ask you, Ms. Harris, I think I'm correct in saying that your initial contact with this Tribunal was by your 1etter of the 11th March 2017, and we could perhaps have that up on the screen at 3571. You're familiar with this letter, I'm quite sure, Ms. Harris?
A. Yes.

349 Q. And can I ask you an initial question about it. what prompted you --
A. It's not up on my screen.
Q. What prompted you to write to the Tribunal on the 11th March 2017?
A. The request by the Chairman for information in relation to any smear campaign.
351 Q. Yes. But the height of your evidence at the end of the day, Ms. Harris, is that, as a newspaper editor, you heard certain rumours amongst journalists about Sergeant McCabe, but you were unaware of their source,
and that, I want to suggest to you, would have placed you in a category of a large group of people. There was nothing distinct that you could tell the Tribunal.
A. To the best of my knowledge at that time, in March 2017, there were not a lot of people coming forward to say that there was -- that certain places in the, shall we say, media and political classes were crawling with rumour and innuendo about Maurice McCabe. I didn't know of anybody else who was going to say so and I felt it should be said.

352 Q. All right. And having made the decision, therefore, to contact the Tribunal, you caused that letter to be sent to the Tribunal. Can I just ask you, how was that letter prepared? Did you type it yourself?
A. I did.
Q. And did much care go into the preparation of your letter, or was it, for whatever reason, a somewhat rushed job?
A. I don't think it was a rushed job, but on re-examining of it I spotted a typo.

354 Q. Yes, you misspelled the Chairman's name, for instance, in the first line of the final paragraph.
A. Yes.

355 Q. And presumably, as a newspaper editor, you place a premium generally on the accuracy in writing?
A. Yes, I would place a premium.
Q. And that's something, it's a trivial point and it doesn't go to anything that the Tribunal is investigating, but $I$ suppose in a letter that doesn't
extend to one full page, a misspelling of the Tribunal chairman's surname is not something you'd be particularly proud of?
A. I'm afraid I don't think it's a hanging offence. I hope that the Chairman doesn't think so.
CHA RMAN I suppose the misspelling isn't 'charlatan', is it?
MR. FANN NG It doubtless --
A. I accept that I misspelled it, and for which I am sincerely sorry.
MR. FANN NG So did you read the letter over before you sent it to the Tribunal?
A. Yes, I did. I did, yeah.

358 Q. And were there any other errors in the letter that doesn't extend to one page that you sent to the Tribunal on the 11th March?
A. No, I'm not aware of other errors. If you mean did I reconsider and have thought about the letter subsequently, $I$ think all human beings consider and reconsider their actions and it's a part of the ordinary process of trying to do the right thing. 359 Q. Sorry, I'm going to ask you the question again, Ms. Harris; are there any other errors in the letter, apart from the misspelling?
A. Not that I'm aware of.

CHA RMAN Well --
360 Q. MR. FANN NG So in the middle of the page, in a two-1ine paragraph which says:
"In 2014, the allegation that Sergeant McCabe was a paedophile was stated in my office by seni or executives --"

And I emphasise the plural form of the word "executives" used in your letter.
"-- fromthe wi der group editorial hi erarchy of Independent Group newspapers."

That's what you said in your letter of the 11th March.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that accurate or inaccurate?
A. I would like to explain that this is something that I went to some considerable trouble to correct with the investigators, that there was -- the group editors had presented a certain line, culminating in Fionnan Sheahan's remark on paedophiles, and I lumped them together in that, and, on recollection and on examining everything, I went to some considerable effort to correct it with the investigators, to say that, in fact, I was wrong to attribute the word "paedophile" to Ian Mallon and I took that back, and it's very clear in my statement that I did.
362 Q. Yeah. So is that a long way of saying that you agree plural form of the word "executives" in your letter of the 11th March 2017?
A. I suppose it is.
Q. I see on the fourth line of the first substantive paragraph, we are to take as meaning three people: Fionnan Sheahan, Ian Mallon and one other person who you are not minded to identify, is that the position?
A. That's the position.

368 Q. Now, we can agree that in your letter of 11th March 2017 you don't identify any of those persons. As a matter of fact, you don't mention any names of any journalists or editors in that letter. We can agree on that, presumably, Ms. Harris?
A. Yes.

369 Q. why?
A. Because that's how it is.

370 Q. Well, I know it's how it is, but why did you make the decision, when initially writing to the Tribunal on 11th March, not to name anybody?
A. Because an interaction between this Tribunal and an editor is an evolving situation and there was a deadline that the Chairman had created for witnesses to volunteer and to do so before a certain time, and I made the decision that $I$ would volunteer and be a witness. And therefore, that first letter was a clear indication that $I$ felt that $I$ had something to say to the Tribuna1. I wasn't trying to aggrandise it. A11 I knew, I explained very carefully I had no -- in my second letter, that $I$ had no evidential proofs. A11 I knew was that if you have -- there is a thing called a smear campaign and then there is the product of a smear campaign, and the product is rumour and innuendo, careless talk and constant careless talk. I knew that that existed and I knew very little more and all I wanted to do in that initial letter was to indicate that I was willing to testify to that. I was very well aware that I did not have much to contribute other than the fact that $I$ had witnessed a great deal of careless talk.
371 Q. An educated person and an informed person reading your letter of the 11th March, which refers to senior executives from the wider group editorial hierarchy of Independent Newspapers would be able, by the use of that fairly wel1-defined phrase, to narrow the
potential field down to a relatively small number of people, isn't that so, Ms. Harris? That phrase couldn't have referred to that many people?
A. That's right, it couldn't. come to your decision and the rationale of your decision as to who to name and who not to name, I want to suggest to you that as of the date that you penned this letter, 11th March 2017, the senior executives from the wider group editorial hierarchy that are referred to by status but not by name was a group of defined number of senior people within Independent Newspapers, isn't that so?
A. Well, I don't know what circulation you thought at that time that letter was going to receive. well --
A. It was a letter --
Q. -- it was going to receive circulation to the Tribunal, which was going to conduct public inquiries, and in your letter you made an allegation that the word "paedophile" was used in your office by senior executives, plural, from Independent Newspapers. And you must have known, Ms. Harris, that that was something that was going to excite the attention of the Tribunal and something that was going to cause further investigation?
A. But then I did proceed to name the -- to narrow it down by naming the senior executives.
Q. You did, and I'11 be coming to that. But before we
people that you were not enamoured with?
A. On 11th March of 20 --
Q. As of the date that you wrote that letter, these weren't people that you were enamoured with, Ms. Harris.
A. No, that's not true.
Q. That's not true?
A. No.
Q. In your evidence already to Ms. Leader and in your statement to the Tribunal investigators, which appears at page 3545 of the Tribunal's reference, you describe a change in the group structure in June 2013 where you went from a situation where you were, as editor of the Sunday Independent, answerable to nobody at an editorial level, to a situation where you were answerable to an editor-in-chief, Mr. Rae, and you were on a par with group editors like Mr. Sheahan, isn't that so?
A. First of all, I was never answerable to nobody, but --
Q. That you were never answerable to anybody at an editorial level, you were answerable to the CEO?
A. Yes.

380 Q. And now, after the restructuring in June of 2013, you were answerable to Mr. Rae as editor-in-chief across the group and you were on a par with people like Mr. Sheahan, who was a group editor, and you resisted and objected to that restructuring at the time it was implemented, you have said so in your statement?
A. Yes. And the key words are "at the time".

381 Q. Yeah.
A. And the fact of the matter is that I continued to work for 18 months of -- the second half of my contract, with these people. My priority and focus at all times was the Sunday Independent and to produce a good newspaper. I am not going to be disingenuous and pretend that it was easy at the beginning. I don't know of anybody who would actually hold down a position where they are autonomous and a structure is imposed over and around them to remove that autonomy, when they are, in fact, doing a good job, that they would welcome it. However, I intended to make it work, and I did make it work, and I grew, actually, to like Ian Mallon and Fionnan Sheahan and I worked with them. So in the beginning maybe -- of course I disputed it in the beginning, because $I$ had to work out a chain of command. It was entirely new to Independent Newspapers. They had never had this structure before. They themselves were learning. They didn't even know how they were going to implement it. I intended to be the editor, to keep my authority and autonomy, and I did my best to do so, and ended up working very successfully with both Fionnan Sheahan and Ian Mallon. 382 Q. As of 11th March 2017 when you wrote to the Tribuna1, I want to suggest to you that your relationship with Independent News \& Media had concluded and by that time you were a critic external to the institution and you were happy to make the statement that you made in your letter of 11th March 2017 if it had negative
consequences for senior editorial executives still in the newspaper?
A. That is absolutely without foundation. I had no beef with Fionnan Sheahan or Ian Mallon. I have texts on my phone, cordial texts between myself and Fionnan Sheahan 14:20 subsequent to my departure. You can see them if you like. And I have not got a bitter relationship with INM. I cannot countenance that you would say that I wanted to do those people down afterwards. I was very proud of the fact that I succeeded in navigating through very difficult waters when that structure was imposed on me. It took a lot of negotiation, understanding of other people's ordinary humanity and the desire to do a good job, to succeed in working well in that structure, and I did. And in the end, I had a new CEO, Robert Pitt, with whom I had an excellent relationship, and he made my last months there very happy, as did my good working relationship with some of the group editors.
383 Q. Now, I'm going to ask you to turn now to the second letter that you wrote to the Tribunal on 21st May, which is at page 3572, and this was a follow-up to your first letter. And the Tribunal sought, in effect, further details from you arising out of what you'd said in your letter of 11th March. Do you follow me?
A. Yes.

384 Q. And you provided some information.
A. Yes.

385 Q. You said you had no evidential proofs to offer. You
said that what you could offer was evidence of the product of a whispering campaign and careless talk among editorial executives in INM. That's another phrase that's critical of senior editorial executives without naming them, Ms. Harris?
A. Is that a question?
Q. Yes.
A. What was the question?
Q. That's another phrase that's deliberately critical of senior editorial executives in INM, I want to suggest to you?
A. No, it's a statement. I've explained the three people and two of them were group editors.
Q. Yes, and I'll come to what Mr. Mallon says about that momentarily. In your letter of 21st May you then corrected the statement in your letter of 11th march when you'd referred to executives in the plural as having referred to Sergeant McCabe as a paedophile; now you refined that allegation to one individual and you elected to name that person, Fionnan Sheahan, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

389 Q. And then in the final paragraph of that letter you said:
"I an Mallon, the then group news editor, now with the FAl, referred on other occasi ons" -- plural -- "to serious allegations invol ving a child."

Now, when Ms. Leader asked you about Mr. Mallon's conversations with you, I understood you to refer to a singular occasion only.
A. Yes, I did refer to a single occasion, because, to be honest, I could only be certain of a single occasion. Well, if you could only be certain of a single occasion, why then in your second letter to the Tribunal of 21st May did you refer to Ian Mallon having referred on other occasions, plural, to serious allegations involving a child?
A. It just was an impression I had, and I -- when I thought about it, I thought hard and I thought I can only say once. And that's my position, I can only say once.
I see. So we now have a situation where, on 11th March, your position to the Tribunal is that multiple executives have described Sergeant McCabe as a paedophile. You've corrected that recollection on 21st May; on 21st May you've attributed comments to Mr. Mallon on a number of occasions and that's also incorrect and you're now narrowing that down to a single occasion, is that the position?
A. That's absolutely correct. Well, let's talk about the conversation with Mr. Sheahan, of which you have given us an account this 14:24 afternoon. By October 2014, when you met with the Tribunal's investigators, you had narrowed down the supposed statement of Mr. Sheahan that Sergeant McCabe was a paedophile, to November 2014, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

393 Q. Now, why didn't you say September 2014 in your letter of the 11th March?
A. Well, I just wasn't being cross-examined about it or being asked about it. I was writing a letter.
Q. Why didn't you say September 2014 in your letter of 21st May?
A. Because I didn't actually -- I wasn't giving that level of detail. I was interested -- I was answering the questions put to me by the solicitor for the Tribunal. I got a letter from the Tribunal asking me just for the names, not asking me for any details of times and dates, nor indeed asking me for any detail of the freelance that I had mentioned. In my second letter, I simply answered the questions I was asked.
Q. And doing your best now, Ms. Harris, as I understand your answer to Ms. Leader earlier this afternoon, you believed that the disputed conversation with Mr. Sheahan took place perhaps in the third week of September of 2014, is that your recollection?
A. It's my best recollection. I didn't note it.
Q. You didn't note it?
A. Yeah.

397 Q. And would it be fair to say that the third week of September 2014 would have been the week that culminated 14:26 in the edition of the Sunday Independent of Sunday, 21st September 2014? That is precisely the 21st day of the month, the 21st September, and it fell as a Sunday, so I want to suggest to you that that's the end of the
third week of the month.
A. I just want to be quite clear that that was -- I want to give you an honest recollection, so I am not saying that it was exactly pegged to that Sunday; it could have just as easily been pegged to the following week, with discussions of the previous Sunday. So I am not -- I cannot be specific.
Q. Yeah. Well, in the edition of the Sunday Independent of 21st September 2014 there were articles about Sergeant McCabe --
A. Yes, there were.

400 Q. And that would appear to make it likely, I want to suggest to you, that Sergeant McCabe was a topic of discussion at editorial meetings in the week leading up to that edition; does that follow?
A. No, it doesn't. He could have been -- all that that means is that the articles appeared in print, were stood up on that week, that things succeeded in getting 14:27 to the paper on that week. There is every likelihood we discussed him the week before that and the week after.

401 Q. We11, do you think it's possible, therefore, that the discussion with Mr. Sheahan took place in the second week of September?
A. I have said several times that my recollection is that it was the second half of September, but I think I have explained that $I$ have done my best to use associative
Q.

Yes. You see, Ms. Harris, in circumstances where Mr. Sheahan does deny the conversation, it would be helpful if we could pin you down to a date, because we could compare the date of the supposed conversation with Mr. Sheahan's diary. Do you understand the significance of that?
A. Yes, I do. He has a diary note of it, has he? never had, but his diary does note where he was on various days, Ms. Harris. So, for instance, the conversation couldn't have happened in the second week of September because he was out of the jurisdiction on vacation.
A. But I didn't say it happened in the second week of September.

404 Q. No. And the main editorial meeting of the Sunday Independent takes place, as I understand it, on a Tuesday, Ms. Harris, as of that time?
A. Usually -- yes, it does take place on a Tuesday. But there are other editorial meetings.

405 Q. There are other editorial meetings. But the central editorial meeting that takes place in your office, and you say the words were spoken in your office --
A. They were.
A. No, I have outlined that there are four editorial meetings a week and the biggest one is Tuesday.

407 Q. Yes. And on Tuesday, 16th September, the Tuesday in
the third week of September, Mr. Sheahan made an appearance as a pundit on RTE's Today with Sean o'Rourke programme, and he was then in white's Hotel in wexford at the Labour Party think-in before the beginning of the Dáil term the following day. So he wasn't in attendance at the main editorial meeting on the Tuesday prior to the third edition of the Sunday Independent --
A. But I have not --
-- of September 2014.
A. But I have not said anywhere that this conversation took place after the Tuesday meeting. I have explained to the Tribunal that there were other meetings. There were four meetings a week.
409 Q. Yes.
A. And it could have been after any of those. I have not said it was a Tuesday.
410 Q. Yeah. And in the fourth week of September, Ms. Harris, I want to suggest to you that a contemporaneous review of the newspapers that were published suggested that a cronyism row over the Seanad nomination of a man called John McNulty had emerged and was dominating the agenda, and there was nothing about Maurice McCabe or penalty points in the Sunday Independent on 28th September 2014.
A. Yes.

411 Q. Do you have any reason to doubt me on that?
A. No, no. I know that was a fact. So what is the question?

412 Q. The question is, in the absence of you being able to pin the conversation down to a particular date, it's difficult for Mr. Sheahan, or for me on his behalf, to disprove the possibility of a conversation, but if you were able to offer us a date, it might be possible that 14:30 Mr. Sheahan wasn't even in the office on the day in question.
A. But $I$ haven't offered a date.

413 Q. Yes.
A. And all I know is that he said it. And it brings me no 14:31 joy to say so.

414 Q. A11 right. We11, 1et's turn then to a slightly different issue. You have already agreed with me that your initial letter of 11th March deliberately elected not to name anybody, it protected the identities of all 14:31 the journalists involved, and you've explained this concept of the discussions in editorial meetings as being in lodge and attracting a type of informal privilege, and that appears to be an important principle to you, Ms. Harris?
A. Yes.

415 Q. And you've chosen to protect the identity of the third journalist even though you're not a journalist that that person is a source for. But for the purposes of giving evidence in this Tribunal, you have elected not to reveal the identity of the third journalist.
A. In my first letter, I explained that $I$ believed that the editorial conversation is in lodge, and I remember, in the preamble to the Chairman, asking for people to
come forward. He did discuss the concept of privilege and journalistic privilege and I made -- and I know that main witnesses here have waived their privilege, and I -- in that very first letter, I addressed the question of this conference and that it was in lodge and that $I$ felt a certain, Chairman, a certain form of privilege could attach to the meeting. And as a matter of interest, the response that $I$ got from the Tribunal did not ask me to name the journalist that I mentioned at the conference, it did not ask me to name that journalist; it asked me to name the other two. And so I merely addressed the issue of the letter and answered the letter.

416 Q. But it's very clear from your statement to the Tribunal investigators that you've made a decision not to disclose the identity of the other journalist because you believe that the revelation of their identity would be detrimental to their career and you believe that, as a freelancer, they would be more vulnerable than an editor, that appears to be your justification for naming Mr. Sheahan and Mr. Mallon and withholding the identity of the third journalist?
A. It's an indisputable fact that freelancers have a very hard life, live from hand to mouth, have difficulty getting paid and rely on the grace and favour of editors. That is a freelancer's lot. It would be difficult to name one, especially when I made it clear I did not want any more discussion of this nature. I checked out what they had said. The thing that
impressed me most about that freelance, about Fionnan Sheahan and about Ian Mallon, was that something had persuaded those three good people of the truth of this rumour, and that was the reason that I brought it to the Tribunal, and that was the only reason. They believed it. I believed they believed it. I don't think any one of them was spreading gossip for the sake of it. And so I thought the purpose of this Tribunal is to find out what made them believe it and so -that's all. So I wasn't asked to name that journalist in the original correspondence, and I didn't.
417 Q. But you have justified your decision to withhold the name of that journalist on the basis of the adverse potential consequences for that journalist if you did name them.
A. It is not my entire justification; it is a part of my consideration that a freelance has a difficult life and that people in positions of power as group editors do not have difficult lives. So I know that sounds -- it gives you opportunity for questions, but that is my position and I think actually it is a legitimate position.
418 Q. Ms. Harris, the consequences for Mr. Sheahan of your evidence to the Tribunal that he described Mr. McCabe as a paedophile, are reputationally potentially very serious; I presume you agree with that?
A. No, I don't. I thought Mr. Sheahan could have come to this Tribunal and explained how he heard it. And that would not be detrimental to his reputation, because I
don't believe -- I think if journalists know something and the thing that they know is damaging to the reputation of somebody else and they choose not to tell, then that is a cover-up, and I don't think journalists, any journalist should be a part of any cover-up.

419 Q. Ms. Harris, you've elected to name certain journalists in your evidence to the Tribunal and you've elected to withhold the identity of at least one other journalist in your evidence to the Tribunal, and that's an editing 14:36 decision that you've made; you have chosen whose reputations to protect and you've chosen who to put in the firing line.
A. Yes, I have chosen to protect one person, a pretty vulnerable journalist, I have chosen to protect them.
A11 right. Now, in relation to Mr. Mallon, I might just put to you what Mr. Mallon says, if we could go to page 5314, Volume 19, and that's Mr. Mallon's statement. And I think the screen might need to move onto the second page of the statement in relation to the whispering campaign. Yes, if we just go to the top of that page, where it's said that:
"Mb. Harris seems to i mply that I was part of those who were muttering or were part of a culture of carel ess tal k. "

Mr. Mallon says that this is entirely untrue and he will set out the facts further in his statement. And,
in essence, Mr. Mallon says in his statement that the identification of him with a whispering campaign or a muttering campaign about sergeant McCabe is nonsense, as there was no muttering campaign about Sergeant McCabe in Independent News \& Media. There was an allegation of child sexual abuse that was well known, because paul williams had written an article about it, albeit that it had not named Sergeant McCabe, and he says in his statement that your evidence that you were involved in shutting down a whispering campaign is untrue because, firstly, there was no whispering campaign, it was openly known and openly spoken about, and secondly, he never saw or heard any instance of you shutting it down, and that's his evidence to the Tribunal. Do you want to comment on that?
A. Yes, I will deal with the second half first, because it arose in the period prior to the restructuring of the Sunday Independent and Ian Mallon would not have been at any of those meetings for some considerable months after that happened. That's the answer to that one. So I do believe Ian Mallon never -- was never present at a meeting at which I said I've checked this out, it's not true, I don't want any more conversation about it. So that's the answer to that one; he didn't, he wasn't there. I believe him.

And secondly, I note that he says there was no allegation -- there was no rumour and innuendo. He's actually saying it was explicit. So that's the answer
then. So it was explicitly talked about, because Paul williams had mentioned it. To me, that's actually not acceptable either, that just because this was the subject of an article wherein the victim is anonymised and the sergeant is -- or the garda in question is anonymised, and yet this is supposed to be something that is spoken about without rumour and without innuendo, strikes me as absolutely astonishing that it was spoken about explicitly.
421 Q. Well, why is it astonishing, Ms. Harris?
A. well, to me it is rumour and --

422 Q. But Sergeant McCabe was a name in the public domain at the time.
A. These were the not name --

423 Q. And this was a story that was, to use your phrase, already the currency.
A. It's astonishing that somebody who was not named in an article, it is astonishing that Ian Mallon is stating that this was not rumour and innuendo, it was quite explicit. So that -- I have to say it's the first time 14:40 I have seen this and I'm quite amazed.
424 Q. I see. In the case of Mr. Mallon, your statement to the Tribunal investigators at page 3547 says that your initial description of his comments, that was the description that you provided in your letter of 21st May 2017, was disproportionate - that was your word as he did no more than say something that was common currency.
A. That's right. As I said, I thought --

425
Q. You see where you say:
"At paragraph four of my additional statement I feel that my comment in respect to lan Mall on may be di sproportionate as he was no more tal kative about Ser geant McCabe at that time, I ate Septenber 2014, than anybody el se."

Now, who did you mean by "anybody el se"?
A. I meant the people in the corridors who would be
very --
Q. which people?
A. No, I'm just talking about, there are a lot of people in INM, the name, you could be having a cup of coffee, a cup of tea, not in an editorial meaning, not with the 14:41 intention of publication, not even with the intention of the thing going any further. It was just the casual talk over the coffee in the kitchen.
427 Q. Well --
A. That's all.

428 Q. How many people did you have this casual conversation with?
A. Over the space of 18 months, $I$ didn't have them with anybody because I didn't go into it, but I could hear them.

429 Q. How could you hear them?
A. You can -- well, you can hear people when they are having their coffee, chatting.
430 Q. So you overheard conversations between other people in

Independent News \& Media about Sergeant McCabe --
A. Yeah --

431 Q. -- is that correct?
A. Over -- in a casual calumniation, $I$ call it, careless talk. You don't spend your life picking up every little thing that you hear, challenging it. You can't. I had dealt with it with my team, the people who worked with me. It wasn't something to be brought up. Independent Newspapers is a large organisation with lots of titles, lots of people coming and going, different areas and everything. You would hear it over the coffee. And you know exactly what I mean.
432 Q. Right. So just to summarise then in respect of Mr. Mallon, having initially identified Mr. Mallon by reference perhaps as one of the senior editorial
executives amongst whom a plurality had described Sergeant McCabe as a paedophile in your letter of 11th March, you, by the time you made your statement to the Tribunal investigators, were absolving Mr. Mallon of doing anything different from anybody else in Independent News \& Media. So why was he ever named at all by you in your statement?
A. I --

433 Q. Why didn't you name all the people in the corridors?
A. I -- you couldn't. I am a journalist, and one of the things that journalists sign up to is freedom of speech. One of the things that comes with that is the right to be wrong. We get things wrong. I acknowledged in my statement to the Tribunal that I got
it wrong about Ian mallon, that what -- I had overstated the case. I was at pains to correct it. That is my duty as an editor and as a journalist. And, yes, it does present as something that is not absolutely perfect in my statement, far from it. But I 19:44 am admitting that I was wrong and I set out to correct it in my statement, and there is no more that I know that I can do.
All right. What about Mr. Mr. Sheahan then; why is your memory to be trusted in respect of the conversation that you believe you had with Mr. Sheahan when you've been proven to be inaccurate about what you have said about Mr. Mallon and you have been proven to be inaccurate in other ways?
A. Because it was a very startling thing. At the time, I ${ }^{14: 44}$ just want to emphasise this, at the time, while I registered that the comment had now escalated and gone from euphemism and innuendo to the very stark word "paedophilia", I put it to the back of my brain, actually, because it was something that was a continuum 14:44 in INM. And then when I saw the Prime Time programme in February 2017 where the whole story of the false allegation in the Tusla file was covered and I saw -and as it unfolded, that story, over 2017, about the journey and the trajectory of that file and how it went 14:45 from the HSE and Tusla on a journey through various superintendents, finally ending up, as $I$ understand it, in the office of the Commissioner, whether she saw it or not, it ended up in the office, is my understanding,
and I thought -- so that's why Fionnan used that word, and sudden7y it was a sort of a ping in my head, because it had troubled me, because, as I said before, Fionnan Sheehan was not a gossip and he was not a person who was given to detracting. And I thought why did he use the explicit word? And suddenly, I might be totally wrong and I have no evidence for this, but I thought here is that very allegation, a very serious allegation of this form of penetration which is graphically described in that file and $I$ thought is it possible that, somewhere along that journey, that custodial chain, is it possible that somebody who shouldn't have seen that file, somebody outside of the HSE and the Gardaí, somebody in media perhaps had seen the file and it occurred to me that that is -- could possibly be the reason why he used the word, because it was out of character, Chairman.
435 Q. Is that speculation that you've no evidence to subtend?
A. No, I know that. I am explaining why.

436 Q. I see. But you're portraying the statement of 14:46 Mr. Sheahan that Sergeant McCabe was a paedophile as being some sort of a dramatic revelation or a dramatic statement that left you shocked, when, in fact, when one looks closer at your statements to the Tribunal, al1 that Mr. Sheahan was saying, if he said it, on your 14:47 evidence, at all - and he denies saying it - is something that people have been saying to you in different ways for 18 months. So why were you so shocked? I see. So can we turn to page 3557 of your statement, please, to the Tribunal investigators. When you were asked the question of why this had lodged with you, you offered a particular explanation, and I just want to ask you if you still stand by this explanation. It's page 3557 . You said:
"I confirmthat person is Fi onnan Sheahan. The reason I thought it was signi ficant is that it moved from euphemisms to the very specific crime of paedophilia, whi ch, to my min, is amongst the gravest of crimes."

Now, is that your explanation as to why the phrase lodged in your mind?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it the use of the word "paedophile"?
A. Yes, you may be different, but the word "paedophile" has a shocking connotation.
Q. I see. And can we just turn --
A. It is completely shocking, and we all know perfectly well the kind of laws and everything that pertain to "paedophilia" and the word is used --
page
Q. And do you stand over that as being an accurate statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you believe paedophilia is a crime?
A. Yes.
Q. As distinct from a condition or a tendency?
A. Because --
A. When it's acted upon, as these rumours and allegations were implying, it is a crime.
Q. I see. Now, if I understand --
A. It is also -- it is also a condition and --

444 Q. If I understand you correctly, Ms. Harris, your evidence to the Tribunal is that when Mr. Sheahan used the phrase that Sergeant McCabe is a paedophile in September 2014, you were shocked by it, that's correct?
A. Yes.

445 Q. You told absolutely nobody about it?
A. I have explained that.

446 Q. Is that correct or incorrect?
A. That is correct.

447 Q. You made absolutely no note about it?
A. No, I made no note about it.

448 Q. You sent no e-mail to anybody about it?
A. I sent no e-mail to anybody about it, that's correct.

449 Q. So there is no contemporaneous record of something that you thought was shocking that, in effect, motivated you to come forward to this Tribunal?
A. I've explained several times that I didn't note it, and, in fact, $I$ note that the Tribunal itself has to deal a great deal with hindsight and I am just saying that this was -- my recollection is correct; I felt it was something that should be reported for the reasons that I felt that it had come from somewhere. The specificity of the word I felt was important after -specifically after I saw the Prime Time.
450 Q. And when Mr. Sheahan said to you that Sergeant McCabe
was a paedophile, did you believe him to be expressing his considered view on the matter or for him to be simply articulating something that he had heard elsewhere?
A. I felt that he was stating what he believed to be a fact.

451 Q And if Mr. Sheahan believed that to be a fact, can you point to a single article that was ever written by Mr. Sheahan or commissioned by him as a political editor or as a newspaper editor that was critical of Maurice McCabe?
A. He generally didn't write articles about Maurice McCabe. He --
452 Q. Can you answer my question? Can you point to a single such article that was critical of Maurice McCabe?
A. I know of no article that was critical of Maurice McCabe that appeared in the Sunday Independent.
453 Q. Do you know of any article that was critical of Maurice McCabe that Mr. Sheahan had any involvement in the editing of that appeared in any other Independent newspaper?
A. Well, I wouldn't be able to give you a comprehensive -454 Q. I want to suggest to you that there's none, Ms. Harris?
A. Well, if you say so, I accept that.

455 Q. Mr. Sheahan will say to this Tribunal that 15 years in Leinster House has taught him to treat rumours with great scepticism before accepting them to be true, and you yourself in your evidence have said that he wasn't a person who dealt in rumour.
A. That's correct.

456 Q. And you're hardly suggesting to the Tribunal, Ms. Harris, I take it, that Mr. Sheahan conducted his own investigation that would have led him to the view that Sergeant McCabe was a paedophile; you're not suggesting that, I take it?
A. No, I'm not suggesting that at all. I --

457 Q. So how could he have held the view --
A. I'm merely telling you --

458 Q. -- as distinct from articulated a rumour?
A. Sorry, could you repeat that question?

459 Q. There are two different possibilities when he says Sergeant McCabe is a paedophile. One is he's offering you his own view, and one is he's repeating something that's in the ether as a rumour. Do you follow me? Those are two different concepts, and I'm asking you to elect for which one you believe it was.
A. So you're asking me whether he was repeating a rumour or he had somehow formed the view --

460 Q. Yes.
A. -- that it was -- well, what I have said is that I believe that Fionnan Sheahan believed that he was stating a fact.
461 Q. And how do you think he believed that?
A. I've no idea.

462 Q. Well, he wasn't a crime journalist or a Garda journalist, a security journalist.
A. He was part of the group structure of INM, and clearly there were discussions of Maurice McCabe at the group
structure. I'm not saying how Fionnan Sheahan came by this information, but he did have a life outside of the Sunday Independent as group political editor, there were articles in the Irish Independent, I don't know what his level of involvement with those was. A separate opinion seems to have been formed in the Irish Independent; Ian Mallon himself says the conversations were explicit, not rumour and innuendo. Fionnan was part of that structure. I have no idea how, but I certainly formed the opinion that Fionnan Sheahan believed it to be true. Ms. Harris, I just want to put to you Mr. Sheahan's version of the matter. Firstly, Mr. Sheahan says he never had that conversation with you.
A. Yes.

464 Q. Second7y, he wasn't prone to peddling in rumour and he had learned to disregard rumours, many of which he had heard over the years as a political correspondent in Leinster House. And thirdly, he never at any stage formed the view that Maurice McCabe was a paedophile, he never conducted any investigation or made any inquiry that could have led him to have held that view. And he will tell the Tribunal that in explaining why he is satisfied that he never articulated such a view to you.
A. And I am sure he will tell it very well. I am just stating what $I$ know.

465 Q. And he will also point to the fact that there's not a single article that he was ever associated with the
writing of or the editing of or the commissioning of that is in any way critical of Maurice McCabe, which is, of course, completely inconsistent with the notion that he held the view that Maurice McCabe was a pedophile.
A. Well, actually it's not completely inconsistent with the view, because it would be very hard to publish such a thing. He would not have been writing articles stating such a fact, I have to tell you.
466 Q. Mr. Sheahan says in his statement to the Tribunal at paragraph 6 that you and he had a very strained relationship and he disagrees with your evidence to the Tribunal that you'd a very good working relationship with him. And he says in his statement that you have made this allegation to try and deliberately damage his reputation.
A. I have no desire to damage Fionnan Sheahan's reputation. I have stated clearly, Chairman, that I admire him as a political journalist. I would not do that. We did have a good working relationship. We succeeded in having an excellent working relationship, in my view, and the evidence is in the newspaper. And, I mean, it's of no interest to anybody here in the Tribunal, but one time $I$ had a very bad cough and Fionnan brought me olbas 0il and hot water. Is that the action of somebody who has a very strained relationship with you? I put it to you that it's not. I'm sorry to have to deal, Chairman, with this, things at this level. I did not have a strained relationship
with him in 2014, certainly the latter half of it. 467 Q. It's my unhappy obligation to put to you, Ms. Harris, that your evidence about Mr. Sheahan calling Sergeant McCabe a paedophile is tainted by an improper motive, that you're a bitter person, you bear a grudge towards Mr. Sheahan and toward your former employer, Independent Newspapers?
A. I bear absolutely no grudge to Fionnan --

And that that grudge is to be seen in op-ed columns that you have written in the Sunday Times newspaper and the Irish Times newspaper about various issues in Independent Newspapers and its shareholders.
A. I am now three-and-a-half years retired. In three-and-a-half years, I have written two articles about INM, both of them for quite compelling reasons.
One was in June 2015, when the Chairman, Leslie Buckley, at the AGM, said Denis o'brien had never interfered in anything to do with INM. I personally -my only concerns at all times are editorial. I had personal evidence that this was not the case. I had chapter and verse of editorial interference. The Sunday Times could not publish that if they had not been able to stand it up, and they did. So that was one of the articles that I wrote.

The second one was in the Sunday Business Post recently when the question of data breaches came up. I personally had data-breached in INM and I wrote an article about that. In three-and-a-half years,
three-and-a-half years, during which I am asked, almost on a weekly basis, or very regularly, by television programmes, radio programmes and various other platforms to come and talk about life in inm and life under Denis o'brien, I turn them all down, the reason being that I had actually a very proud and happy time in INM.
469 Q. Ms. Harris --
A. I know, I just want to finish this, if you don't mind. I am the least bitter person. I bear no grudge. I am not disgruntled. I left my job having worked at it for 30 years extremely happily and left a very, very safe paper behind me.
470 Q. Ms. Harris --
A. Yes?

471 Q. In your article in the Sunday Business Post on 8th April you said that:
"Every news meeting I held was noted furiously by men with big swinging titles."

That's a direct quote from your article in the Sunday Business Post.
A. Yes, it is.

472 Q. Who are these men with the big swinging titles?
A. The men with the big swinging titles were the group editors and --
Q. Yes, including Mr. Sheahan. And that's a statement that is demonstrative, I want to suggest to you, out of
your own pen last month, in April, in a different Sunday newspaper, that testifies eloquently towards your animus towards Mr. Sheahan.
A. No, it doesn't. I can say that without having any animus. It was actually a fact that they did note furiously everything -- everything I was saying. The concentration and their purpose was largely watching the news lists to see what I might be planning to do. They reported up the line on what the editor of the Sunday Independent was planning. It is a fact. Okay, 14:59 the phrase "men with big swi nging titles" is undoubtedly one that perhaps, you know, it's a kind of a colourful phrase, and I'm a journalist and I write as colourfully as I possibly can. They did note furiously, but I have to say that does not denote animosity; it was a fact.
MR. FANN NG Thank you, Ms. Harris.
MR. LEHANE: Mr. Chairman, if nobody else has any questions other than the Tribunal legal time, I just have a couple of questions for Ms. Harris.

## MG. HARRIS MAS EXAM NED BY MR LEHANE:

474 Q. MR. LEHANE: Ms. Harris, just arising out of your cross-examination, are you involved in a negative campaign against Fionnan Sheehan and Ian Mallon?
A. No, absolutely --

CHA RMAN Maybe you'd just explain who you are, first of all, so we all know where you stand in particular.

Ms. Harris hasn't been here that much.
MR. LEHANE: Sorry, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Not that you -- I am not requiring you to be here if you don't want to be here, you appreciate that. MR. LEHANE: Sorry, Chairman, my name is Darren Lehane. 15:00 I appear for Ms. Harris.

475 Q. So, Ms. Harris, are you using this Tribunal to advance a personal vendetta against Fionnan Sheehan and Ian Mallon?
A. No, in no way.

476 Q. Ms. Harris -- and I wonder if page 3649 could be put up on the screen. Ms. Harris -- or actually the preceding page first, please, 3648. Ms. Harris, this is a letter that was sent to the Tribunal by Fanning Kelly Solicitors, solicitors acting for Fionnan Sheehan and Independent News \& Media, on 24th November 2017. And if you could turn to the second page now, please, you will see there, Ms. Harris, in the second-1ast paragraph:
"For the record, the statement made by you concerning Mr. Sheahan being false and untrue is not protected by any form of privilege agai nst def amation under stat ute or common law."

Have you received or been served with any defamation proceedings by Mr. Sheahan?
A. No.

CHA RMAN We11, it's not defamatory to say that
somebody said about somebody else that they were a paedophile.
MR. LEHANE: Well --
CHAN RMAN It's defamatory if the person about whom it's said decides to take an action, but not if you repeat it from A to B.
MR LEHANE: The point is, Mr. Chairman -CHA RMAN Well, is it a good point, do you think, Mr. Lehane? Because there's not much point in a bad point.
MR. LEHANE: I know that, Chairman. But I am saying there is a threat here and I am just asking has she received any proceedings, and the answer she has given is no.
CHA RMAN Yes. A11 right. No, we'11 carry on then. 15:02 MR. LEHANE: Thank you very much.
A. No, I didn't receive any proceedings.

MR. LEHANE: Thank you very much.
MS. LEADER: I have no questions.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, I just have one or two questions.
CHA RMAN Oh, yes, you do. A11 right.
MR. ḾCEÁL O H GG NS: I will be quite brief.

ME. HARRI S MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR M CHEÁL O H GG NS:

MR. Ḿ CLEÁL O H GG NS: Ms. Harris, my name is Mícheá
O'Higgins. I am going to ask you some brief questions
re -- by reference to your statement to the Tribunal on behalf of An Garda Síochána. I think you have told us that you were the editor of the Sunday Independent from, I think it was the beginning of 2012 until the end of 2014, so nearly a three-year period?
A. Yes.

478 Q. And you provided -- you were interviewed by the Tribunal investigators, and your statement -- your interview is in the materials that have been circulated. Just for your benefit, can I ask you to take a look at page 3553 , which is part of your statement of interview. Do you see there in line 165 you were asked by the investigators whether any journalist told you that a senior member of An Garda Síochána, including the former commissioners Martin Callinan, Nóirín o'sullivan and/or Superintendent David Taylor asked him or her, that's the journalist, to print a particular story against Sergeant Maurice McCabe, and, if so, you've been asked to detail what you know of this. And I think you confirmed that never 15:04 occurred?
A. I did confirm that.

479 Q. And you're standing over that, I take it?
A. Yes.

480 Q. Right. And I think just the next question down, Ms. Harris, you might just confirm this remains your position as well, you were asked to "identify from where the negative briefing and/ or derogat ory story agai nst Ser geant McCabe was emanating and/ or what the
journalist reported to me on this respect". And you were asked to be as specific as you could and you were asked whether you've any contemporaneous notes of this matter. And I think the answer is recorded as being:
"I do not know from where the negative briefing was emanating. "

And I think that remains your position?
A. Yes.

481 Q. And then perhaps if you turn over then to page 3554 , please. Again, you were asked another question at the top of that page:
"Whet her you have any know edge of the former
Commissioners Callinan or OUllivan pronoting mere gossip or details of derogatory stories in relation to Ser geant McCabe. "

And I think you answered "no" to that question as well?
15:04
A. Yes.

482 Q. And again you stand over that position, isn't that so?
A. Yes.

483 Q. And then if you wouldn't mind going to page 3563. You're asked on page 3563, halfway down line 328,
about an orchestrated campaign directed by senior officers of An Garda Síochána to discredit Sergeant McCabe by spreading rumours about his professional and
personal life other than the matters detailed previously. And you answered no to that, isn't that so?
A. Yes.

484 Q. And then the next question is really what I wanted to bring you to. You were asked if you were contacted by Superintendent David Taylor in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe and, if so, to provide details. And you confirmed that you were not at any point?
A. Correct.

485 Q. Isn't that so?
A. Yes.

486 Q. And similarly, you were never briefed negatively by superintendent Taylor with respect to Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. No, never.

487 Q. And then, lastly, could I ask you to turn over to page 3556, which concerns An Garda Síochána as well. And on page 3566 you were asked, the second line down, the following question:
"I have been asked to detail any contact as may have been had by me directly with Gardaí as to the character, real or supposed, of Sergeant Maurice McCabe and the detail and provenance thereof."

And I think you indicated you had no such contacts of any nature?
A. That's right.

488
Q. And that remains the position?
A. Exactly.

MR. M' CHEÁL O H GG NS: Thank you very much.
MS. LEADER: Nothing arising, sir.
CHA RMAN Thank you.
A. Thank you.

MR. MARR NAN The next witness, sir, is Gemma O'Doherty, please.

## ME. GEMMA O DOFERTY, HAV NG BEEN SVORN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN:

489 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Now, I think you're an investigative journalist, isn't that right?
A. That's right, yes.

490 Q. And will you just tell the Chairman about your career to date?
A. I began working in the Irish Independent around 1996 and worked there until 2013. I was appointed to the role of chief features writer about probably six or seven years prior to that, and I was the chief writer within my department in the Irish Independent and was responsible for writing a number of features every week, and I would write about all topics, be it from health, education, crime, and whatever the big story of 15:08 the week was, $I$ would generally be responsible for writing about it in our Saturday review.
491 Q. I think that you left Independent Newspapers in 2013, and we'11 come to that in a moment. But since 2013,
where have you been working?
A. In -- after 2013, I freelanced a little bit for the Sunday Times, the Daily Mail, and then I made my first documentary in 2016 about the murder of Mary Boyle, who is our longest and youngest missing person. I also write for village magazine.

492 Q. And I think your solicitors have pointed out to us in a letter that you are also a recipient of a journalistic award, is that right?
A. Yes, during my time at Independent Newspapers I won a number of awards: campaigning journalist of the year; I won an award for work that I had done on cancer research, medical journalist of the year; and shortly before my unlawful dismissal I was nominated for crime and security reporter of the year and features writer of the year. I've won a number of awards since departing Independent Newspapers as well.

493 Q. So I think on 13th March 2017 you wrote to the Tribuna1. If you have volume 14 there, you can look at it, your statements are contained in that, or you can
look at the screen in front of you, the relevant portions will be brought up, whichever you find more convenient. But anyway, you wrote to the Tribunal on 13th March of last year. Your letter is at page 3656 of the materials. And you see there, if we can scroll down about 10, 11 lines in, you say:
"I worked for the Irish Independent for al most 20 years where I was chi ef feat ures writer specialising
primarily in stories about the criminal justice system and An Garda Sí ochána. In 2012, I was contacted by Ser geant MECabe's father, who informed me about his son's attempts to expose corruption in the Gardaí and asked if I could hel p."

I think that that's by way of just introducing us to the circumstances in which you came to be originally in contact with Sergeant McCabe, is that right?
A. Yes, Chairman, I might explain that around -- in 2010, I became involved in the case of Fr. Niall Molloy, who was murdered in 1985 in County Offaly. I'm not going to run through the case, but that was a story that opened my eyes to what I believe is widespread malfeasance and corruption within our police force. And I had been working on that case for a number of years. It was eventually reopened by An Garda Síochána as a cold case on foot of my investigation and was described in the Oireachtas as the biggest cover-up in the history of the state following my investigation.

On foot of my investigation, I was approached by a number of bereaved families who had lost loved ones through homicide and who believed that they had been justice by the state and were alleging grave was around this time that I was approached by the father of Sergeant McCabe. I have to say I was very relieved that this was the case, because up until then

I had only been dealing with citizens who were victims of Garda malpractice, but now, for the first time, a serving member, a very senior member of the force was also making these allegations and 1 felt vindicated and very relieved that at last a whistleblower within the force had had the courage to come forward and express what -- you know, a lot of what I had been writing about in terms of wrongdoing within An Garda Síochána. And I think that, in consequence of being contacted by Sergeant McCabe's father, you came into contact with Sergeant McCabe himself and also Garda John wilson, is that right?
A. I did.

495 Q. And I think that over a period of many months you met them, and you describe them as being decent, honest officers, who had battled for a long time to expose what appeared to be grave abuses of the criminal justice system, is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And you also, I think, indicate that you found the evidence that they were presenting as being highly credible and also of public importance. Now, I think that part of your investigations arising out of your contact with Sergeant McCabe and Garda John wilson was into the penalty points scandal, as it became known, is that right?
A. Yes, that's right, yes. I began to investigate allegations that there was widespread abuse of our fixed penalty notice system and what appeared to be
happening was that members of the elite were having speeding points wiped. They didn't appear to be ordinary citizens; they were judges, State solicitors, crime reporters and people who would have a certain amount of influence within Irish society, and that was the reason why I felt it was really in the public interest that this be exposed. It was quite clear to me that our motoring laws were being abused by the people who were supposed to be implementing them. Now, I think in consequence of your investigations, you 15:15 discussed a story that you had in relation to Commissioner Martin Callinan on 13th Apri1 2013 and you discussed the story with an editor, is that right, within INM?
A. What timeframe are you talking about, sorry?

498 Q. I'm talking about April 13th, 2013.
A. I don't believe I discussed it with an editor on that particular date.
499 Q. A11 right.
A. I can discuss the chronology of that particular story.

500 Q. Well, no, we don't need to go into it in any great detail; we have already heard from Commissioner Callinan and there doesn't seem to be any dispute in relation to this. I think that you were -- you came into possession of a snapshot of a pulse record in relation to the former Commissioner, and you, as part of your investigation, went to the address that was on the Pulse record and you made an inquiry, as it turned out, of Mrs. Callinan, in a courteous way, and there
doesn't seem to be any issue in relation to that; I think you point out in your statement to the Tribunal that you also found her very courteous. But you inquired as to whether or not it was the home of the Garda Commissioner, in case there was some error in relation to the identity of the Callinan that resided at that address whose penalty points had been cancelled, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I came into possession of a Pulse document suggesting that a person called Martin Callinan had had his speeding points terminated. The source believed that this was the Garda Commissioner. That would not have satisfied my lawyers, our lawyers at the time in INM, and so I had to be absolutely clear that the Martin Callinan on the Pulse document was Martin Callinan, the Garda Commissioner. Obviously this was a very -- a story of significant public interest, because the man with overall responsibility for oversight of our road safety laws appeared to be abusing them for his own personal gain. So, I mean, I saw this as a story of huge pub7ic interest, the pub7ic had a right to know about it and so I pursued it vigorously. Yes, I did, to make sure that I had the correct person, as is normal in news reporting, I checked the address and I had a very civil, very short conversation with a woman who I believe was Mrs. Callinan. I was probably there at the door for about 10 or 20 seconds and I jumped back into my cab. I didn't mention penalty points. I asked if the Garda Commissioner lived at the
house. I said who I was and I left.
501 Q. I think you point out in your statement that later that evening you received a phone call from the senior editor at INM. who was that?
A. That was Ian Mallon.

502 Q. Yes. And just will you tell us about the conversation that you had with him, please?
A. Yes, I was having dinner with my husband in o'Connell's restaurant in Donnybrook and my phone rang. I had been discussing the story about Martin Callinan with my husband and realising, you know, that it was a story of huge public interest and I was really looking forward to breaking it and to, you know, making sure that the story got into the public domain as $I$ felt it was very important. And then I received a phone call from Ian Mallon, who was in a very serious temper. He alleged a number of things during that phone cal1; one, that $I$ had been harassing the Commissioner. He told me that RTE would be in contact with me. He alleged that $I$ had ruined everything. I subsequently believe that that was a reference to the Anglo tapes and their distribution by INM. And he was extremely angry on behalf of Martin Callinan. I had never in my entire career at INM been spoken to like this. I had only ever received praise from management for the work that I was doing, and I was utterly taken aback at the way I was being spoken to.

503 Q. Were you informed how angry the Garda Commissioner was in relation to this incident?
A. I was.

504 Q. And over the following days, how were things at work?
A. Hard to describe. I mean, I felt that I was being completely ostracised. I was very keen to get my story published. There didn't seem to be any urgency in that 15:20 regard. I was told that I would have to have a debrief, a debrief by management. That was a term that I had never heard within the newspaper industry in the years that I had worked there. And I was severely reprimanded. And there didn't seem to be any -- I mean, $I$ think in a normal newspaper for journalists who have a story like that which would bring, you know -which would have raised serious questions about the integrity of the chief of police, that would normally receive, you know, praise. I was basically ostracised, I felt I was being ostracised. Over the course of the following days $I$ was called a rogue reporter, I was described as being cack-handed, I was told that the Commissioner was extremely angry and that the Commissioner had thought I was a renegade republican calling to his door, despite the fact that there was no security presence at his home, which surprised me. And I was also informed that a number of executives had been called to Garda Headquarters to explain how it had could to pass that this story had emerged. It is my belief that my visit to Martin Callinan's home had nothing really to do with his anger; it was more to do with the fact that I had uncovered a story about him, about which serious questions remain and have not been
answered by neither him or the Minister for Justice, and these questions are in the public interest.
505 Q. The following Friday, 19th April - and this has just been circulated - two articles that were penned by you were written and published in the Irish Independent. And if we could have page 7467 on the screen, please. You see there on the front page:
"Commi ssi oner had penalty poi nts er ased whilst on duty. "

And all the details of it are set out there in your article. It says:
"The inci dent occurred in Fingl as, County Dubl in, when Mr. Callinan was travelling in his own Renault car to a hi gh-I evel security meeting. He was clocked driving at 83 kilometres per hour in a 60 zone."

And then if you go on, it continues in -- on the -- I think that's the second page, page 2. And then if you just look at the second column in, the third -- fourth paragraph, and then you point out that independent TDs have also named several wel1-known figures -- sorry:
"I ndependent TDs have al ready named sever al well-known figures alleged to have had traffic offences quashed."

And then you go on and point out that -- individuals
concerned. One of those, I think it's important to highlight just at this juncture, was Paul williams, the journalist, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

506 Q. And then if we could just look at the same day in the Evening Herald, and this is at page 7466.
"Garda chi ef had points written off."

And you're the co-author of that with Niall o'Connor, isn't that right? It would appear that your story was published on Friday the 13th, isn't that right?
A. It's not the story that I would have published.

507 Q. Or, sorry, Friday the 19th, should I say. Well, you're down as having penned it, it's attributed to you. It 15:24 appears to be full of most of the salient facts and details surrounding the incident, does it not?
A. Well, I was instructed over this period to deal directly with Dave Taylor on this story and I was ordered not to speak to anybody else about it. You'11 note that there's a time-lag of a week.

508 Q. Yes.
A. A week is a very long time in journalism, whatever about in politics. This story should have been turned around in a matter of days. So there was a long delay, 15:25 during which time $I$ was being severely reprimanded and being treated despicably by management in INM.

I had asked Dave Taylor a number of questions that I
believe -- in relation to this termination, that $I$ believe were in the public interest and were not answered, and rumours continue to this day about allegations regarding the incident itself and whether Martin Callinan was actually driving the car that had the penalty points terminated from at the time or whether somebody else was driving that car. There were many aspects of the termination that didn't make sense. Martin Callinan was Deputy Commissioner at the time. He claims he was going to meet a source. I have asked to see the records for that. For some reason, he chose to drive his family car to this meeting. He would have had a State car at his disposal. And on the Pulse document, where the detail is given in relation to the termination, there's no explanation for the termination.

Now, I discussed this with the head of the Garda Inspectorate shortly after this, Bob Olsen, a very respectable, honest individual, and he thought that it was most unusual. So at the time in the UK, of course, there was another scenario unfolding whereby an MP, Chris Huhne was actually coming before the courts in relation to penalty points, and I think the optics of that, you know, may have played a part. But I certainly was not satisfied that the Gardaí gave me the full facts around this. So this is not the story I would have published.
509 Q. All right. Well, I suppose the relevance of this and
these two articles are that in your letter at page 3658 to the Tribunal you say:
"Sore days later I was told that I was to be made compul sorily redundant. I was the onl y journalist in 15:27 I NM to suffer such a fate at that time."

And that you were forced to take three legal actions against INM to clear your name and that that had taken an enormous toll on your and your late husband, is that 15:28 right? You point out that he was an executive at INM and he resigned as a result of you being made redundant in the circumstances that you were made redundant.

Now, I suppose the importance of that is that you feel
that you were made redundant because you had published an article -- or that you had, first of a11, I suppose, in the first instance, that you had shown an interest in the penalty points scandal as it related to the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána. And am I correct in 15:28 thinking that you believe that he would have been aware of the fact that Sergeant McCabe was probably the source of your information and, if not him, the other whistleblower, John wilson; is that the point that you wish to make?
A. Well, could you just clarify what you're asking me, sorry?

510 Q.
We11, I'm trying to explore the -- in your letter to the Tribunal, you seem to be attributing you being made
redundant and being victimised, being bullied at work in the manner in which you set out, to the fact of the incident that you had called to Commissioner Callinan's home and that you had shown an interest in the cancellation of his penalty points.
A. We11, basically, I mean, the background was, I had been holding the Gardaí to account in relation to a number of very serious cases, mostly homicide, and so I was a thorn in the side of the Gardaí; I've no doubt, you know, that that was how I was perceived. But I didn't get my stories from the Gardaí and I didn't really have any sources within the Gardaí. At the time of my unlawful dismissal, I had -- my Fr. Molloy case had just been reopened by An Garda Síochána, management were singing my praises effectively, I had been
nominated and had won a number of awards in that timeframe and, you know, I was perceived within the company to be doing my job very well and, you know, I was used in advertising campaigns by the paper and then suddenly I was out the door as what I know is a direct result of my support for what Maurice McCabe, Sergeant McCabe was trying to expose in the public interest.
511 Q. You then go on to assert at page 3658, you say:
"I amal so well aware of the whi spering campai gn
agai nst Sergeant McCabe, and when I was informed about the allegations of child sexual assault agai nst him I put themto him"

When did you become aware of, as you put it, the whispering campaign?
A. Well, in relation to the whispering campaign, when you work in a newspaper there's always a lot of gossip going around the corridors. I had got to know Sergeant 15:31 McCabe well and his family and John wilson and I knew that all -- their only motivation was to improve the quality of the force and to expose wrongdoing, and I knew that they had absolutely no other motivation. So when I heard these scurrilous rumours, I pretty much dismissed them. I knew that, you know, people who took on the Gardaí - I myself had been a victim of it in the Molloy case - were blackened, their names would be blackened and things would be said about them. So this came as no big surprise to me and --
512 Q. Well, where did you hear these scurrilous things?
A. I believe it was John wilson who may have told me first. I believe that he may have called me and said, you won't believe what they're saying about him now. And actually, I believe at the time thinking I think I know what this is going to be.

513 Q. We11, did you hear them from any other quarter?
A. I did hear, yes, I did. But I have to stress, because I knew the calibre of the man Sergeant McCabe was, I didn't give them any credence. But I did speak to Maurice about them.
514 Q. Well, you're aware of the fact that the Tribunal are interested in finding out who was putting these rumours about. Had you any interaction at all with

Superintendent Taylor?
A. Not in relation to this.

515 Q. Had you otherwise?
A. I was ordered by INM in relation to my story about Martin Callinan to speak to Superintendent Taylor and nobody else. That was, I believe -- now, I probably had dealings with him, I mean I would have dealt with the Garda Press office on numerous occasions; I never got any answers from them, I was always stonewalled by them in my questions, so I didn't expect to get answers 15:33 from them in relation to my Martin Callinan story. I don't believe I --
516 Q. Has he ever mentioned Sergeant McCabe to you?
A. No. I don't believe so.

517 Q. So what other quarter were these rumours emanating from?
A. Within journalistic circles.

518 Q. Could you be more specific?
A. John wilson was aware of them.

519 Q. No, but can you be more specific?
A. No, I can't really, because I had no time for anyone who was suggesting this. I knew it to be utterly untrue. I did my own background research on Ms. D and her father and was really deeply concerned about what I learned and felt that this was clearly a vendetta against Sergeant McCabe, and I believe that Ms. D is being used to this effect, and has been used.

CHA RMAN We11, at the end of the day, I mean, you are expressing views and you are absolutely entitled to
have views, but I am bound by certain standards and the fundamental standard I'm bound by is that I am to investigate what I am told to investigate. Now, you may have a view to that effect, but you're ventilating it in circumstances where all it does effectively is bring people into things on the basis of what you think as opposed to on the basis of what the facts may be. Now, if I allow it to go any further, I mean, the situation is that I would have to ask the D family to come back and to consider those matters, but I don't actually have jurisdiction to do that and I think there comes a point in life where enough is enough and you leave things behind. So I'm interested in what you have to say in relation to what I am obliged to inquire into, which is where did these stories come from, how did they spread and who was putting them around. But, you know, the other stuff, in particular in relation to people who, whether they were right or whether they were wrong, have actually not been through the most pleasant of times, should just be left aside.
A. Well, Chairman, in response $I$ would say that -CHA RMAN well, I don't think you need to respond. That's actually a ruling, and I'm in charge here, and that's it.
520 Q. MR. MARRI NAN If we could just turn to page 3664 of the materials, paragraph 9. This is the second statement that you made to the Tribunal. It's in the form of bullet-points that you set out and it's dated 23rd May 2017. And some of it is a repetition from
paragraph 1 to 9, and we come to the relevant portion here. You say:
"It was in 2013 that I first became aware that Sergeant MECabe was being associ ated with an allegation of child 15:36 sexual assault. Rumours about this were circulating in a number of Dubl in newsroons at the time."

You can't pin that down, you've told us. Having heard the rumours, you then made your own inquiries, you say, in relation to Ms. D and her family, and you also satisfied yourself from talking to John wilson and then subsequently to Sergeant Maurice McCabe that there was no truth in the rumours, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

521 Q. And then you go on to say:
"It is in my understanding that a copy of the Garda file concerning the allegations had been provi ded to Mr. Paul Willians (special correspondent) by seni or Gardaí in Garda Headquarters and that is how the word got out."

That's in relation to the allegation made by Ms. D. Can you assist us any further in relation to this aspect of the information that you brought to the Tribunal?
A. Well, $I$ think it's well known in journalistic circles that Mr. Williams gets the bulk of his material from

Garda Headquarters, his Garda sources. His boss at the time, Stephen Rae, my former editor, had been editor of the Garda Review and he himself actually had been in possession of the Fr. Molloy file, the Garda file, so -- and they also came into possession of the Anglo tapes in or around this timeframe, and it's quite astonishing that they would have gone ahead and published those tapes, which I believe they were found in contempt of court for publishing without the permission of An Garda Síochána, because obviously that -- the publication of those tapes could have severely damaged one of the most important trials in the history of the State. So as far as my understanding --
MR. FANN NG Chairman, I am not sure -- I am sorry to interject, but I am not sure as to the basis upon which this evidence is being adduced. It clearly goes well beyond anything that the Tribunal is seeking to investigate.
CHA RMAN Yes, Ms. O'Doherty, I actually value what you are saying, and I obviously respect you as a person, but one of the problems that I have is, I have to keep things on the rails. It's a very, very, very different exercise than is involved, for instance, in investigative journalism where you are seeing where make a pattern. I am using that as an analogy. Now, appreciating that you have views, and I would say your views are always interesting, I am tasked, on the
other hand, with looking at facts and looking at -A. Well, I am coming to that, yes. CHA RMAN Yes. And looking at particular pieces of evidence from which $I$ can infer a fact. Fact is often, and quite often, not a direct fact. Now, I'm not sure where we had strayed into, I am actually just a wee bit lost, but I think what Mr. Marrinan was, in fact, asking you about was -- I'm just going to have to go back, I'm sorry, I'm tired. Yes, the allegation that, and indeed I wrote it down, you believe that Paul williams had some kind of special relationship with the Gardaí. You're entitled to believe that, obviously. But specifically you understood, and that's the word I wrote down, that he had got a copy of the file of the Ms. D investigation case from someone, presumably in Garda Headquarters.
A. Well --

CHA RMAK And what Mr. Marrinan was asking you about was how do you justify that? In other words, what are the facts that you put together to say that? Do you know it directly? And if you don't, you are inferring it from A, B, C and D, but what are the A, B, C and D? Mr. Marrinan, is that a fair characterisation of the question?
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
And indeed paragraph 19 might help you in this regard, if we go to page 3665. Because what you say is:
"Rumburs circul ated that a copy of a Garda file had
been given to Paul Wilians and that it reveal ed that Sergeant McCabe was under investigation for child sexual abuse."

So it would appear that your understanding was based on 15:41 a rumour that you had heard, is that right?
A. well, no, just in relation to my earlier evidence, I believe that is important background to explain the nature of the relationship between Mr. Williams and Garda management. In relation to the Ms. D file, I believe, and I believe he has actually alleged this himself, that information was given to him about the Ms. D case, which had been dealt with by the DPP and who the DPP had said that there was nothing to pursue.

So it's my understanding -- I mean, I would like to know how Mr. Williams found out where Ms. D lived, for example, and other details pertaining to the case. CHA RMAN Well, I've heard all the evidence in relation to that, and I can tell you that, actually,
now. I can also tell you what he got from Garda Headquarters because he rang Superintendent David Taylor. But there is a dispute as to who said what and in what circumstances. But the focus of the question is, look, do you have any evidence that he was given the file? Now, there's a problem, because if you actually read the file, and $I$ have read the file, it's a scrupulous file and it's not favourable to any notion that there ever was an assault. That's what the file
says. So in having the file is not actually going to help an anti-McCabe case. There's a problem. But what Mr. Marrinan is asking you, and if you wouldn't mind focusing on that, is, do you have any facts upon which you base your understanding that Paul williams got a copy of the Ms. D file from somebody in the Garda, it seems Garda Headquarters or someone in authority? That is the question, if you wouldn't mind just focusing on that.
A. Yes, I have made it clear, Chairman, that I cannot state that he was handed a hard copy of the file, despite the fact that I was aware that hard copies of Garda files were in possession of INM management. But it certain7y is my understanding that information was provided to him in relation to Ms. D by An Garda Síochána. That is my belief.

523 Q. MR. MARR NAN I think that there is quite a substantial issue as between you and Mr. Williams, because Mr. Williams gave evidence to the Tribunal, and you became aware of the evidence from reading the
transcripts and his statement to the effect that he didn't know of you as a journalist and then went on to say that he believed that you had some agenda with INM. would you like to comment in relation to both those matters?
A. Well, Chairman, I mean, that in itself displays contradiction. I mean, if he did not know who I was, how did he know or how could he allege that $I$ had some sort of an axe to grind with INM? Mr. Williams, I will
strongly claim, knew exactly who I was. I was the chief features writer in the Irish Independent at a time when he had been brought back in by Stephen Rae. I spoke to him on a number of occasions in relation to my Fr. Molloy investigation because he himself in some of his writing had written about the Fr. Molloy case and had written about a Garda deal that had been done with Martin Cahill and John Traynor, the well-known criminals, in relation to the stolen Fr. Molloy file, and Mr. Williams had alleged that charges had been dropped against one of these two individuals in exchange for the stolen file. I spoke to Paul williams about that on a number of occasions and I also remember texting him. But Mr. Williams would also have known me because I wrote about him in the story that was published.

524 Q. On the 19th April, yes.
A. Yes, about Martin Callinan's penalty points. Because Mr. Williams too had been availing of terminations and had had a number of sets of penalty points terminated from his licence, I believe four or five sets. I would like to know exactly how many.

525 Q. If we could go then to paragraph 25 , which is at page 3666 of your statement. You say:
"Si nce coming into cont act with both Ser geant McCabe and Garda Wilson I have heard fromboth fellow journal ists and some politici ans of attempts being made to bl acken thei r good names and reputations."

Can you assist us any further in relation to that as to the identity of the journalists and/or politicians of those attempts to blacken the names of Sergeant McCabe in particular?
A. Well, I don't think I'd go any further than point 26 , where I refer to the fact that John wilson had informed me that Debbie McCann was making these allegations about sergeant McCabe. I was aware of the fact that her father was a senior Garda and, you know, that didn't surprise me that she might be making those allegations. Other than that --
Q. well, if you just deal with paragraph 25 in the first instance: "Si nce coming into cont act with both Sergeant McCabe and Garda Wilson, I have heard from both fellow journalists", plural. Can you say who the journalists were that were --
A. No, I really -- no, I don't think I can and I don't think I want to. And I know at the time my attitude was very much, you know, these rumours are utterly scurrilous, vile and the worst thing you can say about a man. My focus was on exposing what Sergeant McCabe was trying to expose and to continue with my work.

527 Q. We11, you'11 appreciate, I'm sorry to interrupt you, but you'11 appreciate that our focus is on trying to find out who it is that is saying these things about Sergeant McCabe. Can you tell us who the politicians were who were saying these things to you?
A. No, I'm going to claim privilege on that point.

528 Q. A11 right. We11 --
A. I did make it clear, Chairman, when I did my original, when I made my original statement to your two colleagues that I didn't really want to go into any detail in relation to the scurrilous rumours about Sergeant McCabe, because I did dismiss them.
529 Q. Well, that's fine if you think it's in circumstances --
A. It took me away from the work I wanted to do and, you know --
530 Q. If you think it's said in circumstances of privilege in 15:48 relation to what politicians said to you as a journalist --
CHA RMAN I know, but Mr. Marrinan, I mean, we're in a situation, I mean there's a difference between -- we've had it from so many people saying 'Look, this was being discussed, $A$ is talking to $B, B$ is talking to $C$, it's over coffee, you can't really say who it is'. And the fact that a politician is aware of a rumour or mentions a rumour is not the same thing as a politician being the agent of a rumour or the author of the rumour or riding the rumour in order to destroy somebody. So I mean, the fact that people know, that people are talking isn't, frankly, anything against them, unfortunately. The real story perhaps is why is nobody finding out where it comes from and quashing the rumour?

So I don't know why you're asserting a privilege in relation to that, because it actually doesn't help or
doesn't put us anywhere and it doesn't seem to be anything that would in any way be against a politician to say that someone was discussing it. Sure I've had three or five of them in here saying they'd heard it and people were talking about it.
A. But, Chairman, at the time I was very focused on the work that I was doing in trying to expose a number of murders that had been allegedly covered up by An Garda Síochána and assisting in exposing the very serious work that Maurice McCabe and John Wilson were doing. And, you know, there were no shortage of journalists, I'm sure, who were looking into these outrageous allegations against Sergeant McCabe. I didn't see it as my role to do that, I was too busy --
CHAN RMAN No, I think we've gone a wee bit off the point, and it's entirely my point for directing it in that way. Look, the fact that politicians are talking about the matter, it has been admitted here that politicians were talking about the matter, that there were rumours, that they were talking about it, that it was current in Leinster House, it was current in Garda Headquarters, it was probably current in other places, probably people who read the articles by paul williams, some of them in any event in the right quarters would've identified the alleged assailant, the alleged person who was allegedly assaulted. And, you know, I don't think it's going to help me anyway whether you claim privilege or not, because $I$ know the rumours were there. So it doesn't matter, we can just pass on.

531 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Just in relation to paragraph 21 of your statement at 3665 , this is when you say that you approached Sergeant McCabe:
"I asked himif he knew what was being said about him and invited hi mto expl ai $n$ his version of events, as I bel ieved that he was entitled to know that these rumburs were in circulation. "

There's no issue in relation to that.
"I tol d himthat certain j ournal ists were attempting to intervi ew the al leged vi ctimand that it was intended by themto publish the story."

Then if we go over the page to paragraph 26, you say that Garda wilson had informed you that a reporter named Debbie McCann, who worked for the Irish Daily Mail and whose father was a senior garda, was allegedly one of the journalists that was putting the word out that Sergeant McCabe was a child abuser. We know from other evidence and the evidence of Ms. D that she was a journalist who doorstepped Ms. D in February, late February of 2014. Are you in a position to help us and assist the Tribunal in relation to what you say at attempting to interview the alleged victin'? Do you know the identities of the journalists who were attempting to interview Ms. D?
A. No, I will claim privilege there also, because -CHA RMAN On what basis?
A. -- I know it to be the case, but --

CHA RMAN So on what basis are you claiming privilege? I mean, you seem to be the one who's saying 'I want to uncover conspiracies, I want thing to be known' and here you are in front of a public Tribunal saying 'I'm not going to tell you anything'.
A. Well, I have to state once again, Chairman, that these rumours, these scurrilous, vile rumours about Sergeant McCabe didn't occupy a big space in my mind. I know that within journalistic circles they were swirling around. I didn't give them any credence. I had a conversation with Maurice about them. When Maurice explained to me the situation, that, for me, really was 15:52 the end of it and --
CHA RMAK A11 right. We11 --
A. -- I didn't record --

CHAL RMAN No, no, no --
A. I don't have specific dates, I didn't record --

CHAN RMAN A11 right --
A. -- who said what about it.

CHA RMAN -- Ms. O'Doherty --
A. And I wouldn't be able to expand upon that.

CHAL RMAN okay, it's the same -- no, that's a different thing. Because it seems to be then, look, you knew they were rumours and journalists had rumours. But that's a different thing to claiming a source. A source is something which is the source of a fact.

What Mr. Marrinan was asking you about is do you have information that certain journalists were attempting to publish a story? well, is there an answer to that first of all?
A. Well, I would have been aware that, I would have been told that the Garda file, or at least details pertaining to Ms. D had been given to certain journalists and that they were attempting to interview her. And I can't really go any further than that, Chairman.

532 Q. MR. MARRI NAN We11, you've told us that you'd heard, or deduced that Paul williams had been given access to the Garda file. And you then name a journalist, Debbie McCann, as somebody who you have been told by John wilson was spreading rumours about Maurice McCabe. And 15:54 it's just these three lines in your statement: "I told hi mthat certain j ournal ists were attempting to intervi ew the alleged vi ctim', I mean, that's fairly specific. And the Tribunal knows from other evidence that Debbie McCann had attempted to interview Ms. D. And the Tribunal is also aware that Eavan Murray then attempted to interview Ms. D. Both were unsuccessful. And we know subsequently that Paul williams did interview Ms. D. And I'm just wondering, arising out of these three lines in your statement, whether you feel that you have information in relation to any other journalists that the Tribunal ought to know about --
A. No, Chairman, I don't.

533 Q. -- the visit to the Ms. D household?
A. No.

CHA RMAK All right. We11, we know about three, but you are not adding to that number?
A. No.

MR. MARRI NAN That's fine. Thank you very much. would you answer any questions?

MR. MEDONELL: No questions.
MS. BURNS: No questions, Chairman.
MR. MEDONELL: Sorry, there is one question.
CHA RMAK Oh, yes.

## THE WTNESS MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MEDONELL AS FOLLO/G:

534 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Just would you confirm please that 15:55 Sergeant McCabe was not the source of the Callinan story, this Callinan speeding story?
A. I can confirm that.

MR. MEDONELL: Thank you.
MR. FANN NG Chairman, I think Mr. Keeley wants to go next.

## THE WTNESS, WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. KEELEY AS FOLLO/G:

535 Q. MR. KEELEY: Ms. O'Doherty, my name is Michae1 Keeley and I'm the solicitor for Debbie McCann, to whom you've made reference, so I just want to ask you a few questions in relation to her. Have you ever spoken
with Debbie McCann?
A. No, I don't believe so.

536 Q. Have you ever met her?
A. I don't believe so.

537 Q. You're aware of her evidence to the Tribunal that she's 15:56 never spoken with nor met with John wilson; do you accept that?
A. I can't -- if that is what she says.

538 Q. But you won't challenge that in any way?
A. You know, I accept if that is what she says, but --
Q. Okay. But according to your evidence before the Tribunal, the only evidence that you have that she was apparently involved in some kind of campaign against Sergeant McCabe and called him a "pedo" comes from Mr. Wilson.
A. What is your question?

540 Q. Do you have any other evidence other than what Mr. Wilson is alleged to have told you that Debbie McCann was involved in a campaign against Sergeant McCabe and called him a "pedo", as you have alleged in 15:56 your statement?
A. I don't believe so, but --

541 Q. So you've no evidence?
A. I don't believe that $I$ have. But I mean, certainly since the Tribunal began, I think there have been other 15:57 suggestions made that she did make those comments.
542 Q. What is that evidence?
A. Well, I believe that may be before the Tribunal. But I'm not in a position to expand on what $I$ was told.

543 Q. You've indicated to Mr. Marrinan, in relation to the statement in your initial letter, through your solicitors, to the Tribunal that you do not wish to name any of the journalists or any of the politicians who were making attempts to blacken the good names and reputations of Garda Wilson and Sergeant McCabe. And you've given a reason for doing that. If that is the case, why have you included Debbie McCann's name in this?
A. Well, because I distinctly remember Debbie McCann's name being brought up as one of the journalists that were making these allegations.
544 Q. By Mr. Wilson. And you've no evidence whatsoever for that?
A. I believe that what Mr. Wilson said was accurate.

545 Q. okay. So you will recall subsequent to your letter -CHA RMAN I'm sorry, Mr. Keeley, could I just clarify something? Ms. O'Doherty, you never spoke to John wilson, is that right?
A. I never spoke to him?

CHA RMAN No, you did speak to him, that's as I understand.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN You never spoke to Debbie McCann?
A. No, I have never spoken to her. As far as I know, I haven't, no.
CHA RMAN Yes, okay. But you also are not challenging the fact that John wilson never spoke to Debbie McCann?
A. If that is what Debbie McCann is saying. It's my
recollection that John wilson told me that. But I have to stress that in relation to these vile rumours that were made against Sergeant McCabe, I do not want to and I stressed this at the time of my statement - go into any details about who said what, when they said it ${ }_{15: 59}$ and how they said it, because I dismissed them pretty much immediately. So as far as my allegations in relation to Debbie McCann are concerned, I can only te11 you what is in my statement and I can't expand on that.

CHA RMAN A11 right. But I mean, just so as I can be clear - and I'm sorry for interrupting, Mr. Keeley but are you still saying that John wilson said to you that Debbie McCann said to him that Sergeant McCabe was a pedophile?
A. That is my recollection. But I do have to stress that I completely dismissed these rumours --

CHA RMAN No, no, no, I appreciate that.
A. So I didn't log everything in my head in relation to them, I was much more focused on the work that I was doing in assisting Sergeant McCabe.

CHAL RMAN No, but are you --
A. So I'm just, I'm not in a position --

CHA RMAN But even so, it's a simple question; you had a conversation, do you say, with John wilson where he said 'Debbie McCann has said to me that Sergeant McCabe pedophile'?
A. That is my belief. I believe the first time $I$ heard Debbie --

CHAN RMAN Belief is metaphysical --
A. That's my understanding.

CHA RMAN Belief is metaphysical, above the physical, a11 right? Something that happens to you, you know about. Now, did you have a conversation with John Wilson where he said 'I have been told by Debbie McCann that Maurice McCabe is a pedophile' or you did you not?
A. That is my understanding of what happened. It is my understanding that the first time --
CHA RMAN We11, you're using language in a different way to me, I'm sorry. But an understanding of something is a different thing. There's a flag, right? It may be your understanding that there's a flag in every court in the Four Courts, but you'd in fact be wrong, there's one only in Supreme Court as far as I know. That's an understanding: There it is, it's there, you know it's there. Now, do you know or do you not know that you had a conversation with John wilson in which he said 'Debbie McCann has told me that Maurice McCabe is a pedophile'?
A. I'11 say it again: It's my understanding that the first time --

CHA RMAN A11 right.
A. -- I heard Debbie McCann's name was through John wilson and that he alleged that she was spreading these rumours. And that is as far as I can go, Chairman. CHA RMAN Al1 right. okay, I understand.

MR. KEELEY: Chairman, I have no further questions. CHA RMAN Yes.

## THE WTNESS, WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. FANN NG AS FOLLOVS:

546 Q.
MR. FANN NG Ms. O'Doherty, Rossa Fanning is my name and you may have heard from earlier questions that I appear for Independent News and Media. Now, there are just a few issues of concern $I$ want to address with you. I might ask Mr. Kavanagh, the registrar, to bring us to page 7444. And just to put this in context for you, Ms. O'Doherty, it's agreed that you called to the Callinan household on the evening of Thursday, 11th April 2013 and Mr. Callinan, after you spoke to his wife, made representations in relation to that and there was contact between you and people senior in the INM as to what you were doing at the Callinan household. That's all agreed.

Now, at 7444 there's an e-mail sequence. If we scrol1 down to the bottom of the page, the most -- the first e-mail in the sequence is at the bottom of the page. And the first e-mail is from you at 50 minutes past midnight on the morning of Friday, 12th April, if you follow me. So that's late in the night on Thursday, as it were, or, technically, early on Friday morning and the managing editor at the time. And it was important from your point of view that he was in possession of the facts, because he had sent you a text and you
described the story about six lines down in that e-mail as a "cracking yarn". Do you see that phrase?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hmm}$.

547 Q. And that was your description of the penalty points story about Martin Callinan. Do you see the "cracking yarn" phrase?
A. Mm hmm .

548 Q. Because I just want to track that phrase through the e-mails. And you explained what you did, I don't need to go through it with you, you explained the discussion 16:03 you had with Mrs. Callinan and you said that you were polite and friendly and that you didn't harass anybody. Now, Mr. Denieffe's response the next morning at 8:37 is:
"Gemma, thanks for this. Apol ogi es for not seeing your call last ni ght. This certainly is a cracking yarn. I thi nk a real issue here is that when the reaction to your visit to his door starting coming in, no one seemed to be in a position to confirmit was actually you, so a security hoo-hah started. Did you tell anyone or discuss with anyone that you were going to call to the door of the Garda Commi ssi oner? If not, in practice it would better idea to do so so that we are prepared for the inevitable flack. M chael."

Now, that's Mr. Denieffe, the managing editor, e-mailing you the following morning. I just want to suggest to you that that's a temperate and measured
response from him to your explanation of what you'd been doing the previous night.
A. Well, why then did $I$ receive a comprehensive apology from INM --

```
Ms. O'Doherty --
```

A. -- sometime afterwards, which I would like to be read into the record of this Tribunal?

Ms. O'Doherty, I wonder could you answer the question that I asked? I've asked you about an e-mail sent by Michae1 Denieffe at 8:37 on Friday, 12th April and I've suggested to you that that's a temperate and measured e-mail. Now, do you ask the Tribunal to form a different view of that e-mail?
A. Okay, well, I would like to state first of all, are we going to do a rerun of my High Court defamation --

551 Q. -- we are absolutely --
A. -- action?

552 Q. We are absolutely not going to do that.
CHA RMAN No, I'm going to intervene. Look, the system works as follows: Counsel ask questions based on 16:05 their instructions and $I$ intervene in the event that things are going off the rails or $I$ don't understand or in the event that $I$ don't have an understanding of actually what their case is. That's what it's about.

Now, I'm optimistic that we're not going to rerun whatever cases you've been through - and I'm sorry you have had to be in a position of going through cases but I think the best thing to do, and honestly it is
the best thing to do, is to listen to the questions asked by Mr. Fanning and to answer just those questions. Now, can I add a rider to that, which is this: I understand you're represented, isn't that
right?
A. Pardon?

CHA RMAN You're represented?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN We11, you may have worries as to whether things are left out and you're entitled to tell your own lawyers 'Look, I want you to examine me at the end', and that is your entitlement, 'and I want you to bring out the following points, A, B, C and D, which I also think are important'.

So please trust to the system and maybe just try and answer the questions. I know there are other things on your mind, I'm sympathetic to people who have things on their mind, but please just trust to the system and try and answer Mr. Fanning. And there is that safeguard that your own lawyers can bring out other material. And they have the last word, by the way, apart from re-examination by Mr. Marrinan. And please just trust to them --
A. Well, Chairman, I would say that this is not hugely relevant to the Tribunal.
CHA RMAR I know. But unfortunately, I'm the one who has to make those decisions and, you know, these things --
A. Well, these actions --

CHA RMAN No, no, I'm sorry, look, I may come across as the biggest crank on earth and eventually I will turn into Judge Judy, as I've said before, but look, I have to keep things on the rails and if people are determined to put them off the rails, well then I'm going home and I am going to do my garden. Now, would you please answer Mr. Fanning, that's what I'm asking you to do.
MR. FANN NG I'11 put the question again,
Ms. O'Doherty. I've read out a short e-mail from Michae1 Denieffe to you on the morning of 12th April and I've suggested to you that that's a temperate and measured e-mail in response to your account of attending at the Callinan household the previous night. 16:07 Do you agree or disagree?
A. That may be temperate, but --

554 Q. So you agree --
A. -- certainly the overall response was far from temperate.
555 Q. A11 right. We11 -
A. Because I lost my job shortly afterwards.

MR. HARTY: Sorry, Chairman, I act for Ms. O'Doherty and if Mr. Fanning is going to ask her questions, he should permit her to answer the questions.
MR. FANN NG I'd only be delighted if she would answer the questions I'm putting to her, as opposed to -CHA RMAN Well, I'm just wondering now is it time to pull up the stumps? Let's please carry on for about the
next --
MR. FANN NG I'm hoping to conclude with Ms. O'Doherty in a relatively short period of time.
CHA RMAN Yes, let's try and carry on for the next 15 minutes and see how we get on please.

MR. FANN NG Very good.
CHA RMAK I'm conscious, by the way, Mr. Harty, of the point you're making and I'11 try and ensure that everything is all right. But so far I'm failing miserably, that's the plain reality of it. But let's carry on.

556 Q. MR. FANN NG Ms. O'Doherty, your response to Mr. Denieffe is there at the top of the page:
"Thanks M chael. Sorry for not forewarning. I knew the lads were all at the advertising do and I didn't want to di sturb Peter or Stephen. But I went about my busi ness in such a way as to ensure no hoo- hah or upset anybody. It was purely to clarify that it was his address and go. I'mastoni shed that he'd put in a compl ai nt, but then agai $n$ nothing would surprise me about our police force these days. I presure l've the go- ahead to write the story."

So that was your response. And I don't need to put a question in relation to that. If we could turn forward to 7447 , there's a short e-mail sent from you the same morning to Ian Mallon, with who you say you had an intemperate phone call the previous evening.

Mr. Mallon, incidentally, will say he told you on the call the previous evening that there was a correct way of going about things that that doorsteping the Commissioner or attending without warning on your own at his doorstep was not the correct way of going about things. But however intemperate that phone call was, it wasn't so intemperate that you couldn't e-mail him at 9:40 the following morning saying:
"Mbrning Ian. I've di scussed the Callinan matter with M chael Deni effe and he agrees it's a cracking yarn. So my next step is to ring the Garda Press Office to put it to the Garda Commissioner. I will tell them we're going to press tomorrow. Can you confirmthis is okay? If we don't act speedily, I would worry that the story will get out el sewhere. Many thanks, Gemma. "

So it's clear from that I want to suggest, Ms. O'Doherty, that you weren't at all deterred and that you pressed on by putting the content of the story to the Garda Press Office with a view to getting the story published, isn't that so?
A. Well, I would like to think that I acted like a professional at all times. I was very frightened at this point, I didn't understand why management were coming down on me like a tonne of bricks for getting what I would call a story of huge public interest. And I was determined that that story was going to be published, be it in the Irish Independent or wherever.

It was a story that the public needed to know.
557 Q. Very well. And if we could turn forward then to page 7450. At 7450, from the bottom of the page, you'11 see that you'd sent a similar e-mail to Stephen Rae, the Editor in Chief, at five minutes past noon on the same day, Friday, 12th April. That was a similar e-mail to the e-mail you'd sent to Mr. Denieffe the previous night:
"J ust so you' re correctly informed about the events of yesterday, pl ease see bel ow. "

And you set out the detail. Mr. Rae responds:
"Gemma, thanks for your note bel ow. I do, however, need to set out a number of clear gui del ines. All news stories that any journalist is working on require to be coordi nated with the news executive or seni or manager. Where approaches are made to indi viduals, particularly doorsteps, they must al so be cleared/coordi nated with
the news desk. Mbreover, where a reporter is approaching a promi nent official it's even more of a priority to coordi nate and clear with the news desk. Irrespective of the merits of a story, I cannot have journalists operating outsi de the accepted news management chai $n$. As you all know, we're all notivated journal ists who del i ght in generating excl usi ve stories. Nonethel ess, we all have to operate within the news structure that is in pl ace and that means
operating to the news desk or the editor. I've no probl em with hol ding promi nent people to account, but that clearly has to be done within the gui del ines outlined above. I hope this clarifies the matter. I al so bel ieve that a debri ef with the operations editor and managing editor is in order in this case."

And your response, 7450, is:
"Thanks very mach Stephen. The onl y reason I went to the house was to confirmthe address so l had my information correct bef ore l started di scussing the story publ icly and bl aming anybody in the wrong. My error. The story only came to me at about 7 p.m and I felt it urgent to pursue it before other media got it. Unf ort unatel y, I an, Peter and Cormac were at the advertising evening and I di dn't want to di sturb them, so l took it on my own bat to see if this sensational story stood up. I absol utel y note your comments bel ow and may thanks for informing me of same. I cont act prominent people all the time about potential excl usi ves that may or may not stand up, but don't like to be pestering you guys every timeldo. The protocol has not been brought to my attention until now, I was not aware of it. I amnow, so many thanks and again l behaved with impeccable manners and professi onal ismat all times during the 20 or 30 second encounter. Wbuld it be okay to send on those questions
now? l'manxi ous the story is going to break el sewhere. It's becoming known that the Indo have it. I have a few more good lines on it too. Sorry agai $n$ for any hassle caused to you, that was never my intention."

And ultimately, one more e-mail I want to show you. 7457 is a short e-mail now a few days later from Stephen Rae to you on 18th April:
"Gemma, just to reiterate, it's a cracking yarn no
doubt. I just want to give it the best show on ou bi ggest circulation day. I hope you understand this and please convey this to your source. Very best, SR."

And we've seen, because Mr. Marrinan put it to you already, that an article was published on the front page of the Irish Independent on Friday, 19th April and it was continued on the second page. And arising out of all of that, Ms. O'Doherty, I want to suggest that your version of this to the Tribunal that INM came down on you like a tonne of bricks or that you were treated despicably by management is not borne out by the objective sequence of events, the objective sequence of events is that you were sent measured and temperate e-mails indicating a concern with the method by which you approached Mr. Callinan, but that you were supported with the story, which two senior executives agreed was a cracking yarn and it was published on the front page a week later. Isn't all of that clear?
A. All that is clear is that $I$ was unlawfully dismissed from my post of 16 years within a matter of weeks after that. And the High Court has read into the record a significant apology from INM and I received substantial compensation for the loss of my job.

558 Q. A11 right. And I'11 deal with that directly now. Because you've said on a number of occasions that you were unlawfully dismissed, both in oral evidence to the Tribunal this afternoon and in your various statements. I want to put to you a number of matters of public record. Firstly, it's a matter of public record that INM has heavily indebted in 2013, that it sold its South African business to pay down debt, it raised money from its existing shareholders and it formed a cost-cutting plan for a redundancy programme which was announced in a circular to all staff by the then Chief Executive of Independent News and Media, Vincent Crowley, on 26th April 2013. That's a matter of public record, it was a publicly quoted company and this was reported on at the time. So it was a round of redundancies that was publicly announced on 26th April 2013. And u7timately, my instructions are that there were 43 job losses in INM, 29 of which were editorial and six of which were initially non-voluntarily, but alone of the 43 , you were the on7y person affected who did not reach an amicable agreement and you challenged the redundancy as an unfair dismissal.

Now, those are the facts. 29 journalists on the
editorial side lost their job, six of them non-amicably initially. You have told the Tribunal today and in your statement that you were the only journalist to suffer such a fate and I want to suggest to you that that's demonstrably untrue.
A. Well, all I know is that my relationship with management prior to me taking up the story about Martin Callinan was excellent, I was spoken to in glowing terms consistently by management. So why they would come along and make me the only person compulsorily redundant makes absolutely no sense. And I go back to the High Court apology issued to me by INM.
559 Q. Yeah. And just to put that to you, you entered into a settlement with INM on 22nd December 2014, under which settlement you compromised an employment claim, a defamation claim and a personal injuries claim. And you accept that the terms of settlement are confidential? That's what it says, isn't that so, Ms. O'Doherty?
A. Em --

560 Q. You entered into a confidential settlement?
A. Well, I -- you know, I mean, you're the person that is, you're bringing this up. I don't want to do a rerun of, that's not why I'm here, of my High court action.
561 Q. very wel1.
A. The reason I am here is because I believe that INM may have been instructed by Garda management to relieve me of my duties and the reason I am here is to show how my support for the work that Sergeant McCabe was doing
 4
brought about my unfair dismissal.
562 Q.
A. -- Martin Callinan was extremely angry about that, that's on the record of the Disclosures Tribunal. And I know that the tone of management completely changed towards me after that story and after I made it clear that I was not going to be silenced in my work. And INM will be well aware that they put a proposal to me to take me off stories about Garda corruption and to focus on other stories of less public interest and I turned that opportunity down.
564 Q. Ms. O'Doherty, the fact is that the newspaper subsequently published your story on the front page. And the Tribunal can form its own view of that. Now, one final issue that $I$ want to address with you is in relation to the issue about Mr. Williams and the rumour that Mr. Williams obtained the Garda file on Ms. D. Can you just tell me why you saw fit to pass that rumour on to the Tribunal when it is now clear that there is no factual basis underpinning your knowledge o awareness of it?
A. Well, I mean, I believe that the Tribunal needs to
inquire into how Mr. williams found out about the Ms. D case.
CHA RMAN well, we have.
A. well, we also need to look at, or at least I believe the Tribunal needs to look at the way in which
Mr. Williams facilitated meetings between Ms. D and Mícheál Martin, I believe Alan Shatter also. I also believe that --
CHA RNAN But I've had days of evidence about all this stuff by the way. And I mean --
A. Well, I support it.

CHA RNAN -- I repeat to you, you may not think this is significant, but actually practically the first thing I did in February of last year when I was asked to do this job was to get the Ms. D file and to read it. So it doesn't help any case against Maurice McCabe, that file, in any way.
A. Well, I don't think we would be here -CHA RMAN Well, I've read it, you haven't.
A. -- today if it wasn't for that file.

565 Q. MR. FANN NG Ms. O'Doherty, do you have an adverse professional view of Mr. Williams?
A. I wouldn't have the healthiest professional view of Mr. Williams, no.
566 Q. Have you described him as a Garda puppet, a Garda hack, as a purveyor of depraved work and have you called for a boycott of INM simply for employing Mr. Williams in various tweets? Would you dispute any of those comments as being comments that you have tweeted into the public
domain?
A. I would generally agree with that, yes. I think he does a great disservice to Irish journalism and to the public interest in his work.
567 Q. In which case, Ms. O'Doherty, I would put it to you that the wild and baseless rumour that you saw fit to propagate about Mr. Williams having access to the Garda file was based upon your animosity towards Mr. Williams and not based on any factual underpinning.
A. I don't bear any personal animosity towards Mr. Williams. I believe he does a great disservice to my profession and to himself in the stories that he often puts out in relation to the Gardaí.
MR. FANN NG You can take it that Mr. Williams will
disagree with that if he comes again to give evidence, which he is scheduled to do in the coming weeks. But I don't think I need to explore that with you any further. Chairman, I've no further questions for Ms. O'Doherty.
CHA RMAN That's fine. We11, was there anything? MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, I just see the hour. I had --

CHA RMAN what did you say?
MR. MCHEÁL O HGG NS: I had proposed to --
CHAN RMAN Sorry, you said something.
MR. ḾCHEÁL O HGG NS: Sorry, Chairman, I see the time of day. I was going to suggest, Chairman, I might be shorter if I was allowed an opportunity overnight. But I think it would take quite a bit of time at the moment
if we continued at this hour.
CHA RMAN Okay. Do you think you have much, Mr. Harty?
MR. HARTY: I think I have five minutes approximately. CHA RMAN Yes, all right, okay. No, we'11 have to come back tomorrow. And thank you very much for coming here today.
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[^0]:    "Have you any ot her inf ormation rel evant to the Tri bunal ?"

