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## GEMMA O DOHERTY UAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M' CHEÁL O H GG NS:

MR. MARR NAN Gemma O'Doherty, please.
1 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Good morning, Ms. O'Doherty. My name is Mícheál o'Higgins and I will be asking you some questions, principally on behalf of former Commissioner Martin Callinan, and also former Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan.

Can I start with bringing you to some areas, Ms. O'Doherty, where I think and I hope we will be in a 10:09 position to reach a level of agreement, or hopefully ful1 agreement and then I'11 move away to some other areas where we may be covering issues of dispute, and I'11 alert you to those and you'11 have an opportunity to deal fully with those. But first of all then to the 10:09 areas where I think we'11 be able to reach an accommodation. First of all, just a few general matters; you worked for the Irish Independent for, was it upwards of 20 years?
A. Approaching, yeah, I think it was probably about 16/17. 10:09

2 Q. Right. And, we11, just I've lifted that guesstimate of time from your own statement. It's more accurately, it's 16 or 17, is it?
A. Yeah, approximately, yeah.

3 Q. And I think, am I correct in my understanding that you're able to confirm - I think you've actually already done this - but confirm that Superintendent Taylor never negatively briefed you about Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, he never negatively briefed me.

4 Q. He never did, al1 right. And the same goes, doesn't it, for former Commissioner Martin Callinan; equally, he never briefed you negatively about Sergeant McCabe?
A. I've never spoken to him.

5 Q. Right. And the same goes for former Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

6 Q. And am I correct in my understanding in fact that your position is that no guard has ever in fact briefed you negatively in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. I believe that to be correct.

7 Q. Right. The next matter that I want to cover that hopefully again we can reach agreement on, and that is an article that you wrote for the Sunday Times. And I'11 ask you to take a look at it, it's at page 2087 within, if you have it there, Ms. O'Doherty, it's Volume 8 of the papers. Do you have it there? oh, you're working off the screen, all right. And this is an article written under your byline for the Sunday
Times in, on 23rd March 2014 is when it was issued, when it appeared, isn't that right?
A. I don't have the full article in front of me, so I'd need the full articles if we're going to discuss it.

8 Q. Would you prefer - whichever you're more comfortable with - would you prefer looking at the hard copy? It's in Volume 8 beside you there. That'11 give you an opportunity to look at the full thing.
A. I can put it up on my screen, I think, here, if that's easier. I just can't confirm the date, because I can't see the date.

9 Q. Certainly. Well, it's just at the very top above the heading: "Gardaí, stop spying on my toddl ers".
A. That looks correct.

CHA RMAN Ms. Herlihy, would you just mind fishing it out please for Ms. O'Doherty? Thanks.

10 Q. MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: 2087. So just above the heading there, I think it captures the date of the article. And it's The Sunday Times, as we can see from 10:13 the top 1eft-hand side and it is indeed 23rd March 2014, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

11 Q. And this is an article written by you, we see in the paragraph underneath the headline. And just by way of context, am I correct in my understanding this was an article that you wrote criticising the breach of a particular family's privacy and relating to the fact that the names of two traveller children had been placed on Pulse? Wasn't that the context, broadly speaking, of it?
A. That's correct, yes. The context was that this lady was bringing her children to a Garda station in Cork to get their passports, she happened to be a traveller and
for some reason the children's names were logged on the Pulse system.
12 Q. Right. And I'11 bring you to just the more particular context in a few moments when we look at some other papers in the materials. But can I ask you, before we do that -- well, first of all, you recall this story, it was an important story that you broke, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I broke it.

And you had some degree of help or contribution, I don't overstate it, from Deputy John McGuinness, who was also very critical of the fact that the names of children had been recorded on Pulse?
A. Correct.

14 Q. Right. And you're aware, aren't you, that the Garda Síochána Ombudsman Commission, that's GSOC, had directed an investigation should be carried out into the matter on foot of the mother of the children making a complaint; you were, broadly speaking, aware of that?
A. I am aware of it, and I'm also aware of the fact that the children's names were removed from the Pulse system.

15 Q. Yes.
A. As a result of the GSOC investigation.

16 Q. Right. And we can come to that in a few minutes. And I think that you're aware that a Chief Superintendent John McPolin was directed to carry out an investigation under a particular provision of the Garda Síochána Act of 2005, isn't that right?
A. I don't really -- my only real recollection of that is that I was appalled at the fact that the Gardaí were investigating the Gardaí in this case. And I know that I got a call, I think, from this superintendent and I made it very clear to him that $I$ was not really willing 10:15 to cooperate with an investigation which was being carried out by a senior Garda in relation to Garda malpractice.
17 Q. We11, can I bring you to that just so you have an opportunity to deal with it. I wonder if we could have 10:15 on the page 1988 of the materials. And just to orientate yourself with this, Ms. O'Doherty, this is a report compiled by Chief Superintendent John McPolin, or a letter at least that he wrote to this Tribunal, to Ms. Elizabeth Mullan, solicitor to the Tribunal on 3rd November 2017, but it just helps to put matters in context. Do you see there on the second paragraph down where it says:
"On 22nd July 2014 |" - that's Chief Superintendent McPolin - "was appointed as deci ding officer by the then di vi si onal officer, Chi ef Superintendent MA. Finn, Cork City Division, in a supervised investigation under SECTI ON 94(5) of the Garda Sí ochána Act 2005 in respect of a compl ai nt from Mrs. J" - address given in Cork - "made at the Dubl in office of the Garda Sí ochána Ombudsman Commi ssi on on 28th March 2014 on behalf of her two children."

Do you see that there?
A. I do, yes.

18 Q. And he continues:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "The compl ai nt primarily concerned the allegation that } \\
& \text { inf ormation rel ating to her children was recorded on } \\
& \text { Pul se and that she had been provi ded with proof of such } \\
& \text { by a member of the public, whom she subsequently } \\
& \text { i dentified as bei ng independent journalist ME. Gemma } \\
& \text { O Doherty." }
\end{aligned}
$$

That's a reference to you and that is correct, isn't it?
A. That is correct.

Right. And if we go over the page then to page 1989, the second paragraph down reads as follows, and I just want to get your -- ask you to confirm this is correct as well if you can:
"I establ i shed that Mb. Gemma O' Doherty, freel ance
journal ist, provi ded compl ai nant Mrs. J with copi es of thi s Pul se material, whi ch was confirmed by Mrs. J in her written statement of compl ai nt. Ms. O' Doherty declined to cooper ate with my investi gation, but did confirmto me during a tel ephone conversation that
she' d obtai ned the Pul se screenshots and rel evant inf ormation from Mr. John MEGui nness TD and then Chai rman of the Public Accounts Committee. It is bel i eved that Ser geant MECabe provi ded this inf or mation
to Mr. MEGui nness. This material was provi ded by Germa O Doherty to Mrs. J on 22nd March 2014 and was subj ect matter of The Sunday Ti mes newspaper article penned by ME. O Doherty on 23rd March 2014."

That's the article we've looked at. So can I just ask you there -- well, can I put it this way: Can we take it what you told chief superintendent McPolin was the truth?
A. I'm going to claim privilege at this point.

CHA RMAN I don't know how you can possibly claim privilege if you have a conversation with a garda superintendent. I mean, did you have a conversation with a garda superintendent or not?
A. I'd like to know how this statement made it into the public domain. I made a private statement to GSOC. CHA RMAK Look, you know, the Gardaí investigate things on behalf of the people of Ireland and if you make a statement to the Gardaí, that is a public process, the likely result of which is that it will end up perhaps in a Book of Evidence. But certainly if there's any criminal prosecution, it simply has to be and I underline has to be - disclosed to the defence. So I don't know why you're --
A. It's not a public statement, chairman, at this point, in my opinion, because --
CHA RMAN Sorry, let's just hang on a minute. Are you refusing to answer the question?
A. I'm going to claim privilege at this point --

CHA RMAN No, that's --
A. Which I believe is my right as a journalist.

CHA RMAN To do what?
A. To claim journalistic privilege.

CHA RMAN okay, well, give me the facts and circumstances on which you're basing that then.
A. I'm basing it on the fact I'm not going to go into the details of who my journalistic sources are in this particular instance.

CHA RMAN I'm not asking you to, and counsel wasn't asking you to.
A. We11, I think that that paragraph would suggest, and I think the question suggests that you are asking me to. And I'm not in a position to do that.
CHA RMAN It didn't, it said simply did you speak, did 10:20 you speak to Chief Superintendent McPolin, first of a11?
A. I did speak to him. And I expressed the fact that I was not willing to cooperate with a GSOC investigation which was being carried out by a senior member of An Garda Síochána, because I don't believe that the Gardaí should be allowed to investigate the Gardaí.
CHA RMAN Well, sometimes they do a very good job, you know. But the question --
A. There's very little evidence of that.

CHA RMAK We11, I know, but you're entitled to your views -- maybe we could have me not under interrogation please with the spotlights. Thank you very much. The question asked by counsel was very simple: Did you
confirm during a telephone conversation with Chief Superintendent McPolin that you'd obtained the Pulse screenshots and relevant information from John McGuinness TD, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee? That's the question.
A. And the answer is I'm claiming journalistic privilege. CHAN RMN Well, you're not answering the question. Did you tell that to the superintendent, that's the question, not who was your source. Did you tell him that?
A. I think by answering that question I may be in a position to reveal my source, and I'm not willing to do that.
CHA RMAN Your source for what?
A. My source for this story.

CHA RMAN We11, I'm not asking you your source for this story, I'm simply asking you whether what is written there is correct or not. It's in front of you, it's in front of me.
A. I return to my original answer.

CHAL RMAN What's the point of this, Mr. O'Higgins? Look, I mean, there's no point in having a big row about journalistic privilege over something that's trivial, it has to be something that's important, it has to be something that relates to the point and it veered off into a discussion in relation to members of the Irish traveller community and, for all I know, if what happened happened, obviously it would be wrong.

But where are we going with this?
MR. MCHÉAL O H GG NS: Well, I think it's really quite relevant, Chairman, in a number of respects. It was a matter already in fact canvassed with John McGuinness during his cross-examination, it is a matter obviously which the relevant reports have been circulated within the materials, including the article and it's relevant to, at a minimum, the level of interaction between this witness and Deputy McGuinness, and also it's relevant to issues of credit with respect to this witness and also Deputy McGuinness.

CHA RMAN We11, are you trying to undermine the credit of Deputy McGuinness vis-á-vis the fact that - and I don't believe it was put to him, but perhaps it simply passed over my head; was it put to Deputy McGuinness that he was the source of the information which eventually appeared in The Sunday Times in relation to two traveller --

MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes.
CHA RMAN And what did he say?
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: It was, this very passage was read out.

CHA RMAN And what did he say?
MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: He denied that.
CHA RMAN A11 right, okay. We11, fine, he denied it.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Pardon?
CHA RMAN Well, fine, he denied it. what's it got to do with me and the terms of reference and whether senior members of the Garda Síochána were briefing

Maurice McCabe negatively or not?
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Well --
CHA RMAK Because if it's a matter of credit and John McGuinness, why can't I apply the ordinary rule?
Answers as to credit are final. You don't seem to think they're final, you seem to think you're able to explore it further. Now, it's not a criticism, Mr. O'Higgins, I'm trying to move forward.
MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: I appreciate that, and I wasn't proposing to spend unduly long period of time on this. But just at a very basic level, Chairman, I'd respectfully suggest that if, on foot of an answer this witness properly gives, you were to form the view that, for instance, the answer that had been given previously by Deputy McGuinness was incorrect or, for instance, untruthful, I think that would be a relevant matter and that would be a legitimate matter to pursue.

CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, what Ms. O'Doherty is saying is 'I'm not giving you information in relation to my source on the issue of the traveller children and the passport application and the appearance of members of the Irish traveller community for no reason on Pulse', that's what she's saying to you.
20 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O HGG NS: Yes. We11, can I then rephrase the question? And perhaps it'11 be the same response, 10:24 but can I ask you this: Can you at least confirm that you do not demur from what is said there by Chief Superintendent McPolin as to what you said to him?
A. My original statement to you stands. I am not in a
position to discuss my sources on this story.
CHA RMAK okay, well, there you are. I mean, you're in a position, Mr. O'Higgins, where you're saying, okay, I should think less of Mr. McGuinness, Teachta

Dála, by reason of something that is reported by Chief reveals her sources to members of the Garda Síochána and if she denies it then you'11 have to make an application to me as to whether you wish to call Chief Superintendent McPolin. But at the moment and in all seriousness, Mr. O'Higgins, I'm just not interested. I'd rather deal with what we're actually trying to deal with here.

MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Al1 right, Chairman, I'11 move on from that.
CHA RMAK In other words, I'm not making a ruling on journalistic privilege, because $I$ just don't see the point at the moment. There may be other occasions where I do, but I don't. And that's no disrespect to you. I do understand what you're about and I respect the process, but at the moment I'm not going to be reporting on this - indeed there's a lot of one journalist contradicting another and saying another journalist is lying that $I$ am not going to form a view on. Why should I? It's none of my business.

MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: Very we11, Chairman, I propose then not to deal with the other areas within chief Superintendent McPolin's report where he treats further of this issue as to what was said to him by this witness, on his case.
CHA RMAN Well, it may be that there's a point here that I'm missing and I don't want to stop you making that point. And I appreciate that cross-examination is a series of questions leading to a point. But perhaps it is the case, Mr. o'Higgins, that if you think there is a good point here - and I certainly would like to hear it - you'd simply put the point to Ms. O'Doherty and let's see where we stand on it.
21 Q. MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: Well, perhaps if we approach it this way, Ms. o'Doherty: would it be fair to say that from time to time you have had a number of interactions with Deputy McGuinness?
A. I've had a number of interactions with Deputy McGuinness. Deputy McGuinness, in my opinion, is one of the most honest TDs in our parliament and I have the 10:27 height of respect for him, he's a champion when it comes to standing up against Garda malfeasance and defending victims.
CHA RMAN All right, okay, I'm going to stop again. Look, I've said it three times - and you're not following the transcript, I know you're not following the transcript, and why should you follow the transcript after all? But I've stopped people giving -- granting encomiums to Leo Varadkar, TD, in
relation to the way he behaved, I've stopped ex-Minister Shatter making political statements, and similarly, you're not going to make political
statements either. Whether he's a wonderful man or not a wonderful man is neither here nor there, I'm judging him on the basis of what he said in the witness-box. so let's carry on.
22 Q. MR. MCFEÁL OHGGN: And I think it's the case, just before we move off this area, Ms. O'Doherty, am I correct that Deputy McGuinness has assisted you with a number of your different campaigns as a crusading journalist?
A. I wouldn't say he has assisted me, nor am I a crusading journalist. He certainly stands up for victims who have had -- citizens who have had problems with An Garda Síochána. He assisted you with your Mary Boyle campaign, is that right?
A. He met the identical twin sister of Mary Boyle in Dáil Éireann, along with many other tDs.
24 Q. And I think you were tweeting about this issue in March of 2016, that John McGuinness had raised the issue at a Fianna Fáil parliament party meeting, isn't that right?
A. I believe he has raised the issue on a number of occasions, yes.
well, no, I'm asking you specifically, you were tweeting about this in March 2016, that John McGuinness had raised the issue and had asked micheá 1 Martin to meet with a relative of ms. Boyle, isn't that right?
A. Again, I don't really see the relevance of that. If I tweeted it, I imagine it is correct. I know that Deputy McGuinness has raised this case on a number of occasions.
Well, are you aware, for instance, that Deputy McGuinness appears to be a frequent retweeter of your tweets?
A. A lot of people retweet my tweets. You know, I'm not sure, I don't know, I'd imagine he does.
You are quite a prodigious user of Twitter, isn't that right? You have a number of followers?
A. I use Twitter, yes, because it's a means, since I lost my job at the Independent, it's a means of getting important information out.
Yes. And you've used Twitter for, amongst other
things, getting out information to criticise former Commissioner Martin Callinan, isn't that right?
A. Oh, yes.

29 Q. Yes. And that pattern or that practice of yours of availing of Twitter to criticise parties, including former Commissioner Callinan, has continued right up until the present time, including over the last number of weeks, isn't that so?
A. Correct.

30 Q. And I think you also use Facebook, isn't that right, to 10:30 propagate your views and theories?
A. I use social media.

31 Q. Yes.
A. Like a lot of journalists do. There's nothing unusual
about that.
32 Q. Right. And as recently as 24th March you shared on your own Facebook page a particular post concerning certain allegations against Nóirín O'Sullivan, isn't that right? Do you recall that?
A. I don't know what you're referring to, you'11 have to be more specific.

A11 right. We11, can I ask you to look at page 7464 of the materials? If we go from the top for a moment, just to -- if we go back up, sorry, to the beginning of the document. And this is a posting on Facebook made by a gentleman called Shekleton that as I understand it you riposted on your Facebook page on 24th March?
A. You'11 have to show it to me. It doesn't look familiar.

CHA RMAN But it's there. I wonder would you mind opening the page?
A. I don't repost on Facebook as a rule. So I'm very surprised --
CHA RMAK We11, I suppose there's a point here. Look, we're spending our entire time, this is getting like a fencing match, you know, and it's not helping me at a11. And it's not your fault, Mr. O'Higgins, but we're getting irrelevant answers and I'm tending to wonder what's the point of this thing? Let's go for the point, if you wouldn't mind, please. And the point is something like, for instance, I'm noticing here "my dear friend Superintendent Dave Taylor", I'm not reacting to it. But if you're saying this is something
to do with Ms. O'Doherty and it helps me in some way, well, let's hear about it.
MR. MCHEÁL OHGGS: All right. Well, just, it requires, Chairman, just looking briefly at the contents of this communication. And it reads that -MR. HARTY: Sorry, Chairman, I question the appropriateness of putting to my client a statement which is not proven by anybody, there's no question of the author being called -- I don't know where this comes from, my client doesn't acknowledge or doesn't recognise it, has indicated she didn't put it on her Facebook page. So putting the detail to it -- of it to her, I question the appropriateness of that. I appreciate that there's a looseness with the rules of Evidence, but this appears to come out of nowhere. CHAN RMAN Mr. Harty, first of all, I understand your point and I do take your point. If someone puts a passage from war and Peace to this witness and says 'Now, isn't that something to do with you?', she's perfectly entitled to say 'No, it was written by Leo Tolstoy in 1878'. So let's see where we're going. And I'm fully alive to that possibility.
MR. ḾCFÉL O H GG NS: And it reads:
"According to very reliable and extremel y serious
information I've obtai ned toni ght, the Di scl osures Tribunal has been unable to recover text messages sent and recei ved by my dear friend Superintendent David Tayl or, the former Garda Press Officer, as his phone
was wi ped clean or lost by Garda Headquarters after it was taken when he was wrongly accused by the poi sonous di ct at ors of An Garda Sí ochána.

Even though they knew Dave was innocent, it di dn't stop 10:33 them arresting him hol ding hi min a cell, stripping hi $m$ of hi s uni formand wedding ring, taking his phone and wi ping it clean of evi dence or making sure they conveni ently lost it. These corrupt dirtbags al so wrongly suspended Superintendent Tayl or from work for two years with his pay recei ving a huge cut and put his wi fe and children through a horrendous two-year ordeal that was undoubtedl y premeditated by the Garda di ctat orshi $p$, who ae trying to cover up this corruption and criminality that they, in my opi ni on, are guilty of thensel ves. Isn't it strange that the exhi bit officer in charge of that phone was none ot her than chi ef superintendent JimMEGowan, who is the adoring husband of the toxi c ex-Gar da Commi ssi oner Nói rín Ơ Sul I i van ( both pi ctured bel ow).

Thi s story is starting to unravel and the truth is bei ng exposed rapi dly. I have never had any doubt that Dave Tayl or is a compl et el y innocent victimin all this, but I have al ways said that in my personal
opi ni on O' Sul Ii van and her husband are compl et el y responsi ble for what Dave, Mchelle and thei r family have been put through and that both O Sullivan and MEGowan are guilty of corruption, tampering and
spoilation of evi dence and prof essi onal mi sconduct at the very least, and this will be proven to be the case in the very near future."

Now, you, as I understand it, reposted that on your Facebook page.
A. I -- if one were to -- first of all, I don't use Facebook that often. I rarely repost, I do my own posts and --

CHA RMAN No, you were asked --
A. -- I don't believe that I did.

CHAN RMAN Ms. O'Doherty, please, could I --
A. But that is all I can say. I'd be surprised --

CHA RMAN I'11 control my own microphone if you don't mind. Okay, can I get a word in edgeways? You're
asked a very simple and straightforward --
A. Well, I was answering, Chairman.

CHA RMAN We11, you weren't actually. You were asked a very simple and straightforward question. There's this thing, it reads to me like something out of
Private Eye and a column that used to be written, certain7y when I used to read Private Eye, by a man called Dave Spart. But the question you're asked, whether this is sane or insane or sensible or non-sensible is did you retweet this or did you post it 10:35 up on your Facebook?
A. We11, I certainly didn't retweet it. I don't believe that I did.

CHA RMAN A11 right. Okay, we11, that's the answer
then.
A. I would be --

CHA RMAN That's the answer, we don't to hear any more.
A. -- amazed if I did. But if it is there, well, I don't know.

CHA RMAN Can we go on, Mr. O'Higgins, then please?
34 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: All right. Well, just --
A. I would be amazed if I did.
-- I don't wish to test the Chairman's patience in any way, but I am looking at what I understand to be your website?

CHA RMAN We11, Mr. O'Higgins, I'm not sue I appreciate that remark very much. But can we carry on?
MR. ḾCHEÁL O HGG NS: I'm looking at your Facebook
page and it, in front of my eyes, includes a post on 4th -- on 3rd April of this particular communication -sorry, I beg your pardon, 24th March, of this particular communication. And it's really quite simple, this is quite a standout sort of communication, 10:36 it contains quite serious allegations --
A. Are you talking about Christopher whatever his name is, Shek1eton?

37 Q. We11, have you ever seen this before?
A. I possibly have seen it. But I don't believe that I reposted it.

CHA RMAN Well, look, Mr. O'Higgins --
A. That is my honest answer. That is my honest answer. CHA RMAN -- whether I'm trying your patience or not,
and let that water go under the bridge, I'm being very patient here. Now, maybe you would be so kind as to actually just pass up the computer and say 'Look, is this your Facebook page' or whatever we're talking about on social media 'and is Mr. Shekleton's diatribe reproduced on it?' So there's the evidence, if you like, Ms. O'Doherty. (Computer shown to witness). And the question is straightforward: Did you in fact put that on your page?
A. That doesn't mean anything to me, sorry.

CHA RMAN We11, what's the answer then?
A. My honest answer, Chairman, is that I don't believe I did. I'm not in favour of using terms like "corrupt dirtbags", that's not my style.
CHA RMAN No, I appreciate it's not your style, you're 10:37 a serious person and that's not the kind of language that bears any resemblance to anything that you've written that I'm aware of certain7y. But the point made by counsel to you is, look, did you take this and, for whatever it's worth, like a photograph that you
like, did you put it on some form of social media as coming from you to your followers, perhaps on the basis that it's either ridiculous or it's worth reading or whatever? Did you simply repost it?
A. My original answer stands. My honest answer to you is that I don't believe I did.

CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, could I see the computer, if you wouldn't mind, Mr. O'Higgins? This, as I understand, is something that's available on the line
right today, this particular second?
MR. ḾCHEÁL O HGG NS: That's my understanding, Chairman, yes.
CHA RMAN Yes, okay. (Computer shown to Chairman) Okay, it's coming up as Gemma O'Doherty timeline, you have a number of friends and there's a number of comments and then there is, Christopher Shekleton is smiley face with a raised eyebrow, "feel ing determined" with Eddie Smith and 17 others. And it says, and it goes on if this is, if I presumably use this --
A. If it helps the Tribunal --

CHA RMAK Just please let me ask the question if you wouldn't mind. It seems exactly the same as the text that's on the screen that was put to you. It's your Facebook page. You know, there it is.
A. I will have to look at it myself.

CHA RMAN Anyone who's in the room now is perfectly entitled to look up their phone, if they have access to Facebook, or their computer device --
A. And they will see that I rarely, if ever repost.

CHA RMAN -- and it seems to be there. So that seems to be demonstrated to my satisfaction, unless you want to say something else about it?
A. Well, I'd like to make two points. (A) --

MR. HARTY: Sorry, Chairman, I wonder if I could interrupt at this stage? There is also a facility by which somebody can tag somebody on Facebook to an article that they have placed up and that can therefore be linked back to that person's page. I haven't seen
this, it's been revealed as of now --
CHA RMAN We11, you can use your computer and have a look at it if you wish, Mr. Harty.
MR. HARTY: We11, it isn't simply a matter -- simply because an article references somebody's a Facebook page doesn't mean that they put it on their Facebook page.
CHA RMAN A11 right, okay. We11, thank you very much.
A. And that is correct.

CHA RMAN We11, did you put it on your Facebook page?
A. I genuinely don't -- my honest answer is I genuinely don't believe I did.

CHA RMAN I don't think you need to say "genuinely" and "honest" with every answer you make. You know, did you or did you not?
A. I don't believe I did. But --

CHA RMAN It's not a criminal offence to do so, by the way. I mean, you could be putting it up for the amusement of the world.
A. No, I know. And, you know, these are the sentiments of 10:41 a citizen --

CHA RMAN Sorry, it's a straightforward question: Did you or didn't you?
A. I don't believe that I did. I don't use Facebook very often, I don't actually understand really how it works. 10:41 CHA RMAN A11 right, okay, that's your answer, the answer is no. So would you continue, M. O'Higgins?
A. My answer is I don't believe that I did. But I would like to say, if it helps the Tribunal, the general
thrust of this, you know, there probably is some truth in it. But I don't believe that $I$ reposted it on my page.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: And insofar as you indicate there probably is some truth to it, to what are you referring?
A. We11, I can understand the anger within it and, you know, I can understand that maybe a lot of Irish citizens feel like this about the treatment of Superintendent Taylor. But I'm not willing to go any further than that.
Q.

MR. HARTY: Sorry, Si, I just want to interrupt again. I've looked at Ms. O'Doherty's Facebook page -CHA RMAN Look, M. Harty, this is not going to become like the Mad Hatter's tea party. If there's a question that's being asked that's improper, $I$ will rule on it. But you've intervened now four times and we're making about as much progress as a snail travelling between Cork and Dublin. So can we --

MR. HARTY: I'11 deal with it in re-examination. CHA RMAK -- carry on please? Yes, that's a good way of doing it.
40 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O HGG NS: Do you take the view that it is fair to Nóirín O'Sullivan and her husband for this sort 10:42 of material to be spread around social media?
A. This particular post?

41 Q. Yes.
A. I believe -- well, it is my job, and I can only talk
about what my job is, which is to hold power to account. That is my job. Nóirín O'Sullivan is well able to defend herself, as is Martin Callinan.
42 Q. Just, you may not, in fairness to you, you may not be fully aware of the state of play in relation to some of Superintendent Taylor's allegations. All right? He has now withdrawn a number of the allegations that are contained here. And I'm not saying that he made all of the allegations that are contained here, but he certainly made some of them. And they're now withdrawn, all right? So, armed with that information, can I ask you do you think it is unfair to Nóirín o'Sullivan and her husband for this sort of allegation to be circulated widely?
A. Well, I'm not going to speak about her husband. But certainly any dealings that $I$ had with Nóirín O'Sullivan were always negative. She certainly presided over scandal after scandal within the force and I'm afraid that if there is a lot of public disapproval of her, she has brought it all upon herself.

43 Q. I see. So does that mean the answer to my question is it's not unfair that this was put about social media, even though it contains allegations that have now been withdrawn?
A. Well, I'm not responsible for what is put on social media. I'm only responsible for what I say about Nóirín O'Sullivan. And I stand over everything I have said about her.

44 Q. Yes. Can I ask you just to move, to try and make some progress in matters, can I ask you to --
CHA RMAN We11 I wonder, M. O'Higgins, could you bear in mind that the witness has said nothing about Nóirín o'sullivan to me?
MR. ḾCEÁL OHGGS: I will, Chairman, yes. CHA RMAN So --
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: We11, save, chairman, that you'11 appreciate, and I know you do appreciate there are contained within widely distributed materials allegations against Ms. O'Sullivan and against Martin Callinan and also there are contained within statements that have been quite properly distributed by this Tribunal in the statements provided certain allegations that equally have been withdrawn, with respect, to, I think, both persons --

CHA RMAK No, I know that and I've been here all the way through. But what I --
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: I do take what the Chairman is saying.
CHA RMAN That's fine.
MR. M' CHEÁL O HGG NS: And I'11 try and move on from that. I'm soy, just while it's in my mind, Chairman, can $I$ just indicate it may be that you misheard me earlier on in relation to trying patience --
CHA RMAK Well, look, M. O'Higgins, seriously, we've all been together a very long time and I'm a human being and I understand other people are human beings as we11. So let the water flow out into the ocean now and
let's carry on. And I'm not looking for anyone to deliver some kind of an elaborate apology, because let's go on.
45 Q. MR. MCFEÁL OHGGN: We11, I wasn't proposing to do that, I'll just ask you to look at the transcript perhaps later on. (To Witness) Now, Ms. O'Doherty, can we move then to --

CHAN RMAN I'11 look at it when I have to, Mr. O'Higgins. For the moment I'm listening.
MR. M'CFEÁL OHGGN: Can we move to the
allegations -- the article you had written about Martin Callinan's penalty points being cancelled? And I want to bring you to what you said yesterday with respect to that, and it was in your evidence yesterday, all right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

47 Q. And this is what you said, and it's at page 171 of yesterday's transcript. You said that:
"I came into possession" - line nine - "I care into possession of a Pul se document suggesting that a person 10:46 called Martin Callinan had had his speeding points terminated. The source bel ieved that this was the Garda Commi ssi oner. That would not have satisfied my I awyers, our lawyers at the time in INM and so I had to be absol utely clear that Martin Callinan on the Pul se docurent was Martin Callinan the Garda Commi ssi oner. Obvi ousl y this was a very -- a story of si gni ficant publ ic interest."

And then you say:
"Because the man with overall responsibility for oversi ght of our road safety I aws appeared to be abusing themfor his own personal gain."

## All right?

A. Correct.

48 Q. And that's how you put it at that point in time, and this is now at a point in time where you've come into possession of the document, but you haven't yet arrived out to Mr. Callinan's home. Al1 right? And what I wish to canvass with you is, you appear to have excluded from the outset the possibility that Martin Callinan, or indeed anybody else for that matter who'd applied to have penalty points cancelled, you appear to have excluded the possibility they may have validly and legally cancelled a fixed charge notice, you excluded that from the off.
A. I did. Because there were no details written in the 10:48 space where the termination is placed. And I believe, under Garda regulations, that there needs to be an explanation put into the space. If you refer back to the Pulse document, you will see that the space which states "Termination" is left blank. And there needs to 10:48 be an explanation there.

49 Q. Yes. You see, I'm suggesting to you that that is something of a prejudgment, in that, merely armed with the Pulse printout, you appear to have formed the view
that he appeared to be abusing the laws for his own personal gain is how you put it. And I'm suggesting to you that was a prejudgment and it was unfair to start from that premise before you'd gone about gathering together the facts. Do you understand the point I'm making?
A. No, the facts are that the blank space on the termination box indicated that there was a flaw there and that he had not -- the person who terminated the points for him had not given an explanation as to the reason for the termination. And that suggested to me that there was something improper about it. But apart from that, he did personally gain from this, it was a personal gain - he did not receive penalty points on his licence. And he has yet to answer a number of questions which were asked to him and which were also asked of the Minister for Justice. And those questions remain unanswered.
50 Q. You see, I wish to suggest to you that there appears to be something of a pattern here with the way you go about doing things; for instance, you had to be stopped yesterday in repeating allegations you had made in the papers concerning the D family, a member of the D family. And I'm not going to go into that specifically, but you made certain allegations in relation to the D family member who aren't present or represented here.
A. which I stand over.

51 Q. All right. Well, we needn't go into that. But you did
that -- really the point I'm seeking to make is this: You made, in the papers, allegations against a member of the D family without ever even speaking to a member of the $D$ family or hearing their point of view, or still less putting to them the allegation that you were 10:50 going to put out there. And I'm suggesting to you that's an unfair modus operandi, it's an unfair way of going about things.
A. I utterly dispute what you're saying.

52 Q. The door-stepping of, to use that colloquialism, of Martin Callinan's home, the e-mail correspondence that was opened yesterday by Mr. Fanning, counse1 for Independent News and Media, appears to show that you accepted you were in the wrong and that you accepted you had failed to comply with the company's guidelines or protocols on such matters. Would that be fair?
A. My understanding of that - and it is five years ago is that I was not aware that such protocols existed. Mr. Rae had just become editor, there was a completely different culture within the newspaper and certain7y my 10:51 previous editor, Gerry O'Regan, would have congratulated me for a story like that and said -- and would have been very critical of me if $I$ had not checked my facts and checked that Martin Callinan lived at that address and was the Garda Commissioner.
53 Q. Can I ask to you look at page 7450 of the materials please? And this is two e-mails, one from Stephen Rae and your reply to Stephen Rae. So if we just -- if we could scroll down slightly. This is your response. If
we go down a small bit more we just get the date of this communication -- if we go up a small bit more, sorry. So this is from Gemma O'Doherty, yourself, dated 12th Apri1 2013 at 13:51 to Stephen Rae. And Stephen Rae then, what position did he occupy at that point?
A. Editor.

Right. And this is your response to his what was suggested to you yesterday was a rather temperate and reasonable e-mail, this was your response:
"Thanks very much, Stephen. The only 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."

What --
A. Yes, and if you continue reading you will see that I said:
"This protocol has not been brought to my attention until now. "

55 Q. Well, we might do that:
"My error. The story only came to me at about 7 p.m and I felt it was urgent to pursue it bef ore ot her medi a got it. Unfortunatel y Ian, Peter and Cormac were at the advertising evening and I didn't want to di sturb
them so l took it on my own bat to see if this sensational story stood up. I absol utely note your comments bel ow and many thanks for informing me of same. I contact 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 time l do. The protocol has not been brought to my attention until now and I was not aware of it. I amnow, so many thanks, and obvi ously I will take it on board in fut ure. "

Al1 right? So, my question to you, do you see where it says in the second line "my error"; what was your error?
A. I don't believe I committed any error. I was saving the company from a massive libel if I'd got my
information wrong. At the time $I$ had been spoken to in outrageous terms and, you know, following my visit to Martin Callinan's house I had been treated despicably. I know that I was probably very anxious when I wrote that e-mail, because I had never been treated that way before by senior management in INM.
56 Q. Yeah, and perhaps we won't --
A. That's my answer.

57 Q. -- we won't trespass into your dispute, which appears to ask you what error were you referring to there? It's your e-mail, your words.
A. I don't believe I committed any error. This e-mail was
written after a very, very disturbing series of events. And I'm not going to rerun my defamation action against INM, which I was successful in. And I note that the apology has been issued to the Tribunal.
58 Q. There's no defamation here, this is your communication, your words.
A. This is all part of my defamation action.

59 Q. The e-mail that you wrote?
A. All of the -- all -- I mean, most of the correspondence is, of course, yes.
60 Q. All right. We might move on from that. Your statement of 13th March 2017 appears to be a request to the Tribunal to call you as a witness. Would that be fair? That was your desire, to be called as a witness into this Tribunal, you wanted that?
A. Oh, it was my desire. Because I believe I lost livelihood for supporting the work that Maurice McCabe was doing.
61 Q. So effectively this was something of a pitch you were making to be involved in this Tribunal; you desired that for a particular purpose?
A. Well, I believed it was important that the public heard my evidence.

62 Q. Yes. And would it be fair to say you were anxious to make yourself relevant to this Tribunal and to, if you'11 forgive this reasonably strong language, to insert yourself into the whole narrative of the Tribunal?
A. I believe it is hugely relevant when a journalist is
silenced in the course of her work by a police Commissioner when she is holding him to account.
63 Q. And you instructed your solicitors, didn't you, to send a communication with 34 bullet points to the Tribunal, and that was on 18th May 2017 ?
A. I'd like to see that, but --

64 Q. We'11 come to that in due course. And I think also your solicitor, on your instructions, requested a right of representation in their own communication, and that's also in the materials. I'm not saying there's anything untoward about that, but this was all part of your request --
A. I believe I am entitled to representation.

65 Q. Yes. And it was all part of your desire and request to be involved in the Tribunal and to be perhaps centre stage, would that be fair?
A. Absolutely not.

66 Q. Why do you say absolutely not?
A. I certainly did not want to be centre stage, that was not my intention at a11. My desire was for the facts to be presented as they were connected to me before the Tribunal. I know that justice Charleton has requested that journalists come forward if they have information that may assist the Tribunal and that is what I have done.

Yes, and if they're willing to answer questions, doubtless. So before then committing your position to paper and arranging for your bullet points to be sent off to the Tribunal, can I take it that you checked
through the document for accuracy to ensure the Tribunal was being given accurate and reliable information?
A. What point are you making at this stage?

68 Q. It's a question; did you check through your bullet points document to ensure that it was accurate?
A. Well, I'd like to know the point you're making. I'm sure I did, but I would like to know exactly what point you're making.
69 Q. Well, do you --
A. Because if you're suggesting there is an inaccuracy there, well, then show it to me.
Q. My question is: Did you check through it for accuracy?
A. I imagine I did. But I -- until such time as you expand on what you're saying --
71 Q. well would it be your practice --
A. -- I find it hard to answer that question.

72 Q. Would it be your practice to check through documentation that you're putting your name to, to ensure, so far as you can, that it's correct; would that be your normal practice?
A. That would generally be my practice, yes.

73 Q. So it would generally be?
A. It would be my practice to check information that my name is going on. But I don't -- you know, I'm in the dark as to what point you're trying to make.
74 Q. So on what occasions would it not be your practice, if it's only generally your practice?
A. I think you know the answer that I'm giving.

75 Q. I don't, that's why I'm asking the question. If it's generally your practice, on what type of occasions would it not be your practice to do that, to check it?
A. It would rarely not be my practice to do that. But I mean, as I say, I'm in the dark as to the point you're trying to make.

76 Q. We11, if we could look at the document please at page 3665, which I think is your bullet points communication. Just to help you, it's in Volume 14, Ms. O'Doherty. And it actually starts at page 3663. And it is enclosed under a cover letter from KRW Law Solicitors dated 18th May 2017, where your solicitors indicate in the third paragraph down that:
"We herewith encl ose a copy of our client's instructions in rel ation to the queries rai sed by the i nquiry in your previ ous correspondence of 27th March '17. To that end, we woul d ask that the inqui ry will now consi der granting ME. O' Doherty representation."

That's fine, we can pass from that. So in any event, the enclosure with this represents your instructions, isn't that right? Isn't that right?
A. That letter was written by my solicitor.

77 Q. Yes. And behind it --
A. I didn't write that letter. It was in the hands of my lawyers at that stage.

78 Q. Yes, but they have enclosed a copy of your instructions, isn't that right? Is there any doubt
about that?
A. I don't -- I mean, I imagine -- I'm not familiar with this letter as far as I know.

79 Q. We11, just -- I don't intend --
A. What point are you trying to make?

11:01
80 Q. This isn't intended as any sort of, just in case you're concerned, this isn't some sort of catch-out session. Just the letter indicates that your solicitor is enclosing "a copy of our client's instructions in rel ati on to the queries rai sed." A11 right? And then behind that there is a document of a few pages containing numbered paragraphs 1 to 34 and that, as I understand it, these represent your instructions. So just to take it in stages, do you recall sitting down with your solicitor to write down your instructions to your solicitor?
A. I instructed my solicitor.

81 Q. Right. Did you -- were you aware --
A. Could we get to the point though?

82 Q. You see, how this works is I ask the questions and you
A. I'm not really able to answer these questions until $I$ know the point that you're trying to make.

Does this document, paragraphs 1 to 34 , have you seen it before?
A. Yes.

84 Q. Does it represent, as your solicitor's letter indicates, does it represent your instructions?
A. Well, I can't see the whole letter.

85 Q. All right. If we move to page --
CHA RMAN We11, you can, you can see the whole letter, because it's been put out in front of you and you can simply turn the page.
A. Well, do you want me to read the entire letter?

CHA RMAN You know, you're a literate person, so am I, and taking the trouble of taking out the volume, opening it at the right page, it's there right in front of you, so you can see the whole letter and all of the bullet points.
A. When was the letter written again?

CHA RMAK We11, all you've got to do is cast your eye down and you'11 see a date on it no doubt.
A. Well, it was written more than a year ago, so $I$ would like to read it in full before $I$ answer any questions. But to save the Tribunal's time, if you'd like to get to the actual point that you're trying to establish, I'd be more than happy to answer it.
86 Q. MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Are you in any doubt as to whether this represents the normal process whereby a solicitor takes instructions from a client and then commits them to paper, are you in any doubt about that?
A. I don't understand the question.

A11 right, could you look at page 3664 ? There is a number of paragraphs 1 to 10 , do you see that?
CHAN RMAN Ms. O'Doherty, look, it may help if I explain. You kindly wrote to the Tribunal and you said 'Look, I've got something to offer' and you said, perfectly properly, 'I want representation, because if

I'm going to be a witness and I'm going to say things then I may be attacked as to my character, the Tribunal may take a negative view'. That's all perfectly proper, there's nothing wrong with that and thank you for your help. But enclosed with the letter is a statement of fact. It reads a bit like an affidavit. So you say 'One, I am a journalist; two, here is my relationship with Maurice McCabe', all of that kind of stuff. And all that counsel has been asking you about for the last while is were you the author of this document that is actually now in front of you?
A. And I'm asking, given that this letter was written more than a year ago, that I have permission to read the entire letter before I agree to answering the question. CHA RMAN we11, you know, part of the reason, Ms. O'Doherty - and indeed I had this yesterday and the day before - that you're represented is you have a lawyer, they have the papers, we distribute them, you have the opportunity to consult, the people of Ireland are going to be given a big bill for all of that in due 11:04 course and I expect anyone who's coming in to actually know their case, to have read their papers beforehand. Now, it would be nice if Mr. O'Higgins put what he says the point is, but I am taking it as a fact as of this moment that you did write to us in this letter, that you were seeking representation, that you were seeking to cooperate and that you enclosed a statement of facts. Now, if Mr. O'Higgins would come to the facts that are there, the rest of it, as far as I'm
concerned, is primary school stuff and I'm going to take it on board.
88 Q. MR. Ḿ CFEÁL OHGGN: Paragraph 14 on page 3665 , Ms. O'Doherty, your letter of instruction says the following:
"The Gar da Commi ssi oner Nói rín O Sul I i van I aunched a book of his" - that's Paul williams - "and they appear to have had a cl ose rel ationshi p. It's my understanding that the same firm of solicitors represents Paul Willians, INM and the woman who was purportedly behind the allegations of sexual abuse concerning Sergeant MLCabe. "

If we just concentrate on the first sentence, the first 11:06 line I should say, the Garda Commissioner Nóirín o'Sullivan launched a book of paul williams.
A. I've clarified this for the Tribunal. Nóirín o'sullivan attended his book launch.
89 Q. Yes. It may be a trivial point, but I'm just wondering 11:06 did you check through paragraph 14 prior to sending in what I think you now accept was inaccurate, providing the Tribunal with actually factually wrong information?
A. I don't think so. I mean, I think the fact that she was at his launch you could you interpret, you know, that she was part of the launching. She attended his launch.

90 Q. Yes. We11, did it suit your cause perhaps that it would, to the innocent reader, it would suggest a
closer relationship perhaps between the two if she'd actually launched the book? Is that why you went a little bit further than perhaps the truth?
A. I don't think there's any dispute about the close relationship between Nóirín o'Sullivan and Paul williams.

91 Q. Do you wish to --
A. You don't need me to prove that.

92 Q. That actually wasn't my question. My question was -we11, first of all, did you knowingly make that error?
A. I don't think it is a particular error. I mean, she was part of the launch of his book. There were photographs distributed fairly widely of the two of them together at the 1aunch. So technically was she the person who launched his book? No. And I made the 11:07 Tribunal aware of that.

93 Q. So why did the -- so can I take it from that you accept that is an error?
A. Well, I accept that she did not technically launch his book, and I corrected the record on that. But I do
stand over the fact that I believe, you know, she was part of the launch.

94 Q. Right. So you accept it was something that required to be corrected. why did you include an incorrect version in your document?
A. I corrected the record on it. And the point that I was making here was a relevant point, in that it showed the close nature of the relationship between Paul williams and Nóirín O'Sullivan, which I know has been
established before this Tribunal already.
95 Q. Has it -- do you bother yourself with -- you don't appear really terribly troubled by you provided factually incorrect information; that's not a concern for you, is it?
A. As I have said, I corrected the record on this. Right. But I'm simply asking you, are you saying the error occurred inadvertently or did you make that error deliberately?
A. Well, given that there were pictures of the two of them together smiling at the book launch, it probably was my understanding that she was the person who launched the book. But as soon as I became aware of the fact that she had just attended the launch and had not actually technically launched it, I corrected the record.

97 Q. Yes.
A. But I don't really see how relevant this is. It is all -- this particular point proves the close relationship between Paul williams and Nóirín o'sullivan.

98 Q. We11, just while we're on that, do you happen to listen to Newstalk radio?
A. No.

99 Q. You don't, al1 right. And you're not aware that Nóirín o'Sullivan was the subject of considerable criticism over a period by Paul williams? You weren't aware of that, were you?
A. I'm not in a position to go into that. I don't really have an awful lot of time for paul williams'
journalism, as I stated yesterday.
100 Q. No, but you're happy to bandy about the motion that the two of them are tight. And I'm suggesting --
A. That is my belief.

101 Q. -- I'm suggesting to you that's not borne out by actually objective facts and anybody listening to Mr. Williams' communications on radio about Nóirín O'Sullivan, simply not borne out by the facts.
A. Well, I believe that this Tribunal has heard that a significant number of telephone calls were made between 11:10 Nóirín O'Sullivan and Paul williams.

102 Q. Let's move to paragraph 19, Ms. O'Doherty:
"Rumburs circul ated that a copy of a Garda file had been gi ven to Paul Williams."

Is that factually correct, that a file had been given to Paul Williams?

CHA RMAN Can I just stop for a minute? It would help, Ms. Ni Gowan has taken the trouble of taking out the volume and putting it in front of you now --
A. Okay. I've an awful lot of volumes here in front of me.

CHA RMAN We11, it's the very top one, which was handed to you personally just a few minutes ago and
it's there. And one of the problems which witnesses may have is a particular paragraph is quoted and you may need to see what the context is, the paragraph before and the paragraph after --
A. I understand.

CHA RMAR -- so it's a wise thing to do to actually look at the hard copy. So if you'd like to look at the hard copy. But if you don't, that's your own issue.
A. I can see here, yeah, thank you. Thank you, Chairman.
Q. MR. MCHEÁL O HGGN: Paragraph 19, you appear to be conveying the message, albeit with the language "rumours circul ated", you're conveying the message that a Garda file had been given to Paul williams, isn't that right? That was something you were giving the Tribunal to understand?
A. I state very clearly that rumours circulated to that effect.

104 Q. Well, you go further:
"Rumburs circul ated that a copy of the Garda file had been gi ven to Paul Willians and that it reveal ed that Ser geant MtCabe was under investigation for child sexual abuse."
A. $M m-h m m$.

105 Q. "I knew that files were sometimes gi ven to INM When I heard the allegations, I contacted Ser geant McCabe."

So insofar as the reader of that paragraph was given to understand that a copy of the Garda file had been given to Paul williams, do you now accept that that's wrong?
A. No, I stated that rumours circulated that a copy of the Garda file had been given to paul williams. That's what I stated. Is it my belief that Paul Williams was
given details of the Ms. D file? Yes.
Q.

We11, can I ask you, I mean, is that normal journalistic practice, to float the notion, a particular allegation and to seek cover by suggesting 'I didn't say it, I merely said that rumours indicated that'; is that normally -- is that normal practice and is it fair?
A. Well, that is my belief. But it is also my belief, as I stated yesterday, that the new INM management under Stephen Rae seemed to be in possession of Garda files. Because Stephen Rae was in possession of the Garda file pertaining to the Father Niall Molloy murder. You see, we were over this yesterday, or at least you were, with the Chairman in fact and I had understood you to downgrade your position to a recollection. Do you remember that exchange?
A. Can you expand on that?
Q. Well, perhaps I'll move actually -- sorry, I'm perhaps jumping ahead of myself in an effort to move things on. Could we move to paragraph 26:
"Garda Wilson al so informed me that a reporter named Debbi e McCann who worked for the Irish Daily Mail and whose father was a seni or garda was allegedly one of the journal ists that was putting the word out that
27. He sai d that she called hi ma pedo".

Al1 right?
A. I stand over that.
Q. We11, do you stand over that? I had understood you to, in exchanges with the Chairman yesterday, downgrade your position to a mere recollection?
A. Yes, my recollection is that Garda John Wilson told me that he had heard that Debbie McCann was spreading rumours that Maurice McCabe was involved in child sexual abuse.

110 Q. And you declined to withdraw the suggestion, even though you're now aware that Debbie McCann has said she never spoke with John Wilson nor met him?
A. And I did not say that.

111 Q. I beg your pardon?
A. I did not say that John wilson had spoken to her.

112 Q. But you see, again --
A. Has Debbie McCann disputed this?

113 Q. -- I'm suggesting to you that the way it's phrased here in paragraphs 26 and 27 again would entitle the reader to think that you're saying -- the reader to think that 11:14 Garda Wilson had in fact spoken to Debbie McCann.
A. That's not my understanding.

114 Q. And are you suggesting that isn't a reasonable construction from paragraphs 26 and 27 ?
A. No. But I would like to know, if you can assist in this regard, does Debbie McCann dispute the fact that she called Maurice McCabe a pedo?

115 Q. Yo usee, I'm suggesting you --
A. "Pedo" is the word that was used. I don't like to use
that word.
116 Q. -- this is all part of a pattern again, Ms. O'Doherty, of you making allegations against people and, specifically on behalf of my clients, you making allegations against Martin Callinan and Nóirín O'Sullivan that are unfounded and are really quite wild.
A. Absolutely incorrect.

117 Q. I'm suggesting to you that you've no difficulty throwing out, or sometimes repeating allegations against persons with whom you believe you are in dispute.
A. Again, absolutely incorrect.

118 Q. Your first main allegation, as I understand it, is that Martin Callinan somehow procured your dismissal or redundancy from INM, you blame him for the fact you were made redundant?
A. I do.

119 Q. Right. The way you put it in your document is that:
"Martin Callinan brought consi derable pressure to bear on INM and that such pressure ultimatel y resulted in my bei ng wrongf ul ly di smi ssed. "

That's the end of paragraph 8 of your bullet points. And that is your claim. Isn't that right?
A. I'd like an opportunity to read point 8.

120 Q. Certainly. It's on page 3664.
A. Yes, I'm reading it now.
Q. The last line of it:
"I met significant resistance in my newspaper when it came to getting my story published concerning the former Garda Commi ssi oner and I have reason to bel i eve that he brought consi derable pressure to bear on INM and that such pressure ultimately resulted in my being wrongf ully di smi ssed".

Do you see that there?
A. I'm not in any doubt about that.

122 Q. Yes. Even though it has been indicated to you through counsel for INM that the decision was objectively based, a lot of people were made redundant, you were the only one who didn't accept the proposals and that in fact it had nothing to do, contrary to your insistence, with any pressure from any guard or Martin Callinan; you heard him say that?
A. This has all been decided in the High Court and my apology stands. I would like to take the opportunity to read my apology from INM into the record of the Tribunal if I may?
123 Q. I think we can be saved that, there's no need to do that now. I want to just ask you to stick with the questions. You appear to have -- you're insisting on a 11:18 position because it is no more than your belief; that appears to be your position, isn't that right?
A. It is my belief, yes.

124 Q. Can I ask to you move then to your own interview
statement with the Tribunal and go to page 3684 , which is in the same volume, Volume 14? And on page 3684 , towards the bottom of the page, line 168 you make the following, if I may say, rather sweeping statement. Towards the end of the line of page 168 you say the following:
"J ust in that timeframe fromApril 2013 I believe that all hell came down on Maurice McCabe, especially regarding the Tusla all egations. I believe this was because Martin Callinan" -- do you see it there?
A. Yes.
Q. Well, are you following what I'm saying?
A. I am, yes.

126 Q. "I bel i eve this was because Martin Callinan was named as a person abusing the fixed penalty notice system It became personal for him"

So you've posited a belief there that Martin Callinan was responsible, or partly responsible for the Tusla allegation.
A. The point I am making here is that it is my belief that the smear campaign against Sergeant McCabe intensified following the exposure of Martin Callinan's penalty points being wiped. And I'd like to expand on that if I could be given the opportunity.

127 Q. Certainly. Can I ask it this way, to give you that opportunity: Can you point to the Chairman please any evidence to justify your belief that all hell came down
on Maurice McCabe, especially regarding the Tusla allegation and your belief this was because Martin Callinan was named as a person abusing the FCPN? what is the evidence for that, not your belief now, what is the actual evidence for that?
A. I believe that in the weeks following my exposé on Martin Callinan's points being wiped the Ms. D allegations emerged. I believe that the Tusla file was created in August of 2013. But going back even closer to that, I know that my former colleague Anne Harris yesterday testified to the fact that the information that she heard in relation to the allegations against Maurice started to emerge as early as May of 2013. We also know that 'Operation Squeeze' apparently was launched shortly after my story. This was the catalogue of bad news stories which Garda Headquarters seemed to be digging up against Sergeant McCabe. Then, not long afterwards, in January 2014 we had the "disgusting" comment from Martin Callinan, which was a clear expression of his real views towards Garda wilson and sergeant McCabe. So I'm not in any doubt about the fact that the campaign against Sergeant McCabe intensified after my story was published.
128 Q. Again you might just focus on my question; do you have any evidence that you can point the Tribunal to for what appears to be your belief that Martin Callinan was somehow behind the Tusla allegation? Do you have any evidence for that?
A. My belief is that the campaign against Sergeant McCabe
by Garda Headquarters intensified after my story about Martin Callinan.

129 Q. You see, this would appear, again returning to what I'm suggesting is a pattern, this appears to be further evidence of a pattern of you making baseless and wild allegations, perhaps to catch a populist wave, when it suits you, to make allegations against persons whom you feel you're in dispute with. I'm suggesting to you you are again -- this is further proof of wild allegations not grounded in actual facts. Do you understand the point I'm making?
A. I repeat that the Tusla file was created in August 2013. The Ms. D allegations emerged at that point, very shortly after my story about Martin Callinan. I'm not in any doubt about any of this. And I'm also not in any doubt that Paul williams, who facilitated this smear campaign, was another person who personally gained from the abuse of our -- the penalty points system, in that he had a number of penalty points wiped from his licence. And he was the facilitator in relation to putting stories about Ms. D into the public domain.
130 Q. Can I finish by asking you, Ms. O'Doherty, from your experience as an investigative reporter, as you describe yourself, do you have any view on whether it is necessary for an investigative reporter, before forming opinions that they share with the wider world, that there's any necessity to ascertain basic facts to ground such opinions? Do you have any view on that, or
is there a freedom to simply publish one's opinion unsupported by objective facts?
A. My journalism stands for itself. And I always tell the truth as I see it and make sure that the facts are checked before I put anything into the public domain. MR. ḾCFEÁL OHGGS: Thanks very much. CHAL RMAN was there any further questions for Ms. O'Doherty, apart from her own counsel? No. All right, Mr. Harty.

## THE WTNESS WAS EXAM NED BY MR. HARTY:

131 Q. MR. HARTY: Ms. o'Doherty, perhaps if we can start with that final question; in relation to the article about Commissioner callinan's penalty points, did you publish your initial concerns without checking the facts?
A. No, I checked the facts, as I always do.

132 Q. You were in fact in contact with the Garda Press office in relation to those, weren't you?
A. Yes, I was.

133 Q. And you sought as much information as you possib7y could, isn't that correct?
A. Very limited information was given to me and the questions that I asked, by and large, were not answered.
134 Q. In relation to the other steps that took place on that, in relation to that story, the protocols which were put to you yesterday o referred to in the e-mails yesterday, is it the case that those protocols had
never been brought to your attention before?
A. I wasn't aware of any such protocols. The only protocols were that you were not to get the company sued. And that's what I was doing in that position.

You can be tagged on somebody else's Facebook postings, isn't that correct? So somebody can add your Facebook to tag you into it, isn't that correct?
A. I believe so. I don't use Facebook sufficiently to understand how it works, but I don't believe that I reposted that particular post.
And if you were publishing about somebody wild allegations about what they're saying about somebody, would you make sure to check your facts before you put questions to them in relation to it?
A. I always check my facts before I put information into ${ }_{\text {11:26 }}$ the public domain.
138 Q. Yes. And the facts in this case is that you had not in fact published that piece on your Facebook page, isn't that correct?
A. Well, that is my belief.
A. Three sets, personal injury as well.
Q. And in relation to that, Independent News \& Media, on 13th January 2015, counsel on their behalf read out an apology to you in relation to the manner in which you'd 11:28 been treated. And could you -- I think you have a copy of that in front of you and in fairness to you, you should be allowed to read that.

CHA RMAN We11, I think we have it in the papers as we11, Mr. Harty, don't we?

MR. HARTY: we do have it in the papers.
CHA RMAN Yes. We11, can we get it on the screen then, because for no other reason than I've become fascinated by this apology.

MR. MARRI NAN It's volume 27, 7470.
143 Q. MR. HARTY: Thank you, I'm obliged. (To witness) If you'd like to read that?
A. "I ndependent Newspapers wi sh to acknow edge the exceptional work of multi-award wi nning investigative j ournal ist Gemma O' Doherty for the Irish Independent during the course of a lengthy career. Independent Newspapers accept that Gemma O Doherty has acted at all times in a professional and diligent manner and in the best interests of I ndependent Newspapers. I ndependent Newspapers unreservedl y apol ogi ses to Mb. O' Doherty for the stress and hardshi p caused to her and her husband as a result of its actions. Independent Newspapers have agreed to pay to MB. O' Doherty uncl osed danages and to indemify her in rel ation to her legal costs". In relation to that, your evidence was yesterday that you were told that you could remain in Independent Newspapers if you continued with the Travel Editor position, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. The then-CEO, during -- in the aftermath of me being told that I was to lose my job, approached me and said that there had been a change of heart when they saw that $I$ wasn't going to go quietly and he put it to me that if I was willing to give up the stories and the work that I was doing on Garda malfeasance and focus on other less controversial work that I would be invited back to the company. And I declined.

145 Q. Were any measures put in place in relation to the
publishing of -- in relation to stories in relation to the Garda Síochána?
A. Pardon?

Were there any measures put in place in relation to publishing stores by the Independent News, by you, in relation to stories about An Garda Síochána; were protocols put in place at that stage?
A. No, my unlawful dismissal went ahead because I refused to agree to their proposal that I stop writing about issues within An Garda Síochána.

147 Q. Yes. The circumstances whereby it's been suggested to you, even by Mr. O'Higgins there, that you describe yourself as an investigative journalist, what do you say about somebody suggesting that you're simply describing yourself as an investigative journalist?
A. Well, that is my role, I investigate. That's my job.

148 Q. And in relation to Mr. Williams, Mr. Paul williams, in evidence on day 11 , suggested that some people have an agenda for describing that he has too close a relationship with An Garda Síochána. If we go to day 11, the evidence of Mr. Williams, at page -- at question 410 please. Page 88 of the transcript.
A. Which volume?

149 Q. I think the registrar will bring it up now. It's day 11 of the transcript. I'11 read it out. The first thing Mr. Williams says about you is that:
"If she is a journalist, I don't know her, I never worked with her."

What do you say about that?
A. Well, I say that that is incorrect. Because I spoke to Mr. Williams at least twice by telephone and I also texted him, and I wrote about the fact that he had his penalty points wiped.
Q. He then goes on to say:
"I don't know her, I never worked with her. She may have an axe to grind with Independent News \& Media."
what do you say about that?
A. I did work with Paul williams. We worked for the same company. So that's incorrect. I certainly don't have any axe to grind with Independent Newspapers, but I do have an axe to grind with journalists who appear to have very close relationships with powerful people police Commissioners, politicians, et cetera - which are damaging to the public good.
151 Q. Well, perhaps we can come to that. But then he goes on to say:
"In term of the wi der pi cture, an allegation, a narrative started about ten years ago in this busi ness bet ween certain politicians, criminals, subversives, thee is a whole group of them not al together in uniform but all separatel y where a narrative was created that all crime journalists are in the pockets of the guards."

Now, in relation to that, can you just confirm for the Tribunal that you're not a politician?
A. No, I'm not a politician.

152 Q. Can you confirm to the Tribunal you're not a criminal?
A. No, I am not a criminal.

153 Q. And just for the record, would you perhaps confirm to the Tribunal that you're not a subversive?
A. No, I am not a subversive.
what is your view of the relationship between Paul williams and An Garda Síochána?
A. It's my belief that Paul williams has a toxic relationship with An Garda Síochána which is very damaging to the public interest.
MR. HARTY: okay, I don't think I have any further questions. Thank you very much, Ms. O'Doherty. CHA RMAN Is there anything?

## THE WTNESS WAS RE- EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN

MR. MARRI NAN Yes, thee's just one matter. I suppose Mr. O'Higgins has criticised you for making statements to the Tribunal that were based on rumours that you had heard and perhaps innuendo as wel1. And in fairness to you, I think that the Chairman, in his opening remarks when he appealed for information originally, asked people for any information that they had, hearsay or otherwise, rumours or otherwise, isn't that right? And I think that you made your statement to the Tribunal on 23rd May 2017, the statement that was sent in by your
solicitor with the bullet points, and that was prior to the opening statement made by counsel for the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. I can't confirm that.
well, I can. And I think that the position is that, at 11:35 that point in time, no material had been circulated by the Tribunal to any of the journalists or any of the other parties. So I want you to look at paragraph -at paragraph 21 again of your statement, it's at page 3665. I asked you about this yesterday, and I just want to put this in context because you mentioned an issue of privilege yesterday, and this may be important, particularly in the light of recent developments and information that has come into the possession of the Tribunal. But here, you are
recounting a conversation that you had with Sergeant McCabe after you had heard the issue in relation to the rumours concerning Ms. D, and it's the second sentence there where you say:
"I told himthat certain journalists were attempting to intervi ew the alleged vi ctimand that it was intended by themto publish the story."

Now, I pointed out to you yesterday that the Tribunal
had information from Ms. D -- or Mrs. D, that two journalists had door-stepped her, one she had invited into her home, and they were Debbie McCann, who wasn't invited into the home, and that was late February or
early March of 2014, and then, a number of days later, that Eavan Murray arrived; you know both those journalists?
A. No, I don't know them personally.

157 Q.
well, not personally, but you know them by reputation or that they are journalists?
A. I know of them. Tribunal, have accepted that they went there at that time, and we have evidence from Mrs. D that they did call to the house, as I indicated. But what the Tribunal is interested in is, when you were referring to certain journalists there, were you referring to what you had heard in relation to Debbie McCann and Eavan Murray and subsequently Paul williams calling to the home of Ms. D?
A. My evidence stands as I told it yesterday. I can't assist the Tribunal any further in that I'm not aware of any other journalists.
159 Q. Well, that is what I just wanted to clear up
A. Yes.

160 Q. You don't have information to give to the Tribunal that would identify another journalist other than those three journalists, as persons who had called to the Ms. D household, is that right?
A. That's right.

MR. MARI NAN okay. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MARRI NAN The next witness, sir, is Alison O'Reilly.

## Mb. ALI SON O REI LLY, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARR NAN

MR. MARR NAN The material in relation to Ms. O'Reilly is to be found in volume 15, commencing with the letter 11:39 to the -- from the Tribunal to Ms. O'Reilly at page 3800, and there is a statement to the Tribunal on the 12th October 2017, which is at page 3812.
161 Q. Ms. O'Reilly, you are a journalist by profession, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

162 Q. And will you just indicate to the Chairman a brief history of your journalistic career to date.
A. Yes. I'm -- I have been involved in the media industry for about 23 years. I've worked in television and radio as a journalist, on-line news and print journalism. I've made documentaries and I am a published author and I am currently full-time staff with the Irish Daily Mail.
163 Q. Now, I think that the Tribunal contacted you and asked you had you any information that you could give to the Tribuna1; I think it was a matter that concerned you quite deeply, isn't that right, and you thought about it long and hard --
A. I did.
A. I did, yeah.
Q. And I think that eventually you provided a statement to 11:41 the Tribunal on the 7th June of 2017, and it's at page 3830. First of a11, what was your motive in providing this statement to the Tribunal?
A. We11, I didn't like what happened at the time, I didn't like what I heard, and then I had raised - maybe not strong enough concerns at the time, but I had certain7y questioned it at the time, what $I$ was hearing, and then I heard on the news that David Taylor had made a protected disclosure and that there were malicious rumours being spread about Maurice McCabe and that it 11:42 may have involved journalists, and, if anybody knew anything, they had to come forward, or they were being invited to come forward. I knew also that I had been to Maurice McCabe's house. I had told him at the time that I had heard rumours. I had told John wilson a lot 11:42 of what I'd heard at that time as well. And I just felt that I needed to say something.
Q. Most of what you heard at the time, and we'11 come in more detail to what you actually heard, but most of what you heard at the time was from a colleague of yours, Debbie McCann, who was also working in the Irish Mail on Sunday, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And how long had you been -- had you known Debbie

McCann prior to 2013?
A. I started working full-time with the Mail in around the summer of 2011. I had just come back from adoptive leave, and I worked very briefly with her in -- I was only a freelancer in the News of the World, so I didn't -- I knew her to say hello to. I didn't know her very well until she joined the Mail.
168 Q. Now, you say in your statement to the Tribunal at page 3830, under paragraph A, towards the end - you subsequently correct that in another statement - or mid --
"The mid to end of 2013/early 2014 my colleague with the Irish Mail on Sunday, Debbie McCann, told me that the Garda whi stl ebl ower, Ser geant Maurice McCabe, who 11:44 had lifted the lid on the penal ty points scandal, was a child abuser."

Wi11 you just develop on that a little bit further in terms of where this conversation took place, if you can 11:44 recall?
A. Yeah. I suppose, Chairman, there was a lot happening at the time in relation to the whistleblowers, so it was flaring up in the media and going away and coming back and going away, so Debbie and I probably had loads 11:44 and loads of conversations about it, well over a year-and-a-half. So I can on7y really recall conversations around times that stories happened or -because I obviously don't have any dates or times of
things, but I remember at this point we had discussed it a few times and the names of people who had their penalty points being quashed had been in the papers a few times, I think, but on this particular occasion we were in the kitchen in the Mail having a cup of tea, which we did regularly - I'm not office-based, so I would be in and out quite a bit - but I remember we were in the kitchen, and you can't really talk when you are there, but we were making a cup of tea, which we did loads of times, and I said to her, I think -- I am not sure, I think there was a senator or somebody was in the paper about having their penalty points quashed, and there was a reference possibly to the volume of penalty points that are being quashed or something like that, and she said to me, 'I have had my penalty points 11:45 quashed and I am concerned that my name is going to end up in the paper', and her father was a guard and she didn't like that, I think it had been referenced in another paper before about something else, not her penalty points being quashed but the fact that her father is a guard and she didn't like that, obviously. 169 Q. We11, do I get a sense that what she was saying to you was that it could embarrass her father if it turned out that -- or it was made public that she had had her points quashed, is that --
A. well, I suppose you can see her point of view; her father is a guard and she has had her penalty points quashed, and nobody would like that. But I had then mentioned the whistleblowers, you know, and she said,
well, you mightn't mind Maurice McCabe, he is a child abuser. I said, what do you mean he is a child abuser? And she said, he abused a child that is now an adult and everybody knows, all the guards know.
A. She said that he had a falling-out with his superiors, and that all of this, lifting the lid on the penalty points and raising alleged Garda malpractice, was just to get back at his employers, when really he had this thing in his past.

171 Q. Now, I think arising out of that conversation that you had with Debbie McCann, that you spoke to another journalist, just to discuss the issue generally, and there is no need to name him or to go into the contents 11:47 of that particular conversation, but your mind was put at ease in relation to Sergeant McCabe by a colleague, isn't that right?
A. Well, I suppose, Chairman, I was suspicious of it myself anyway. I didn't really need anybody to -like, the colleague $I$ spoke to would just be somebody I trust, but it was really just to bounce the idea off, that this is what I had heard, and he had said, I had heard a bit of something about that or -- I know I kind of explained what I had heard and who I had heard it because I thought, why would you put yourself out there with all these allegations about penalty points if you had gotten away with something like that? So I bounced
it off somebody, but I don't need anyone to tell me how I feet.

Right. And I think that the issue of the penalty points controversy continued on for a few weeks and months indeed, and then you had another conversation with Ms. McCann, is that right?
A. Well, I suppose in my statement I haven't made any attempt to put it into sequence or a time-line; I just pretty much put everything I could remember into the statement at the time. But I remember sort of around early 2014, Debbie had told me that she had gotten the name and address of this girl that had made the allegation, and I'd asked her where she was getting it from and she said the Gardaí.
173 Q. In your statement, you say that she got it from someone 11:49 high up in the Gardaí?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

174 Q. Is that right?
A. That's correct.

175
Q. Or was it just the Gardaí?
A. No, she had said the Gardaí. I mean, this is a conversation that we had for a long, long time, you know, and it was quite tetchy and heated between the two of us, a bit like the yes and no campaign, two colleagues, two friends, there is always something they 11:49 dispute about. So she said the Gardaí, she said someone high up in the Gardaí, she said her dad confirmed this story, she said she heard it from Dave Taylor, she said she heard it from Nóirín o'sullivan.

It just went on and on. We had numerous conversations about it.
okay. when you say that she had heard it from Dave Taylor, that is Superintendent Dave Taylor, the Garda Press officer, isn't that right?
A. Mm-hmm.

177 Q. And did she tell you at that time that she had got information from him?
A. She never -- she never said much about Dave Taylor, other than I remember she had said that he told her she 11:50 was in a -- this girl was in a bad way and that it was -- you know, it was going all the way up to government at some stage. I remember the conversation I had about her with Dave Taylor, I was at home in the evening from work and it was around the time of the Roma children story, and I'm not sure what specific day it was, but at that point I think the children had just been returned home at some point around that time and we were talking about it on the phone, and I said to her, you know, you see you were wrong there about the Roma children and you were wrong about the family, and she said some derogatory things about the family and I said to her that it was totally unfair and she was to leave it go, and it got very heated, the exchange on the phone, and I said to her you are probably wrong about the Maurice McCabe stuff as we11, and she said, no, no, no, Dave Taylor told me she is in a bad way. That was the first time I'd heard a name.

178 Q. We11, did she advise you that she was going up to Cavan
to get the story?
A. I think that was around January or February 2014. We were in the office and --
CHA RMAN Well, if we could just -- the placing for this, if this was in or around the Roma story, that was 11:52 21st/22nd October 2013.

179 Q. MR. MARRINAN That is 2013 where you had that discussion, but --
A. That was the conversation I had with her on the phone. The children were only back and I was very upset about that story, so I remember it very well.

180 Q. Yes. Just if we move forward then to early 2014.
A. Yes, I think it was around the time of the Public Accounts Committee meeting. We sat in the office. We had moved to the back of where the Mail offices are now, we had been in the open-plan office and then we had moved to the back of the office where Finance is now. They have since moved again. But, like, I sat just kind of facing the hallway and Debbie sat right next to me. I think Ali Ryan was in front of me and then John Lee and maybe Niamh Griffin the other side, and Helen Rogers was behind us and Robert Cox was behind me, and then Enda Leahy was in the corner and Conor O'Donnell would have been in the glass office behind us, so myself and Debbie sat very close to each other. And I remember, like, I would go in and out of the office very rarely - I mean, I don't even go into the office now at all, but $I$ would have mostly been in the office on Tuesdays and Saturdays, if I did at all.

Like, I would be a door-knocker, so I would be out quite a bit. I didn't always go to conference and I wasn't always in on Saturdays, but I would have expected that conversation to have happened on a Tuesday because we were discussing what we were working on. And she and I would -- we'd say to each other, what did you have this week or have you got anything decent? And she said she had the details of this girl. And I think that Robert Cox was there, is that right, and there was some issue in relation to Robert Cox indicating that he would check with the editor, Conor O'Donne11, as to whether or not Debbie McCann could go on the story, is that right?
A. Yeah, well the usual process would be to come in on a Tuesday, you would have conference on a Tuesday. Not every idea that you worked on would be pitched in conference. And then Robert Cox would go and have a discussion with Conor O'Donne11, the editor of the paper. He might come back to you that day, he mightn't come back to you until Thursday, sometimes even Friday, 11:54 if you were pushing a story. So I just remember that they were standing at the back of the office having a conversation, and I kind of just joined in and said, are you sure? You know, I had asked that question a few times. But they were discussing going up there it would be considered in The Mail on Sunday and in the Mail a sensitive story, a very sensitive story, because it involved an allegation, it involved somebody who had
made the allegation. So there would have been a considerable amount of planning put into that story in the sense that Debbie has heard it somewhere, she brings it to the table, she discusses it with her line manager, then he discusses it with the editor. They may have a conversation together with Debbie, the three of them.

182 Q. Yes. In your statement in this, as part of this conversation, it appears from your statement, at the bottom of page 3830, you say:
"She told me she had heard from Dave Tayl or that the woman was goi ng to try and bring the matter to government because it was not fully investigated."

Is that something that she said at that time?
A. No, I think she said that later on.

183 Q. Yes.
A. Because that was something I had heard later on. She had discussed that with me so I don't think --

184 Q. Can we extract that then from -- it appears in chronological order as though it was said around about that time?
A. Yeah, and I do accept that. But when I put my statement together, I made no attempt to put it in sequence. I just put everything in.
185 Q. At that time when Robert Cox was present and the other people that you have named, do you recall what it was that -- information that she said that she had in
relation to --
A. No.
Q. -- Ms. D?
A. No, the only time she told me the full details of it was when she said that she had interviewed the girl. CHA RMAK Mr. Marrinan, there was just one point, and it may that be I misheard, but I thought you said that at some point in the conversation - and please don't mention a name, if you don't mind, I know you won't mention a name - but that was the first time you'd heard a name; I think you said that, didn't you?

MR. MARRI NAN Ms. D.
A. I had never heard -- I have never heard her name. Sorry.
CHA RMAN You'd never heard her name. That's fine. I 11:57 must have misunderstood what you were saying.
A. Sorry.

CHA RMAN That is al1 right.
A. No, I think what I meant was, it was the first time I had heard a garda's name, Dave Taylor.

CHA RMAN A11 right. That is what you were saying. A11 right. I beg your pardon. Yes, I understand it now.
187 Q. MR. MARRINAN Well, insofar as the story or the -- she was seeking -- she was trying to justify her interest in doing a story in relation to Ms. D at that time --
A. Yes.
Q. -- do you recall what facts in relation to the story that she was pitching in your presence to the -- to the
group that were there?
A. No, I just heard -- Debbie told me that Maurice McCabe was a child abuser, there was an allegation, and that this girl was in a particularly bad way and she had heard that from Dave Taylor, but she seemed to -- she believed it, Debbie believed it, and seemed to have been very moved emotionally by this girl's story. I don't know anything about the gir1, but $I$ can only tell you what Debbie was saying and the sort of behaviour that she had. She just seemed to be very, very annoyed 11:58 with Maurice McCabe for, as she said, you know, damaging this gir1.
189 Q. So I think that you were quite unhappy with the developments and what you were hearing, is that right, at that time?
A. It just didn't sit right with me, it didn't ring true. But to be honest, I hadn't a single shred of evidence as to whether Maurice McCabe was or wasn't a paedophile.
You say in your statement that you thought that the Gardaí were closing ranks to shut down the whistleblowers?
A. I just felt that it was all going a bit pear-shaped for them, that what they were -- what John wilson and Maurice McCabe were raising seemed to be fairly just felt that we should have been looking at that more as a paper, and I felt maybe at the time we weren't.

191 Q. I think at that time you hadn't met Sergeant McCabe or
indeed John wilson, isn't that right?
A. No, no.

192 Q. So did you approach your news editor, Robert Cox, to ask him could you go and meet with John wilson?
A. I did.

193 Q. Yes. Will you just tell us about that.
A. Well, you can't really go off -- well, certainly in The Mail on Sunday, or the Mail, you can't really go off on a solo run if you like a story, Chairman; you have to pitch it to your line manager and you have to get permission to go to somebody's door. And I suppose John wilson seemed to be the approachable person because he was -- and easy enough to get in contact with because he was on radio and he was very public at the time with his comments. And I felt, given that this story was very prominent and these were two men that were of huge interest to the media at the time, that we should be trying to make inroads, get to know them. And I got a number for John wilson. I never spoke to him before. I rang him up, we got on straight 12:01 away, and I think we met the next day, but I went to my news editor, Robert Cox, and I said, look, can I go up and meet him? So...
194 Q. Well, we needn't go into what he said about him. But I think that you did then go and meet with John wilson, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

195 Q. And did you mention anything to John wilson about the rumours that were -- or the story that was there to be
investigated that Debbie McCann had referred to?
A. I did, yes. We met in front of a pub in Virginia somewhere and we sat in his car and we talked about loads of different things that they had raised as whistleblowers, sort of an introduction meeting. We got on quite well. And then I said, look, you know -I mean, you go to meet people in the hope that you are going to get a story, you go to meet people in the hope that you are going to build a relationship or maybe be able to feel comfortable to ring them for a comment if the story flares up in the media again, that you have at least met them. So I said to him, I felt that really, you know, the only story was, is Maurice McCabe a paedophile or not? And people make allegations all the time, and that is their own business, and no disrespect to Ms. D or anybody, but the story, to me, was whistleblower at the heart of the controversy.
Q. Yes.
A. He was a sergeant, he was the story, he was the accused in the land of rumours, so I just said to John, look, I am hearing a rumour that Maurice McCabe is sort of motivated by a bit of malice here and that he might be hiding something and I had heard that he had abused a girl who is an adult now, and John said he absolutely did not, that is completely unfair. I mean, he was aware of it, of course he was aware of it, but he then rang Maurice McCabe there and then in the car and he said, Maurice, I have a journalist here with me and I think you'd like to meet her, there is something she
might want to ask you, can we come out to your house? Or something like that. And Maurice said, yes, come out to the house. So, I mean, I had sought permission to go up to see John wilson, but obviously things
happen when you are on the ground and you have to use common sense, and I knew I was in safe hands, so I went with John to Maurice McCabe's house.

197 Q. And I think when you got there you told Maurice McCabe that a colleague of yours had told you that the Gardaí had told her that he had abused a child years ago, is that right?
A. Yes.

198 Q. And I think that you also told him that she had told you that there had been a big cover-up in the Gardaí about the sex abuse case, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

199 Q. Now, I think you asked him was it true, and he denied it, and had denied that he had abused any young girl, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN I am sorry, Mr. Marrinan, I know you are going on to something. But the detail about the cover-up, was that coming from Debbie McCann in one of these conversations, is that --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN That the Gardaí had covered up the sex abuse?
A. Yes, yes.

CHA RMAK We11, kind of a bit contradictory, on the
one hand blaming a person and covering it up. But is that what she had said?
A. She said there was just a big cover-up in the Gardaí, that he -- this is why he was never caught, or something, I don't know, because it wasn't -- they didn't want to expose one of their own, or something. I don't know.

## CHA RMAN okay.

MR. MARRI NAN If we could just go back to your conversation with John wilson when you were referring to a fact that your -- a colleague of yours, who we know is Debbie McCann --
A. Yes.
Q. -- was anxious to do this story on Ms. D. Did you tell John Wilson that it was Debbie McCann?
A. I didn't tell him at the start, but I think I told him -- I think I told him her name that day, I think.
Q. Because we heard from the last witness that apparently this information had filtered through to her.
A. Yes, that's correct.

All right. So you are discussing this with Maurice McCabe; he is denying it?
A. Yes.

204 Q. And did he indicate to you that he knew about the rumours already?
A. I thought he did, and maybe he was referring to -- he knew about it obviously or that maybe his colleague said it to him, but I had said they were rumours and it's my understanding he had heard them, but he
didn't -- I don't remember him saying he had heard them from journalists.
A. I did tell her, yes.
Q. And did you express the view that you didn't believe the rumours that were circulating?
A. I did. Again, Chairman, I only had my gut feeling to
go on. Maurice McCabe didn't produce a piece of paper and say: there is that file, read it yourself, there is the outcome from the DPP. I had nothing other than my gut feeling and what John wilson and Maurice McCabe were saying to me, so I had no facts whatsoever, but I believed him, I just only had a gut feeling and I just felt it was quite suspicious. So given that she and I had spoke about it so much, I told her the outcome of the meeting.

211 Q.
okay. So at this stage you are really very much at odds with Debbie McCann. She is promoting a story in relation to Ms. D and you have taken a view that this is -- really is highly suspicious at the time and you think that it may be a smear on Maurice McCabe, who is a whistleblower?
A. Well, I suppose, you know, we were good friends and she is a good journalist and I just felt that she was being used, and I felt, by using her, they were trying to use our paper. Whoever was telling her this, she believed it. And I just shared with her what Maurice McCabe had told me and how I felt about it, but again, I had no proof of anything other than his word, and he seemed quite credible to me. And I know from previous persons in The Mail on Sunday, when you go to the accused and they say 'no' or they deny it, it's usually dropped, it's usually dropped. They run a mile from stories like that. They would be afraid of getting into trouble with stories like that. So I just felt, you know, it was probably just best to leave it, but I am
not the editor.
212 Q. Well, she pitched her story and she was permitted to go down to Cavan, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. I don't know whether she went before or after me, I just don't know. I didn't write a story on it. 12:10 I checked my mileage and I can't -- I obviously didn't even put in for the mileage for that trip so $I$ can't say exactly who went first. I don't know, I am not sure. Maybe the Mail know.

213 Q.
Did you discuss her visit to Ms. D's home subsequent with Debbie McCann?
A. Yes, yes.

214 Q. Do you recall where that conversation took place?
A. It was in the office. We were seated beside each other.

215 Q. And did she tell you that she had gone to the home of Ms. D?
A. She did.

216 Q. Did she say that she met Ms. D?
A. She did. She told me she spent about an hour with her and that she really believed the gir1. She said that she was in the living room with her, that she was sitting on one end of the sofa and a girl was sitting on the other end of the sofa and that she was kind of gripped, gripping herself like this, that she was in an 12:11 awful state, like, she was visibly shaking recalling the story, and then she outlined the allegation to me.

217 Q. Will you tell us what she said that Ms. D told her?
A. I was obviously quite interested because I suppose

Debbie and I both write crime stories, not everyone would have been interested in it, but both -- I'm not a crime correspondent, but I would be interested in crime so I have written so many stories about child sex survivors, child abuse survivors and rape survivors, so 12:12 I was kind of gripped by what she was telling me. And she said that she had spent about an hour with this girl, she had called up to the house, that she was in an awful state, she said that she had been, what, I don't know, five, six or seven at the time, that her father was a guard and that he knew Maurice McCabe and that they were at some gathering, I thought she said in her house, when she was small, and he went in behind the sofa and pushed up against her using his groin and that she had forgotten about it for years and then it all came flooding back and it was now in the media and upsetting her and she was very damaged by the whole thing.
218 Q. I think in your statement, your account that Mr. McCabe was a friend of the woman's father but that they fell out at some stage?
A. That is what she said, yes. Do you recall that being said to you?
A. Yes, Debbie said that, that they had fallen out at some stage.
220 Q. You then go on to say that:

[^0]Was that said to you as well?
A. That is what she said. And she said something like, I think that happens to abuse victims quite a bit, that they can forget things and it can all come flooding back, and this is what happened to this girl, she said.

221 Q. And what did you say in response to the story that you were being told by Debbie McCann at that time?
A. You see, it seemed very believable to me. Like, I can on1y tell you what Debbie told me. I wasn't there. Again, I had only the word of Maurice McCabe, who I felt was quite credible, and John Wilson as well, but I didn't meet this girl, I didn't talk to her, I didn't know anything, and given Debbie's expertise and, you know -- in this area, and her experience as a journalist, I mean, why would she be telling me something else? And I kind of was thinking maybe I have this wrong, maybe this did happen, I don't know, because she seemed to have all this information, and it's -- and it always seemed like the story was
building and building, and I thought at some point maybe Maurice McCabe is going to be arrested here and I have got this totally wrong, I don't know.
222 Q. One of the problems that we have here, and I'm sure you have identified it yourself, is that we have evidence from Mrs. D that Debbie McCann called to the door?
A. Yeah.

223 Q. And she was a bit taken aback by Debbie McCann being there?
A. Yes.
Q. She recalled her being pregnant and that the conversation lasted a very short period of time, that Debbie McCann left?
A. Yes.

Here, we have you providing a statement to the Tribunal and, in that, there are facts there that reflect what Ms. D originally said --
A. Yes.

226

227 Q. And were obviously leaked out in some way or another.
A. Yeah.

228 Q. But you are attributing your state of knowledge in relation to these facts --
A. Yes.

229 Q. -- to Debbie McCann?
A. Yes.

230 Q. But it appears that Debbie McCann didn't get them from Ms. D?
A. No, I have read her statement and I have read Ms. D's.

231 Q. And you are aware that Ms. D says that the only person that she recounted her story to was Paul williams?
A. Yes.

232 Q. So it would appear, if you are to be believed in relation to this, that Debbie McCann was spinning you a yarn?
A. Well, she either wasn't telling the truth then or she is not telling the truth now.
Q. Right.
A. But that is what she told me.

I mean, is there -- I mean, what it would mean would be 12:16 that Debbie McCann went down, she tried to interview Ms. D, she was unsuccessful.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. She returned to the newsroom.
A. Yes.
Q. And she tells you that she did interview --
A. Yes.
Q. -- Ms. D, and she gives you a blow-by-blow account of the account of her conversation with Ms. D, graphically --
A. To the point where I was doubting myself --
Q. Graphically describing how she was upset?
A. Yes.

239 Q. How she held herself in her arms at the other end of the settee, and this would then have all been an invention on -- in its entirety, from beginning to end?
A. You see, I can only tell you what she told me --

240 Q. I mean, I know that.
A. But it was very, very believable. I mean, she did this with her arms and said the girl was visibly shaken and 12:17 very distressed and told me she'd continued to be in touch with her.

241 Q. We11, you made this statement back in June, the 7th June of 2017, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

242 Q. And, in fact, you had, earlier on, and we will come to it in due course, spoken to Mr. Howlin about it as well?
A. I did.
Q. But you didn't have any access to any of this information that is set out in your statement that you have told the Chairman about in relation to Ms. D's account of what took place in her -- in her home, about the sexual assault?
A. Oh, no, I don't know anything about Ms. D.

244 Q. You don't know anything about it. You had no access to any file, or otherwise?
A. Absolutely not, no, absolutely not. I don't even know the girl's name. I don't know anything about it, only what Debbie McCann told me and obviously what I have read in the Tribunal since.

245 Q. And you didn't discuss any of it with Sergeant McCabe, did you?
A. No, I didn't know the details then.

246 Q. Right. Okay. You appreciate I have to ask you these questions --
A. Yes, of course, of course.
-- because it's a most peculiar situation. I mean, had Debbie McCann, had she spun yarns to you before, that 12:18 you are aware of?
A. Well, you see, you don't know because you don't expect to end up in a tribunal, in an investigation, trying to find things out, so I don't know.

248 Q. Right. Okay.
A. I mean, it wouldn't be unusual for some journalists to maybe exaggerate their level of contact with sources.
249 Q. Yes.
A. Or disguise sources or maybe just not tell you the truth, I don't know.

250 Q. Yes. We11, lawyers could be guilty of talking up victories themselves. But this would appear to be an entire invention?
A. It appears so.

251 Q. You know, there is a difference, because it's not an exaggeration; it's inventing a conversation?
A. It appears so. I mean, I can only tell you what she said, but I have a very clear recollection of what she said.
252 Q. Right. Now, if we could just then --
CHA RMAN I am sorry, there is just one detail, if you wouldn't mind, Mr. Marrinan, and that was the reference to pregnancy. I understood Ms. D to say that Debbie McCann, in calling to the door, was pregnant herself, but maybe I got that wrong, or are you saying that she was saying Ms. D -- that Mrs. -- I am talking about Mrs. D, the lady who answered the door, was pregnant. You mentioned somebody was pregnant at the door.
MR. MARRI NAN No, I mentioned it, recounting what Mrs. D had said, but it was that Debbie McCann was pregnant.
CHA RMAN Yes. A11 right. We11, that was the point I was hearing. Well, was she? I don't know.
A. Debbie was pregnant, yes.

CHA RMAK A11 right, okay. Because Mrs. D certainly said that a lady called to the door and that she was pregnant and they had a very brief conversation, and that she, Mrs. D, said she was horrified and didn't want to talk any further and was not saying anything, and the person said, $I$ know you have been through a hard time, et cetera. So that seems to be it. And it's Day 10 of the Tribunal at -- on Monday the 17 th July last year. But anyway, I am sorry, I just wanted to clarify that point.

MR. MARR NAN So if you could just look at page 3832 and paragraph J, you continue on to say that:
"Debbie told me that the story was not going to make it 12:21 into the paper and she was very annoyed about this."

Now, it's in a different paragraph. Is this part of the same conversation that you were having?
A. No, I think it was a conversation we were having -- we 12:21 walked to our cars all the time together if we finished early, so I think we were talking about it on our way back to the car one day where she just -- I said, what happened with that story? Because it kind of went off the radar again. And she said that she had -- she had 12:21 talked to Conor and Robert, or whoever, and it wasn't going in and that it was Sebastian Hamilton, the editor-in-chief, who had put a stop to it.
254 Q. So she told you the matter had been under consideration
but had been rejected, is that right, the story had been rejected?
A. That's what she said, yeah, I think she said it a second time as well. Sometimes you would try and get a story in and it wouldn't go in and then you would push for it to go again and push for it, and then eventually you just know, look, it's not going in. your early -- first conversation with John wilson, but here at paragraph K you say:
"I spoke to John Wilson on a number of occasions throughout the period of time and confided in himthat Debbie MECann had gone to Cavan to speak with a woman who was a daughter of a garda. I told him Debbie insisted the story was true, but John saidit was not. I said I was hassled by what she was telling me and I was annoyed."

Now, you then go on to say that you have a recollection that Debbie tried to get the story into the paper on a second occasion, but that it was refused again.
A. That is what she said. And that could be just you verbally asking, you know, what about this story?
256 Q. And then you say that you had a conversation with her in Herbert Park before going to your parked cars after a Tuesday conference. will you just tell us about that?
A. Again, I think it was a Tuesday conference because we
were leaving early and we didn't seem to be rushed. when it was Saturday we would be rushed to get home, because you could end up working until all hours. But we were walking back to our cars, as we always did, and we were standing at the black gates of Herbert Park and the cars were across the road, the other side of the road, and we were just talking about it again, and she was saying, you know, the story is true, and I was like, maybe there is something wrong with it, just the usual sort of tetchy debate that we had about it, and a11 I remember is that she was in the latter stages of her pregnancy; like, Debbie is quite slim and tall, but you could see that she was pregnant and in the latter stages of her pregnancy, and I just asked her a bit more about it and she said, oh, this woman was going to ${ }_{12: 24}$ go and meet Micheál Martin and the Taoiseach Enda Kenny and I just kept thinking the story was getting bigger and bigger and, you know, something was going to happen to Maurice McCabe again, and I said I -- I can only tell you what she was telling me, and I said, you know, 12:24 like, where is it coming from, like? Your pal Nóirín? And she said yes. That was it. I kind of thought to myself then, maybe you have got this wrong completely yourself, and maybe, you know, he is going to end up in jail. I don't know.
257 Q. Well, what you said at paragraph M of your statement is:
"I asked her how does she know the story is true. She

tol d me the inf ormation she had was coming fromthe top. "
A. Yeah.
"I asked her, from your pal Nói rín? And she sai d yes."

Is that what she said to you?
A. Yeah, I mean, you would say that, you know, about the guards, or, you know, it's coming from way up there or it's -- in other words, it's pretty serious. So I said, what, from your pal Nóirín? And she said yes.
Q.


$\square$
$\square$
Q. Now, in terms of the reference to Micheál Martin and -were you -- were you aware at that time of the article that had been written by Paul williams when it was published --
A. I think those articles, I think they were published when Debbie -- after Debbie went on maternity leave.
Q. So you believe this conversation was before?
A. I believe so, because she was in the latter stages of her pregnancy and then she was gone for a few months from work. And we were in touch with each other afterwards, you know, and I went out to visit her when she had her baby, and we were in communication with each other, even when she was on maternity leave. So I think those conversations were -- I'm pretty sure they were when she was pregnant.
261 Q. And did she tell you that she was still in touch with Ms. D?
A. Yeah, she did, and she certainly gave me the impression that they had formed a bit of a relationship, as you
would do with a contact that you get along with, you know, you'd be in regular touch with people. But the story just seemed to kind of die out and the big dramatic ending never came. I thought he was going to be arrested. I know when I read about it in the paper I thought, God, you know, I did question myself, I did think sometimes that maybe, that I was wrong, because, again, you know, $I$ was only going on a gut feeling. And did she also make a reference to the fact that there was -- no Pulse number had been assigned to the case?
A. She did, yes. And I just took that to mean it was al1 kind of hush-hushed, or something. I don't know.
Q. Now, I think that you refer to, at paragraph $N$, around this time the story of Sylvia Roche-Kelly was happening 12:27 and that you wanted to investigate it further as it involved Bailieboro Gardaí, and that you spoke to Robert Cox about it?
A. Yes.
A. I just said can we do something positive on the whistleblowers, can I write something about it? And he said they didn't want any negative stories because it would piss off the Gardaí and they would stop giving Debbie stories.

265 Q. Now, I think that you continued to meet John wilson on a number of occasions, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, I think I might have met him a couple of months later, but we did speak a lot on the phone.
Q. And I think the Guerin Report was published and it spoke highly of Maurice McCabe?
A. Hmm.

269 Q. And you were talking to Debbie about it and you say that she described it as gross?
A. Yes.

270 Q. Is that reference to the report?
A. Yes. in your statement, she said:

[^1]to journalists, and that it was a pantomime."
A. That's correct, yes. It's in a text message.
Q. And I think that we will come to those after lunch. But those were text messages that you have provided to the Tribunal, is that right?
A. That's correct.

CHA RMAN The Guerin Report is the 6th May '14, so is that the right kind of time-line?
A. She'd be off then, she was off.

CHA RMAN You spoke, what, by text?
A. By text and phone call.

CHAI RMAN Oh, I see. All right. Do you want to break there?
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHA RMAN All right. We will take an hour.

THE HEARI NG AD OURNED FOR LUNCH

THE HEARI NG RESUMED AS FQLLONS AFTER THE LUNCHEON ADJ OURNMENT:

273 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Now, we'd just got to the stage where the -- you had contact after the publication of the Guerin Report. Just before we move on from that, do you know whether or not Debbie McCann was friendly with paul williams?
A. I would know Paul from -- well, obviously everybody knows Paul, but, yeah, I think they were -- well, they would know each other well, yes, I think so. I worked for a short period of time as a freelancer in the News of the world and they were in there, but he kind of just seemed to work on his own; he was quite friendly, you know, but he seemed to just work on his own stuff. But yeah, I think they do, yeah, I think so, yeah.
Q. And what about Eavan Murray?
A. I know Eavan well, yes.
Q. Yes. Would Debbie McCann be friendly with her?
A. I wouldn't have thought so. I don't think so. I'm sure they know each other as journalists, but I can't remember them being pally.
276 Q. But do you think there's any circumstances where they may have shared information with each other as between Debbie McCann, Eavan Murray and Paul williams? Is there a possibility of that?
A. It's absolutely possible. I mean, journalists meet all the time in courts and on crime scenes and they try and help each other out. So it is possible, yes.

277 Q. And even though you might be working for rival newspapers or providing stories to rival newspapers?
A. Yes.
Q. Even as freelancers?
A. Yes.
A. I think with most journalists there's goodwill, and if you are kind of stuck on something or if you're trying to get into an area that you are not familiar with, there are senior journalists that have certainly helped me along the way, and $I$ find most journalists are quite helpfut.
Q. But in --
A. They will keep the exclusives for themselves, though, you know.
281 Q. Yes, all right. We11, then we move on, and Nóirín o'Sullivan was appointed Commissioner, and you had some interaction with Debbie McCann in relation to trying to get an interview with the Commissioner --
A. Yes.

282 Q. -- because you knew her personally.
A. We11, so I believed anyway.

283 Q. Hmm?
A. I believed that.

284 Q. Yeah. And did you inquire in relation to her story and 13:40 getting an exclusive with the Commissioner, did you inquire from time to time in relation to that?
A. Yes, I did. At that time now, Debbie was back from maternity leave, so you're moving towards the end of
the year, and Nóirín O'Sullivan was appointed Commissioner. So she was obviously the first female Commissioner and, as I understood it, Debbie knew her, and I just -- like, she would have encouraged me with stuff and I would have encouraged her with stuff. So I 13:40 was saying, you know, why don't you try and get a sit-down with Nóirín o'Sullivan? Because I remember when Frances Fitzgerald was appointed Minister for Justice, I just kept going at the Press office to try and get a sit-down with her. So I was kind of encouraging Debbie to just keep at it, like, just keep doing it. And, you know, I just said it would be a great story for the paper, obviously. So she said that, you know, that she had her mobile number, she had her -- I remember she had her bag on her shoulder and she gestured to her bag and said, well, I do have her mobile number. And she said that she'd been in touch with her, but she had to make a request through the Garda Press office to make it look like they didn't know each other.

285 Q. And I think that she ultimately did interview her and she wrote an article which was published in the Irish Mail on Sunday on 30th November 2014, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

286 Q. And you kindly attached that to your statement and text messages from in or around that time in 2014. And if we could just go to page 3840. And this is one of the text messages that you had retained on your phone
and you made available to the Tribunal from you to Debbie McCann. It reads:
"A hi ghl y respected of ficer hel din 'high regard' " -in quotation marks -- "is how judge Guerin describes McCabe. "

And then the response is:
"I amfully aware and, to be honest, l thi nk it's
gross. There is a very messed up girl at the heart of it and no one gi ves a fuck."

Then over the page at 3841, again $I$ think this is a text message, is it, that was sent to you?
"It's a farce. Everyone knows, frompoliticians to cops to jurno."
A. Yes.

287 Q. "It's an f-ing pantomi me" is there. And then the following page at 3842 , and we see a text message there:
"Sorry for Shatter? It's just like a house of cards. Self-preservation is the name of the game. It's one bi $g$ sor di d game. Nói rín shoul d get the job, she' d be fab, and it'll be the ultimate knee-jerk reaction if they go down the ci vilian route. I al so feel for Callinan. What a way for his career to end. The tape
thing is one big f-ing smokescreen designed to save political face, and at what cost? Justice will be the bi ggest loser if the government continues the way it's goi ng. "

Then she says:
"It's di sgusting."

And I think you just provided those to give a flavour of the interactions that you had?
A. Yeah, I just gave the Tribunal everything I have. I don't know whether it's relevant or not, but it was just to show, really, you know, that we were kind of having this ongoing debate.
Q. Now, if we could fast forward to --

CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Marrinan, I'm just wondering are there dates or kind of approximate dates for those? MR. MARRI NAN Sorry, sir, I thought that they were on them.
CHA RMAN No, unlike most things it doesn't -MR. MARI NAN well, we can deduce that --

CHA RMN It's in around the time of the interview being published then, is it, or Mr. Callinan resigning?
A. In and around Mr. Callinan resigning. And then also -- ${ }_{13: 44}$ CHAI RMAN So it's earlier in the year, is that March --
A. It could have been earlier in the year, right down to when Nóirín o'sullivan was appointed. So it's across
the year.
289 Q. MR. MARRINAN The first one at 3840 has the date on it as being 9th May 2014.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MARRI NAN And the second one then is after -CHA RMAN Oh, yes. No, I see.

MR. MARRI NAN -- Callinan -- or, sorry, is after Shatter has -- Minister Shatter has resigned. You might be able to provide us with the exact dates --
A. Yes.

291 Q. -- after you've given evidence. So if we could fast-forward to early last year. You say at paragraph Q in your statement the story of Maurice McCabe emerged again and that you heard there was an issue with the Tusla file in relation to Maurice McCabe. 3833. And that you heard on the news several times that the matter of Gardaí being in collusion with journalists was a major issue and that there were attempts to smear Mr. McCabe. And then you indicate that you heard Dave Taylor made a protected disclosure and claimed he was instructed by Garda management to smear Maurice McCabe and brief journalists about vicious rumours.

You hadn't been approached, or had you, by Superintendent Taylor?
A. No.

292 Q. Did you know him as the Garda Press Officer?
A. Not really, no. I would have had a handful of phone conversations with him maybe on a Saturday when -- if

Debbie wasn't in, and I might have met him at some markings, but that would be about it. were you at all suspicious that he may have been behind Debbie McCann's hostility towards Sergeant McCabe?
A. I had no idea. At the time, I had no idea. I mean, a lot has emerged since then, but at the time $I$ was just listening to what she was telling me, but --
294 Q. But what she was telling you was that David Taylor was giving her information?
A. Yes.

295 Q. In relation to Ms. D?
A. Yes.

296 Q. Firstly, that the information that she was in bits, I think the description was, is that right?
A. Yeah, she was in a bad way.
Q. And so from that point of view you knew that she'd been discussing the matter with Superintendent Taylor?
A. Well, that's what she told me.
Q. Did you know that they were in a lot of contact with each other?
A. I wouldn't know who Debbie's in contact with. She's the crime correspondent, so you just naturally assume that her port of call would be Dave Taylor, because he was the Press officer, but... But in any event, you say that you were very concerned and that you believed what happened to Maurice McCabe was wrong, but you felt afraid to tell anyone in the Mail?
A. Yes. . .

300
Q. From reading the material?
A. Mm hmm .

307 Q. You say then -- you continue on at paragraph $R$ that you have been speaking to a confidante about a number of issues that we needn't go into and that he had experience and that he had a connection with Deputy Brendan Howlin, is that right?
A. That's correct.

308 Q. And was there a suggestion that you would contact Deputy Howlin?
A. I think what happened was, there was all this talk about a tribunal, Dave Taylor, slurs and smears against Maurice McCabe, and I felt very concerned. I think I had heard Nóirín O'Sullivan on the radio at that time saying she'd no knowledge of any smear campaign. And I was talking to my contact - or, well, he's a friend, actually, he's not a contact, but $I$ talk to him all the time, at all hours, but $I$ just said to him, look, there's a bit of a situation here, I've heard this about Dave Taylor, they're looking for people to come forward with information, I can't prove a lot of what I'm saying, but I know that Debbie was up at the house, I know what she told me about Nóirín O'Sullivan and Dave Taylor and her dad, I don't really know what to do. And I knew as well from speaking to John wilson that Maurice McCabe was highly distressed. I mean, I had met the man myself and I got that feeling from him too. And I just thought it was so wrong. I just thought it was just so wrong that anybody could do that to somebody when they didn't do anything wrong. And it involved, you know, on the face of it, what Dave Taylor was saying, guards and journalists and everybody. And I knew what Debbie McCann had told me, so I told my friend that and he said to me, 'do you want to speak to Brendan Howlin?' And I said okay, but it has to be in the strictest of confidence, because I've been so sick for a year-and-a-half, I just -- I'd need it to be
really, really confident -- confidential. And then later on that morning, I don't know, a couple of hours later, Deputy Howlin rang me and --
309 Q. This is on the 8th February --
A. Yes, yes.

310 Q. -- of last year?
A. Yes, the day he made the speech in the Dáil. And he just said to me: I believe you have some concerns. And I said I do, but I'm in a bit of a difficult situation here and I've had a terrible year, but this is wrong and I remember stuff and I know stuff and maybe it's of no help to anybody, I don't know, but Debbie McCann told me about Nóirín o'Sullivan and I've heard her there on the radio saying she'd no idea of any smear campaign, and that's not what I heard. And he said, but that's, you know, that's hearsay. And I said it is, but, you know, that's what I heard. And he said, okay, like, what do we do? And then he went away and then he came back and rang me and he said -- and I don't know if I missed a few phone calls from him, but he rang me later that day, or that morning, and he said, okay, I 'm going to make a speech in the Dáil. And I said right. And he said I've been asked -speaking to another few journalists and they all seem to be coming up with the same name, that Debbie McCann was part of this smear campaign. And I said, well, I know what she told me. And so he read out his speech to me and I said -- he was saying like the journalist and she, and I was saying, oh, Jesus, Brendan, now,
don't be getting me into trouble there. And he says, well, you know it's very important, like, and it is really important. And I said okay. And he mentioned direct information and I said, we11, I don't have direct information. And he said -- I think he said something like, it's direct in the sense that she's told you and you believe it.

So it just happened really fast. He stood up and made his speech in the Dáil and then he rang me afterwards to see if I was okay, and I said yes, I'm fine. And I said, but, you know, Brendan, like, if you're talking about direct information there, you'd better just clarify that. And he said yeah, because a few people are looking for information off me, a few people are trying to clarify that. And I said now, Brendan, you're not to give my name to anybody, and he said I will never give your name to anybody. He did ask me would I speak to the Tribuna1. I said I would, but I -- you don't just speak to a Tribunal; you have to get advice. And I was thinking that in my head, you know? But he clarified his statement pretty much straightaway, I think, and then he went on radio the next day and explained what happened and that he had thirdhand information, and he got a bit of a hard time, 13:54 I think, but he accepted it. And then that was that. And then the day after that then --

311 Q. We11, just before we move on to that, so that we're clear on what you actually --
A. Well, not really any more, no.
Q. No, it -- there doesn't seem to be much between the two of you. And I'11 come to what Mr. Howlin says in relation to this in a moment. You then go on to say:
"I told himl had a very bad year in work and that l could onl y speak to himin private. He said he would not di scuss what 1 told him l told himthat a reporter called Debbie McCann had tol d me that Commi ssi oner O' Sul I i van and Dave Tayl or had tol d her Mauri ce MsCabe was a child abuser."
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.

316 Q. "I tol d hi m Debbie MECann told me she had the Commi ssi oner's phone number."
A. Yes.

317 Q. "I tol d hi m Debbi e MLCann was all owed to go to the
alleged victims house to interview her for the paper."
A. Yes.
Q. That wasn't common knowledge at all at that stage, except for what Debbie McCann had told you in relation to that?
A. It's just what Debbie McCann had told me.
Q. "I told him Debbie said terrible things about Marice MECabe and that she had told me that she got her i nf or nati on fromthe Gar daí."

And that's what you've told us and you told that to Mr. Howlin, is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. And he then pointed out to you, you say:
"But that is only third-party information."
A. Yes.

321 Q. And you said:
"Yes, it is.
And then he sai d: So what do we do?
I sai d: I don't know. I'mjust telling you because you are a TD. "

I suppose your understanding was that he would take the matter further, isn't that right? That's why you were telling him?
A. Yeah, I suppose, yeah, yeah.

322 Q. So, in any event, if we could just have a look then at
what Mr. Howlin has said in a statement to the Tribunal at page 1692. This letter dated 13th March to the Tribunal:
"I am writing to you pursuant to the Tribunal's opening is:57 statement. On returning to my Dáil of fice after 10 a.m on Wednesday, 8th February 2017, I was tol d by my chi ef of staff, Neil Ward, that a journalist, Mb. Al i son O' Reilly, wanted to speak to me in rel ation to the then ongoi ng Garda Commi ssi oner controversy. I tel ephoned Ms. Ó Reilly frommy Dáil office. She inf ormed me that she had direct know edge of the campai gn of vilification conducted agai nst Sergeant Mauri ce McCabe. Mb. O' Reilly worked, as I al ready knew, in the office of The Mail on Sunday. She informed me that The Mail on Sunday crime correspondent, Mb. Debbi e McCann, had had ongoing communi cati on with Garda Commi ssi oner Nói rín O Sul I i van during 2013 and 2014."

Is that right?
A. No, I just have the one conversation that she told me about, and then obviously when she interviewed her a few months later for her piece in the paper.
323 Q. "Mb. O Reilly said that Mb. McCann told her that the 13:58 Commi ssi oner had gi ven inf or mation to her cl ai ming serious sexual misconduct on the part of Ser geant McCabe. It invol ved a girl in Cavan whomit was alleged had been abused by Ser geant McCabe."

> Is that correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. "Ms. O Reilly said that Mb. McCann, after the conversation, described Sergeant MkCabe as a dirty f-ing bastard," in quotation marks.

Is that right?
A. I think -- it mightn't have been after the conversation. She said it so much throughout the years, she'd said a lot of bad names about him, so it mightn't have been directly after our conversation.
Q. And you advised Mr. Howlin of that?
A. Yes.
Q. "Mb. O'Reilly said that superintendent Dave Tayl or and

Is that right?
A. According to Debbie, yes.

And you can confirm that that's --
A. Yes.

328 Q. That's right, is it? And then he goes on to say:
"I spoke again by tel ephone to Ms . Ơ Reilly just before attending the Dáil for Leaders' Questions and I read to
her the text of what I proposed to say in Dáil Éi reann. She repl ied that every word was true."

Is that right?
A. I don't know if I said every word was true. I would have said, well, I don't have direct information. But he asked me, do you believe this? And I said I do believe it. And then he goes on:
"Later in the afternoon of 8th February l spoke again to Ms. O Reilly to make sure that she was okay with the publ icity that resulted frommy Dái l statement. She replied: well done, fair play to you."

Have you any issue in relation to any of that?
A. We11, I actually had asked him to clarify the direct information, and he clarified that and we spoke again -- or he read that statement to me, that second statement, and I said well done, fair play to you, thanks for doing it.

330 Q. okay. And then if we could go to -- have page 6380 up on the screen. This is a further letter by Mr. Howlin to the Tribunal on 20th February 2018. And it's in response to the statement that you had made to the
"Mb. O' Reilly says that she did not have di rect know edge and di d not use the words ' di rect know edge'
in rel ation to her know edge of the campai gn agai nst Mauri ce McCabe. "

He says:
"My recollection is that ME. O Reilly did use these words and, in any event, not as a legal expert might have done. I think it is clear from Ms. O'Reilly's vi ews frommy earlier statement to the Tribunal, i ndeed frommy Dáil statement of $8 t h$ February of last year, that it has al ways been clear that Mb. O Reilly did not tell me she was herself party to a conversation with any of the Gardaí concerned, but rather, that she had know edge of Garda contacts with journalists. I have never cl ai med or implied that Mb. O' Reilly herself recei ved any such cont act."

Is that a fair enough observation?
A. Yeah.

331 Q. There doesn't appear to be anything between you in substance, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, I think that's fine.

332 Q. Then paragraph 2 he says:
"I bel ieve that, overall, my statement to you detailing what Mb. O' Reilly rel ayed to me on the morning of 8 th February 2017 in her statement to you of 7th June 2017 are consistent in thei $r$ accounts of her deal ings with Debbi e McCann. "

Do you differ in any way from the observation of Mr. Howlin in that regard?
A. No, I think that's okay.

Hmm?
A. That's okay, yeah.

334 Q. He then points out at paragraph 3:
"Ms. O Reilly's statement and my oun recollection are theref ore not substantially at variance. That said, there is one aspect of her statement which I must take issue, although I appreciate that the Tribunal may not consi der it to be rel evant to its own investigation."

And that's in relation to the issue as to whether or not this was said in private or there was an understanding that he wouldn't mention you. Because obviously he mentioned you in his statement to the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, I mean, he could have just stood up and said my name in the Dáil. I just felt that it was very much up to me to speak to the Tribunal myself. But, you know, at the time when I received the statement from the Tribunal, it was a bolt out of the blew, because I hadn't spoken to him. He didn't come to me and say, I'm going to write off to the Tribunal now. So there was no warning. So, you know, in that circumstance I was shocked and I was upset and I felt very let down. I felt all sorts of feelings, I suppose, when you get a
shock like that, but, you know, like, in the fullness of time and when other more important things happen in your life, it doesn't really matter. I mean, I did speak to him, and he -- you know, he's clarified that I didn't have direct information and he clarified that pretty quickly. And I have spoken to the Tribunal, so it's not an issue for me any more.
335 Q. Right, okay. But at the time it appears to have been an issue to you. He points out at page 6381, in the third-7ast paragraph:
"When I informed the Dáil on 8th February that 'I have been contacted by somebody who is willing to gi ve evi dence to the commission'," that was actually correct, because you did indicate to him --
A. I did.

336 Q. -- that you were prepared to give evidence to what was then thought to be a commission rather than the Tribunal?
A. I did. But I just felt that it was up to me to do, and 14:05 that was the issue.

337 Q. Yeah. So you feel that perhaps Mr. Howlin ought to have contacted you before he sent the letter in to the Tribunal?
A. well, he said he would. I mean, I thought he would be in touch. And, you know, as I said, I think I probably would have always been sitting up here talking to the Tribunal because I had been told things that had upset me anyway. So I've just told the Tribunal everything I
can think of and remember, and I sent it in.
338 Q. Well, I've gone through what Mr. Howlin says in relation to the matter.
A. Yes.

339 Q. We have your evidence in relation to it --
A. Yes.

340 Q. -- as we11. It doesn't appear to me that there's a great deal between the two of you in relation to your account of the same incident --
A. I don't think --

341 Q. -- and interactions?
A. Yeah, and I don't think it matters. I'm not upset any more about it. I think he was just trying to help Sergeant McCabe and he was just trying to do the right thing.

342 Q. Okay. Sorry, just give me one moment. Yes, if we could have page 3739 up on the screen. This is an interview that Debbie McCann had with the Tribunal investigators on 7th July 2017. If you look at line 163 there, this is a quote from your statement:
"Mb. Al i son O' Reilly of the Irish Daily Mail stated the following to the Disclosures Tri bunal :
' I do not have any direct information. I was told by
my former colleague inthe Irish Mail on Sunday, Debbie McCann, bet ween 2013 and 2014, that Superintendent Dave Tayl or and then Acting Commissi oner Nói rín Ơ Sul I i van told her Maurice MECabe abused a girl when she was a
child. Debbie told me the abuse was covered up because Mr. MECabe was a garda and the case was never given a Pul se nunber.'"

The question is:
"I have been asked whet her what Mb. O' Reilly has stated above is accurate and whether I wi sh to make any comment."

And this is the general comment that you made:
"I wasn't i nvol ved in any or chestrated campai gn to mal i gn Sergeant MLCabe. I have no evi dence of any orchestrated campai gn to mal ign Sergeant Maurice MKCabe. The allegations that we are looking at at the time were di scussed in the office. I certainly did not negat i vel y brief Ali son Ó Reilly. We certai nly would have di scussed the allegations. As journalists, we became aware of allegations all of the time. Our job is to investigate them see if we can substantiate them and publish themif they are in the public interest. But until proven, they are treated onl y as an allegation. The allegations were di scussed in a private capacity. They were never going to be ai red and shared with anyone el se. I work primarily on crime in The Mail on Sunday. Al i son would al so have worked on crime. We would have di scussed stories all the time together. She was a colleague and a friend at that
poi nt and any di scussi on around stories were in that context. Just to say it wasn't a briefing in any description; it was a di scussi on among colleagues. To clarify, any di scussi on was into the allegation we were looking at, as al ready described above in my st at ement."

So you see there she's characterising the discussions that she had with you and the conversations she had with you as not being a briefing, and I suppose she's right in that regard?
A. Mm hmm .

343 Q. It could never be described as a briefing --
A. No.

344 Q. -- is that right? But nevertheless, the conversations took place between two colleagues, is that right? Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Yes. And then if could go to page 3730:
"I have been asked to provi de an account to the Di scl osures Tribunal rel ating to all meetings, i nt ervi ews and all attendant circunstances, including the facts and circunstances rel ating to why, how, when and in what circunstances I sought to interview Mb. D
and/ or members of her family in 2014. In February 2014 we had been hearing mur murings about Sergeant Maurice McCabe. "

I am not sure who the "we" refers to.
"As I say, it was around the February 2014 period. The Gardaí were big in the news at that point. Martin Callinan had made the 'di sgusting' remark. There was
al so controversy surrounding Al an Shatter at that point. I deci ded to look into the murmurings of an allegation agai nst Sergeant McCabe a little more closel y at that point. I approached a number of different sources in respect of trying to firmup the allegation and l established that there had been an allegation made around 2006, 2007 mark. I wasn't sure of the date precisely. I was al so aware it rel at ed to a child at that point who was now (2014) a teenager."

That corresponds with what she told you, is that right?
A. That's correct.

CHAN RMAN Except the teenager detail?
A. The teenager bit, $I$ do not remember the teenager bit.

346 Q. MR. MARRI NAN "I established it was an allegation of i nappropri ate touching."

Is that in accordance with what she told you?
A. She said he was behind a sofa and pushed up against her using his groin.
347 Q. She adds that:

[^2]Did she advise you that a file had gone to the DPP?
A. No, I think she just said there was a cover-up, a big cover-up in the Gardaí and, because he was a guard, it was kind of dulled down.
"I ran the information that I recei ved by my news editor, Robert Cox..."

You say that that is correct, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

349 Q. "... who, in turn, spoke to our overall editor in The Mail on Sunday, Conor O Donnell."

And that is in accordance with what you have advised the Tribunal, is that right?
A. Well, that is what we would do, yes, but I wasn't there.

350 Q. "As woul d be usual, I report to my line manager, Robert Cox. I would run everything by himfirst. A decision was made in mid to late February 2014. The deci sion was to approach the family of ME. D and ask if they would like to comment on the allegation. "

Do you want to make any observation in relation to that?
A. In relation to all of it?

351 Q. Yes.
A. I mean, "murmurings" is not the word I would have used.

352 Q. All right. She says:
"The next morning l travelled to the Mb. D family home. I thi nk, fromrecollection, it was Friday, either the 14th or the 21st February. I wasn't sure of the exact I ocation of the house, so when l arrived in the area I asked some nei ghbours for directions. On arrival at Mb. D's house, l got out of my car, knocked on the door. A woman came out who l bel ieve was Mb. D's nother. I told her why I was there. I identified myself as a journalist with the Irish Mail on Sunday. She appeared to me to be a little upset. She made ref er ence to listening to the one o' clock news, so it must have been that time of day. The reason I gathered she was upset was that Sergeant McCabe's name had been mentioned on the radio. I asked her if she would like to talk a ittle bit more. I recall l gave her my card. That would have been my mobile number and contact details. She was very ni ce and polite. I thi nk we left it that she would thi nk about it, or words to that effect. She did not speak to me about the allegation."

Now, that, of course, is at variance with what Debbie McCann told you, is that right?
A. That's correct. It's nothing like what she told me. I'd also like one of them business cards as well. I don't know if -- I do not remember us having them. MR. MARRI NAN Thank you. Would you answer any questions
A. Thank you.

ME. O REI LLY MAS CROSS-EXAM NED BY MR. MEDONELL:

353 Q.
MR. MEDONELL: Ms. O'Reilly, Michae1 McDowe11 is my name. I am one of the counsel for Sergeant Maurice McCabe. Could I firstly ask you, do you agree with my client's instructions that you visited him on one occasion and the visit was at his home and lasted approximately ten minutes or so; was that your recollection of it?
A. I thought it was a little bit longer, but yes, yes.
Q. We11 --
A. Maybe 20 minutes.

355 Q. Maybe I'm being --
A. Maybe it doesn't matter.
Q. Ten minutes or quarter of an hour at most?
A. Maybe, yes.

357 Q. And can we take it that you informed him that you knew that there were rumours that had been put out about him, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that he denied them to you, is that right?
A. He did.

359 Q. Is there any question that he would have given you an account of the -- Ms. D's allegation, including the sofa, the pushing up against, or anything like that?
A. No, he shut down completely.

360 Q. I see. He didn't in any sense impart to you any information concerning what her allegation had been, is
that right?
A. No, he didn't.

And, after that, did you have any further personal contact with Maurice McCabe?
A. I didn't. But I actually just remembered there
recently that, and I haven't got it in my statement because I only just remembered it, I rang him around the time last year that David Taylor made a protected disclosure, to speak to him around the time I was talking to Brendan Howlin, around that time. Now, I can get the date, but the Mail would have my phone records, I can get the date. But the phone was off and I just left a message saying it's Alison O'Reilly from the Daily mail, could I speak to you. But I presumed there was so many people ringing him at that time, so he didn't return my call.

362 Q. And that accords with his instructions to me, is that he had only one interaction with you?
A. Yes.

363 Q. And that was in 2013?
A. He probably forgot about it, or maybe he didn't even hear the message.

364 Q. Now, could I ask you, in relation to the account you've given that Debbie McCann gave you of her interview with Ms. D, this is her sitting at the other end of a settee --
A. Yes.

365
Q. -- and clutching herself. I just want to ask you one thing; could that possibly have come from seeing a
video recording with her at a later stage, or something? I mean, can you put a date on when that happened?
A. I honestly, I think it was just around January or February, possibly. I can't say for sure, because I wasn't reporting on this and I have no dates because these were -- a lot of it was just conversations. yes. I'm just wondering where the detail could come from. Maybe she witnessed -- could she by any chance have told you that she had seen a video recording, or anything like that?
A. No, she didn't.

CHA RMAN You are talking about the Paul williams video, is that what you're --
MR. MEDOVELL: or whatever, yes.
CHAN RMAN And is she on a couch clutching herself? MR. MEDOWELL: I don't know.
CHA RMAN I don't know. well, I will look at it, in any event? But did you see -- did --
A. No, I didn't see anything, no. I mean, that's just what she told me.

367 Q. MR. MEDONELL: So, but you have no doubt that she led you to believe that she had been present in a room in Ms. D's home and had had this conversation with her, is that right?
A. Absolutely no doubt.

368 Q. And did it occur to you to ask yourself whether, given that her father was a member of An Garda Síochána, that she might have had access to materials by that means?
A. I didn't ask her.
Q. She never mentioned that to you?
A. She said to me earlier in the year that her father had confirmed the story, but I didn't know what the story was at that point. All I knew was there was an
allegation from a young gir1 who was now grown up, and that's all I knew, and that Dave Taylor had told her she was in a bad way later on in the year. But she said her father had confirmed the story, but she never told me what her father actually said.

370 Q. Did she ever tell you that she'd had a brief encounter with Mrs. D at the home which didn't prove successful?
A. No.

371 Q. Did you ever hear her report that back --
A. No.

372 Q. -- to the Daily Mail?
A. No. The Mail on Sunday.
Q. Or The Mail on Sunday, rather?
A. No, I didn't.

374 Q. And in relation to the account she gave you, can you just assist the Tribunal, was it a vivid account, or what kind of account was it of Ms. D that she gave you?
A. She said that they were -- she was in her house, that Debbie was on one side of the sofa and Ms. D was on the other, and that she was very, very distressed; I mean, she referenced her distress a lot in the aftermath, but she was saying that she was really gripping herself and was just in an awful way and that Sergeant Maurice McCabe was responsible for this damage. .

375

I see. Now, could I ask you just to go to page 3840 of Volume 15. This is, I take it, you sending her a quotation from Sean Guerin's report which came out on 6th May 2014 and you sent her a text with a phrase from it?
A. Yes, I think it was just part of the ongoing debate that we were having.
Q. Yeah.
A. Saying, look.
Q. And can you just put that in context; you were citing this in support of Sergeant McCabe's --
A. Yes.
Q. -- innocence, is that right?
A. Yes. Well, again, I only had my gut feeling to go on, but I believed he was innocent.
Q. And it reads:
"A hi ghl y respected officer hel din hi gh regard is how judge Guerin --"

You've elevated him to the judiciary.
A. Yeah, sorry.

380 Q. "-- descri bes McCabe. And she replied: I amfully aware and, to be honest, l think it's gross. There is a very messed up girl at the heart of it and nobody
A. Yes.

381 Q. Is that right?
A. Yes. She was very in support of this girl and, I mean,

I certainly believe from speaking to Debbie that they had formed some sort of a friendship, because that's a text message that, in my impression is, she's moved by this girl's story.
382 Q. Could I ask you to go to the next page in that volume, page 3841 . There's a text which reads:
"It's a farce. Everybody knows frompoliticians to cops to jurnos. It's an f-ing pantomime."
A. Yes.

383 Q. Who sent you that?
A. That's from Debbie, off the back of that other text.
Q. I see.
A. It's probably not done the right way, but...

385 Q. And can we take it that this reflected what she'd told you, that this was generally known to be true, as far as she was concerned?
A. As far as she was concerned, that's what she told me.
Q. And the next text is one which obviously, or maybe not obviously, but seems to post-date the resignation of Alan Shatter, is that right?
A. Yeah, I think so, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. I'm not sure.

389 Q. And she deals with the fact that Nóirín O'Sullivan would get the job and she'd be fab, is that right?
A. Yes.

390 Q. And that a civilian commissioner would be a bad idea, she imparts that to you as well, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

391 Q. And she says -- she describes any suggestion of that as 14:24 the ultimate knee-jerk reaction. And she says:
"I al so feel for Callinan. What a way for his career to end. The tapes thing is one big fecking smokescreen designed to save political face."

And she goes on to say that it's disgusting at the end. Was that her general approach to this controversy and the political outcrop of this controversy at the time?
A. Yes. She very much admired Nóirín o'Sullivan and Martin Callinan. I mean, Nóirín o'sullivan is the first female Commissioner and a highly intelligent woman, very good at her job, you know, but I always was on the -- under the impression that she knew Nóirín o'sullivan, she had told me she was in touch with her, she had given her an off-the-record interview, which I think a lot of us would struggle to get if you didn't know her, but that's just my view. And, yeah, I mean, she didn't believe the whistleblowers. She really, really had strong views and feelings about Maurice McCabe, she really didn't like him or John wilson.
MR. MEDONELL: I see. Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN You have no questions?
MR DI GNMM No questions.

MR. MDHAN Sorry, I don't know if I am next in turn. My name is Hugh Mohan, barrister.
CHA RMAN I am not sure anyone wants -Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, do you want to ask any questions? Sorry, or -- I beg your pardon?

MR. DOYLE: Excuse me, Chairman, I will see what arises from Mr. Mohan's cross-examination, and if there are any matters, $I$ would ask, Chairman, to take then up at that stage
CHA RMAK A11 right. We11, that's fine. So, Mr. Mohan, maybe kindly introduce yourself.

MR. MDHAN May it please you, Chairman.

## MS. O REI LLY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MDHAN

392 Q. MR. MDHAN Ms. O'Reilly, my name is Hugh Mohan, I am a barrister. I am instructed by Mr. Michael Keeley on behalf of your current employers, Associated Newspaper Group and indeed on behalf of Debbie McCann and a number of other individuals who are associated with
Associated Newspapers and the Tribuna1. I have a number of questions and --
CHA RMAN Can you see Mr. Mohan?
A. I can't really hear him, sorry.

MR. MDHAN Can you hear me?
A. I can.

CHA RMAN He is just down in the back there.
MR. MDHAN I'm here.
A. Hi .
A. Yes.
Q. And at that stage, and again I'm not putting a time on it, I'm keeping it rather broad, because we're talking about from maybe mid-January through to February, March 14:28 or April, I know Ms. McCann has said, she uses the word "murmurings"; you have taken exception to that and I want to keep neutral for the time being.
A. Sure.
Q. Okay. Well, you didn't discuss the issue with any other journalistic colleagues?
A. There's nothing that jumps to mind. The first $I$ had heard about Maurice McCabe was obviously he was in the media the whole time, but the rumours and the allegations I'd heard from Debbie McCann.
Q. Yes, but I don't want to dwell too long on it, but it seems to have been an issue which very quickly became a lead story of sorts, and was being followed, I suppose, by crime journalists, by journalists in general, and something which you had an interest in or were on the periphery of?
A. Well, I suppose I'm not office-based and I'd be in and out of the office and I would be out and about a lot
dealing just with ordinary people. I don't do stories on the guards really, a few of them obviously from covering for Debbie, but there's nothing that jumps to mind where somebody sat down to tell me about it.
402 Q. And you describe, and I use a phrase that you used this morning, you said "we were good friends and good journalists"?
A. Yes.

403 Q. And you've described her as a good journalist?
A. She is a very good journalist, yes, and a nice person.

404 Q. And in that regard, you kind of also said this morning that you -- my client and your employer ran a tight ship, you wouldn't go on a solo run as such, you would have to, I'm trying to get a picture of it, that you would meet and you would have a discussion of what stories you may or may not follow, you'd be given broad approval for it, bring it back and have it checked out, and the like?
A. Yeah. And I think with something as sensitive as that, you're quite -- given that it was an allegation, given that Debbie was also pregnant and going to the door of somebody while she's heavily pregnant, there would have been a duty of care, because somebody could react very badly at the door and, you know, that could also lead to maybe a photographer going with her, I don't know, I'm just saying generally. There would have been, I'd say, a discussion with the line manager, Robert cox.

405 Q. Sure.
A. There would have been a discussion with conor

O'Donnell, quite possibly a discussion with Michae1 Keeley, given the nature of the story and given that she was pregnant and how someone could react on the door.
well, we'11 take a look at what you did, first of all. I think you went on the -- maybe the whistleblower angle, you meet with the two individuals concerned and you meet with Sergeant McCabe, you come back, and I think, as you described it yourself, you had just had a hunch that they were, in your view, innocent and were, I suppose, deserved - these are my words - a better hearing, and that you did and wanted to put that forward in a form of a story, but, as you say, and I am quoting you, you had no proof of it?
A. No.

407 Q. And the story didn't elect to run or cover that, is that correct?
A. Well, I think when I first heard the story, I was suspicious of it, but obviously when I met John wilson and Maurice McCabe, I believed them, but I had no proof.

408 Q. But to get to the end, you followed -- I mean, in fact, you went -- I think you went up to virginia and you met with --
A. John Wilson.

409 Q. Yes, John wilson. And even though you're not meant to do a solo run, he gave you Sergeant McCabe's number and you followed that and you sat down with him and you spoke with him; to use your phrase, you had no proof,
you came back, and the newspaper decided not to run with any story on that, isn't that correct?
A. Oh, no, it was never a story. I just explained to Robert Cox when I came back from the job, look, while I was there John wilson asked me did I want to meet Maurice McCabe, because I put it to him about the rumours, and I ended up in Maurice McCabe's house, and I asked him straight out, did you know about the rumours, do you want to do a story about it? And Robert Cox said, okay, grand.
410 Q. And the same, in fact, happened with Debbie McCann, who, in fact, had followed, if you will, the other line? We know, and I'11 get into what -- we know what she says and we know how you differ in versions as to what may or may not have happened there. But for the time being, she certainly was maybe interested in running a line or a story from that point of view. And again, the newspaper didn't run that story?
A. I wasn't there for the conversation or why it didn't work out, but it didn't run, it definitely didn't run.
411 Q. It would seem to follow a pattern that the journalists check stories out, they see do they stand up, there is a discussion about them. If they do, they do. If they don't -- they have to stand up fairly we11, and if they don't, they don't go with those stories?
A. Absolutely.

412 Q. And I just want to come back to, again, your time-1ine. You said this morning, maybe I have this -- I am misunderstanding this, but you said that you had a
discussion with Debbie McCann about her being interviewed by Mícheál Martin and the like, is that correct?
A. Yeah, I think, as I said, I made no attempt to put my statement into a sequence or a time-line, I just put everything in. And obviously you have time to try and think about things better. But there are certain conversations that I have a fairly clear recollection of, but again, there was no diary or dates, or anything like that. These were conversations around the office. 14:34 413 Q. And then she went out on maternity leave, is that correct?
A. She went on maternity leave, yes.

414 Q. You see, again, just, I don't want to be nit-picking, she went on maternity leave on the 22nd march 2014.
All of what you're describing with Mícheál Martin didn't happen until post the Paul williams interview in the following month of April 2014 ?
A. Yes, and I said that this morning. I said I believe that conversation was probably a little bit later on with Dave Taylor. Dave Taylor had told her that. And I explained that it was probably a little bit later on.
415 Q. So --
A. Around that time, because that's when she told me.

416 Q. She was out on maternity leave?
A. No, no, no, before she went on maternity leave. She had spoken to me when she was heavily pregnant and I had asked her about Nóirín o'Sullivan. It was the same conversation at Herbert Park.

417 Q. You see, the difficulty with that is that none of this had, in fact, come into the public domain until the following month.
A. okay.

418 Q. It hadn't happened. This happened post a Paul williams 14:35 article which appeared, I think, on 12th April 2014.
A. Okay. We11, that's just the best to my recollection, that's my best.

419 Q. But do you understand that none of this came into that, and she's really gone at this stage, three or four weeks. Again, it would suggest that your time-line, as you make -- I'm not being overly critical at this point, but it would seem that it couldn't have happened when she was still working, in any event?
A. I don't know. I can only tell you what she told me.

420 Q. And if I may get to the point where you seem to have -seem to be a very --
CHA RMAK Sorry, Mr. Mohan, just before you go on, I'm sorry, it's my fault, I am not following the point. what's not in the public domain as of March 2014?
MR. MDHAN We11, I may be wrong about this, Chairman, but it appears to me that the Paul williams article, which was 12th Apri1 --
CHA RMAN Yes, there was four of them. The first was certainly 12th April, yes.
MR. MDHAN And that brought this issue about the -Ms. D into the domain and the issue of meeting Mícheá Martin and all of that. CHA RMAN Certain7y, yes.

MR. MDHAN In other words, that was the commencement of all of that, if you will. And it's just that it's a matter of fact - and Ms. McCann will be giving evidence in due course - she went out on 22nd March.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MDHAN Quite some time before.
CHA RMAN No, al1 right, I understand your point. But your point is that you couldn't have been having a discussion about Mícheál Martin, the Taoiseach, etc., in March, it had to be later than that, and she was on maternity leave. I'11 just clarify that for myself. Do you understand that?
A. I do understand that. But I thought that - wel1, it was my understanding anyway that did Paul williams not say his article was delayed? I don't know, but --
MR. MDHAN Again, I'm open to correction, I'm told that his meeting was 8th March 2014 and the first of those articles appeared -- sorry, 8th March 2014. And then his article appeared on 12th April 2014.
A. Yeah, I think he told the Tribunal maybe they were delayed. But again, I can only go on what I remember she told me.

421 Q. And I think we now get to quite a divergence of a recollection between you and Ms. McCann in relation to the, if you will, meeting Mrs. D and her -- your recollection of her account that this interview took place and took place in such graphic detail. We now know that it didn't take place, isn't that correct?
A. It seems that way, yes. We11, for the time being, your recollection may be incorrect, or indeed correct, Ms. McCann's recollection 14:37 may be incorrect, that's a possibility on both?
A. No, I remember the conversation clearly. I remember her describing this girl. So I can only go on what Debbie McCann told me. I wasn't there.
424 Q. By the time you put all of this information down, in fact, all of this material was, in fact, part of the public domain.
A. I don't know, I can't remember.
Q. We11, it was in fact.
A. Was it?

426 Q. Because your statement was in 2017, it was all -- yes, it was.
A. Okay. We11, I can only tell you what Debbie McCann told me.
427 Q. Now, this is a lady who you characterise as a good journalist?
A. She is.
Q. You used the phrase that sometimes journalists exaggerate, sometimes journalists do things and say things that they should or shouldn't?
A. I was just asked, what do you think the reason is behind this? But I have a very clear recollection, Chairman, of Debbie McCann telling me that story.

429 Q. And why do you think she would do that? There doesn't
seem to be any reason or motive behind it?
A. That is something you will have to ask Debbie McCann.

430 Q. It doesn't make sense when one takes a look at it at face value, does it?
A. It is just something you will have to ask Debbie McCann.
431 Q. No, I appreciate that, and Debbie McCann, we have already noted from what -- her statement, is going to say it didn't happen.
A. I just have a very clear recollection of it. CHA RMAN Sorry, she doesn't actually say that in the statement.
MR. MDHAK Sorry, I'm characterising it --
CHAN RMAN I'm sorry, Mr. Mohan, what she says in her statement, Mr. Mohan, is, and we both know this, just from the point of view of clarity, is that she describes the encounter at the door of the D household effectively the same way Mrs. D has given evidence of. But she never says: I never had a conversation along the lines of $I$ went into the house, she was on the couch, I was on the other side of the couch, Ms. D was clutching herself, she was very upset and I said that to --
MR. MOHAN I am sorry, chairman, you are quite correct. But for the purposes of clarity, it might have been better expressed, but the conversation didn't happen. In fact, her conversation with Mrs. D was as set out in the statement, not otherwise.
CHAN RMAN No, but the issue was --

MR. MDHAN In other words, no further conversation other than was set out.

CHA RMAN No, I appreciate that, that may we11 be the case, I don't know, but --

MR. MDHAN I'm clarifying that, sorry.
CHA RMAN No, but is -- your client is denying having the conversation now described with --

MR. MDHAN Yes, Ms. D.
CHA RMAN Sorry, your client is -- I just want to make sure. Your client is denying having a conversation with Alison O'Reilly about actually meeting Ms. D, her clutching herself and being very upset?

MR. MDHAN Sorry, yes,
CHA RMAK I am sorry for misunderstanding that, but I just wanted to make sure because it's --
MR. MDHAN That is so.
CHAN RMAN A11 right.
MR. MDHAN And the reason why is because it simply never happened, we say.
432 Q. Sorry, there are two different conversations, and I want to be clear about this. She will say she never had the conversation with you, Ms. O'Reilly, it never happened.
A. I can only tell you what she said, Judge. That is what she told me.

433 Q. Now --
A. I wasn't there.

434 Q. You then -- and I want to get to, if I may, the next, maybe divergence -- you -- there seems to be a dispute
between you and Mr. Brendan Howlin as to whom contacted whom, but we know there was contact made, in any event, between both of you.
A. I spoke to my friend, who gave my details to Deputy Howlin, and he contacted me.
Q.

Yeah. And you knew at this stage that giving the type of information that you, in fact, gave to him, was, and it's my -- the use of my word, explosive at that point in time?
A. It's the truth.
Q. No, no, I appreciate that. I am characterising it as, at that time Nóirín O'Sullivan was the Commissioner and she was being now named by you, information you were giving, that she had, in fact, been speaking to journalists along the lines that you have described about Maurice McCabe. That was, and again it's my word, explosive?
A. Yeah. But, you know, there was no master plan. I just wanted to tell somebody what I knew. I mean, anybody looking at this story knows there was no master plan. I just felt I needed to tell somebody.
437 Q. I appreciate that. When you give that information, you're a journalist, you know the impact it was going to have, and certainly it did have the impact that one could surmise it was going to have. It was, I think, the lead story on the news, it was on the headlines of all the newspapers the following day, and we know Mr. Howlin, who we will hear from, was, I think, on Morning Ireland the following day describing it. We
know as well that the Ceann Comhairle had taken him to task about it. But it was explosive information?
A. I didn't consider what was going to come out in the media; I just felt I needed to tell somebody.
No, and I understand that point. I just want to -that you understood the significance of what you were saying, that's the question I'm asking you?
A. Yes, it's very important information.
Q. Explosive?
A. Maybe. Very important, I would have thought, extremely ${ }_{14: 42}$ important information.
440 Q. And you knew that when he spoke in the Dáil and when it was now being carried on the airwaves and in the newspapers, that you were the source of the information?
A. Well, at first I thought he had spoken to a few journalists. But yes, I accept that -- the Nóirín o'Sullivan stuff and the Dave Taylor, yes, I told him that.
441 Q. And it came then, and you wanted anonymity at that point?
A. Yes.

442 Q. Why was that?
A. I had a very difficult time in work and I just didn't want any more issues. And I, you know, as I said to
him, I was going to speak to the Tribunal, so I suppose it was just up for me to get independent legal advice and come forward. But, you know, like, two days after that interview, the editor-in-chief of the mail,

Sebastian Hamilton, wrote a two-page spread on what a great idea it was for Brendan Howlin to stand up and speak in the Dáil. I just think he didn't obviously -I don't think he would have written the article had he known that Brendan Howlin was referring to two of the company's reporters.
Ms. O'Reilly, when, and before, I think, Mr. Howlin had named you, in the course of a meeting with michael Keeley you were asked had you -- were you the source and had you a conversation with Brendan Howlin?
A. He asked me was I the source. He didn't ask me did I have a conversation.
Q. I want you to go to page, if I may, 382, please -3862 , sorry. If we could put that up on the screen, please. This is documentation that I think you or your 14:44 solicitor sent to the Tribunal. volume 15.
A. It's just not up yet, sorry.

CHA RMAN It's 3862, I think.
MR. MDHAN Sorry, my apologies.
CHA RMAN No, you did say it right.
445 Q. MR. MOHAN Now, at this point you have already given a statement -- or, sorry, you haven't given a statement, but there is a typed note of a conversation you had with Michael Keeley about this issue, and this is referred to, and I want to read this to you:
"I had asked --"
CHAN RMAN Just hang on a minute. I am sorry, Mr. Mohan, you probably know the context of this, but I
am afraid I am a bit lost, and if you wouldn't mind just giving me a context. I didn't know if Mr. Keeley came into this or how he might have come into it.
MR. MDHAN The Tribunal had contacted a number of journalists, and when they contacted my client, the in-house counsel, Mr. Michael Keeley, who is instructing me, sitting beside me, had been given and taken the responsibility of meeting any and all relevant journalists for the purpose of speaking to them, if they had any information that might be of assistance to the Tribunal, and, in doing that, he spoke to various members, including yourself, and he typed up his account of that meeting and he sent, in each case, an account of that meeting to each of the journalists and he sent to you an account of that meeting. And in that account, which we don't have and it's not here, but the key parts are referred to in this, and I'11 just read this now, and it's in that context:
"Al ison, I had asked both questions at our meeting and you responded that you were not M . How in's source and had not spoken to him After our meeting on 5th April last I prepared a note of our conversation. I sent that to you by e-mail for your approval or amendment. It incl uded the following sentence: ' She (Al i son O Reilly) di d not speak with Brendan How in, TD, and was not his source before his Dáil statements about Ser geant MECabe on 8th February 2017'. While you
amended other aspects of the note, you agreed with this record of what took place. You did so in your e-mail of 21st April to me. Given what has since transpired, I do not believe that you could have been unaware of the importance of this statement."

And it goes on to say that it has placed him in an extremely difficult position that would lead to a conflict of evidence between you and another client, etc. But I want you to deal with that first paragraph, 14:47 please.
A. Chairman, I went to a meeting with Michael Keeley after receiving a letter from the Tribunal and he asked me a series of questions and he asked me did I ever hear the rumour about Maurice McCabe being a child abuser, and I 14:47 said yes, I did. And I went to tell him who it was and he put his hand up and he said, I don't want to know. And I thought, well, what are we doing here? I mean, do we tell the truth or do we not tell the truth? And then he went on, maybe question five or six he said: Did you meet Maurice McCabe? I said I did. I asked him to do an interview. I said, Michael, I actually feel very sorry for Maurice McCabe. And he said -- he put his pen down and he looked at me, he was sitting there, and I was sitting here, and he said: You know, nobody comes out of a Tribunal looking okay, even if they're trying to be the good guy. And I said, do you know what? I'm not telling you anything. I was terrified, absolutely terrified. I felt threatened and
terrified. And I thought, what is this? I knew that Debbie had been up at the house, I knew that I had been up with Maurice McCabe, and by the time he got to his very last question, as we were standing up to leave, I said I'm not telling him anything, I'm too afraid.
446 Q. No, you did; you, in fact, said to him that you did not speak with Brendan Howlin, TD, and were not his source.
A. I remember just shaking my head and going no.

447 Q. Why I'm putting that you said to him, because you may have been all of those things, which I'm not going to caval with for the time being, but this was sent to you afterwards?
A. It was.
Q. Which it could have been corrected. You saw fit not to correct it. And further than that, in further messages I'm going to show, you actually denied that that had been so. The reality was, you actually denied it and you told Michael keeley a lie.
A. I felt very threatened by Michael Keeley, and when I got that e-mail from him, I didn't read it line by line, and I remember saying, we11, he must know that Debbie McCann was up at that house, and I specifically wrote on the top of it: I don't know what anyone else is saying but that's fine by me, or something like that I said to him. And I sent it in.
449 Q. Ms. O'Reilly --
A. Now, I've told the Tribunal absolutely everything I can tell them. It wasn't perfect, but I've told you everything I know.

450 Q. Ms. O'Reilly, you -- and if we go on to the following page of 3859 , you say at the second paragraph - now, you're not, I think, at this stage being threatened because you're not sitting across from him, it's from your mobile phone:
"J ust read the letter fromthe Tribunal to me. I am really shocked. It's full of inaccuracies. The reality is, l know his friend, Councillor George Law or, for a long time, and I had confided in him--" 14:50
A. Sorry, I don't mean to interrupt. I actually just don't have that page.
451 Q. I'm sorry, it's important that you do see it.
A. Yes, I have it now.

452 Q. Sorry. "Just read the letter fromthe Tribunal to me. 14:50 I amreally shocked. It's full of inaccuracies." CHA RMAN Just hang on if you wouldn't mind a wee moment, please, Mr. Mohan, because it's just not coming up. Would you give us a page number again, if you wouldn't mind, please.
MR. MDHAN Sorry, 3859.
CHA RMAN 3859. It will just take a second. And where does this come in sequence vis-à-vis the meeting --
MR. MDHAN If you see at the top of the page, this is 14:50 the reply. It's, in fact, the same day, the first letter that was sent.
453 Q. This is again sent from your iPhone, isn't that correct? You're familiar with this, I'm sure,

Ms. O'Reilly?
CHA RMAN This is an electronic communication?
MR. MDHAN Yes. And we see at the top --
CHA RMAN Maybe just give her a second to have a look at it, if you wouldn't mind.
A. I see it. I have it.

CHA RMAN You have it.
A. Thank you.

454 Q. MR. MDHAR "J ust read that letter fromthe Tri bunal to me. I amreally shocked. It's full of inaccuracies. The reality is, I know his friend, Councillor George Law or, for a long time, and had confided to hi m during dozens of conversations about difficulties l was experiencing because of his own expertise inthis area. He gave Brendan How in my number and he rang me without 14:51 me asking to speak to him I never thought he was tal king about me as source because he said he tal ked to loads of peopl e and got background on the issue and kept coming up with the same thing. He al so said this was an important issue and that any conversations were protected by parliament ary privilege and he would never use my name in anything he did into his background st uff. This was repeated to re."
A. Yes.

455 Q. "I never thought he was tal king about me as a source."
I specifically asked you that and you confirmed you knew full well you were the source.
A. Well, you know, as I said, I have told the Tribunal everything I know, and I wrote that e-mail to Michael
on the day that I got Brendan Howlin's letter. I was very, very upset, very shocked, probably the same way Debbie McCann felt when she heard I named her to the Tribunal. It's all of those things. But, you know, I had tried to tell michael Keeley in a meeting when I went to see him, and he said he didn't want to know.
A. And I didn't feel obliged to recall any private conversations I had with Brendan Howlin. But, you know, I have corrected that, and I have told the Tribunal everything I know. I could have sat here and said I'm not saying anything, I'm claiming journalistic privilege. I have told the Tribunal every single thing that I know.
457 Q. Ms. O'Reilly, when you were asked by Michael Keeley were you the source of Brendan Howlin's story and did you speak to him and when you denied that, do you now accept that you lied to Michael Keeley?
A. I didn't lie to Michael Keeley. I actually didn't know if I was or wasn't. He had said he'd spoke to a number of journalists. I accept it now, I accept it now, and I've told the Tribunal I accept it, but at the time he had said he had checked these things out with other reporters.
458 Q. I can bring you back over your own statement, I can bring you -- I don't intend to, but I --
A. I fully accept, Chairman, that I am Brendan Howlin's source.

459 Q. And recal1 in graphic detail how you described the
events of that morning when he rang you back and made it abundantly clear to you and that he was going to the Dáil and when I tried to -- and I think you accepted that you knew the information you had given was explosive, there is no getting away from it. Yet when your employer was seeking to sit you down and discuss this with you, you lied to them?
A. My --

460 Q. For whatever reason?
A. My employer told me he didn't want to know.
Q. No, sorry, no, no, he asked you -- forget about whatever else you are saying. I want you to just think of the question for a moment. You accept you were asked were you Brendan Howlin's source and did you speak to him? You denied you were his source and you denied speaking to him. You lied on both occasions. Do you accept that now?
A. I accept that I told the Tribunal the truth and I accept now that I am Brendan Howlin's source.
462 Q. Do you accept that when you denied that to Mr. Michael
A. I accept that I tried to tell Michael Keeley everything, and he didn't want to know.
463 Q. Do you accept when that was put to you, as you accept it was, and when you did not give the truth, that you lied?
A. I was terrified of telling him, Chairman.

464 Q. That's not the question I'm asking you.
A. I didn't tell him. I didn't tell him.
Q. That's a lie, it was a lie?
A. There were circumstances surrounding that where I fe7t very, very threatened by Michael Keeley. I'11 get to that in a moment. But I want you to understand that you are coming to the Tribunal here saying I am telling the truth, you must believe me insofar as regards my conversation with Ms. Debbie McCann, you must believe me insofar as my conversation with Ms. Debbie McCann in two respects: one, a meeting that neither party says took place; and secondly, when Ms. Debbie McCann is absolutely clear about her association at that stage with Nóirín O'Sullivan, that she did not have Nóirín O'Sullivan's number at that point in time, you saw that in her statement?
A. But Debbie McCann told me she had Nóirín o'Sullivan's mobile number before she did her interview in November 2014.

467 Q. Sorry, and be very clear about this, we are talking about at that time, which was -- she did an interview with her at a later point in time. But at that time. I'11 read to you, and it's page 3744, Debbie McCann. And it's from page, sorry, from 252 of the --
"However, according to --"

Sorry, I will wait until everybody gets it.
"However, according to Mr. How in's statement to the Dáil, it is alleged that the Commissi oner called me in

2013 and early 2014 and made al legations agai nst Ser geant Maurice McCabe. I have previ ously outlined to the best of my know edge I never spoke to her on the phone during those periods and there was certainly no mention of Maurice MkCabe when we did speak later in 2014. "

That's her account and that will be her testimony.
A. But I never said she spoke to her on the phone. I just said she told me that Nóirín o'sullivan had told her this stuff. That's al1 I said.

468 Q. But are you suggesting they met then? Is that what you are suggesting?
A. Pardon?

469 Q. Are you suggesting they met?
A. Sorry?

470 Q. Are you suggesting, rather than speaking on the phone, that they met individually one-on-one or --
A. I've no idea. I can only tell you what Debbie told me. I have no idea how they were conversing.
471 Q. But by implication you are saying that they spoke on the phone, with respect?
A. I have no idea. Debbie McCann had told me later on in the year that she -- well, before she did her interview, that she had Nóirín O'Sullivan's mobile

472 Q. Well, we now know from, I think Ms. Leader on behalf of the Tribunal, at -- I think two days ago, Day 81, question 158:
"There are no mobile phone contacts in any event with Ms. McCann. "

Do you accept that?
A. But I didn't say they spoke on the phone. I said she told me she had her phone number.

Ms. O'Reilly, that's why I was asking you do you accept that you lied when it was plain on the face of it that you give an incorrect answer on a question which you knew the truthful answer but decided to lie about? CHA RMAN Can I just ask you, Mr. Mohan, was this meeting for the purpose of receiving legal advice in consequence of the very detailed letter which this

MR. MDHAN Yes.
CHA RMAN -- might know something about this?
MR. MDHAN Yes.
CHA RMAN why are we hearing about it? Has she waived 14:57 her privilege in relation to this meeting?
MR. MDHAN Yes, she sent all of this information in to the Tribunal.
CHAN RMAN A11 right. And vis-à-vis part of the
conversation -- question from the Tribunal which was read to her: Have you heard the rumour about Maurice McCabe being a child abuser? And her saying yes, I did, and then it coming --
A. I went to tell Michael Keeley --

14:58 CHA RMAN Sorry, just hang on a minute. And said: I don't want to know. Is that accepted?
MR. MDHAN In relation to what information journalists had --

CHAL RMAN No, no, no, it's pretty straightforward. Is 14:58 that accepted?

MR. MDHAN He made it clear that he did not want to be put in a position where sources were told to him in that context. I think it's a different version of events, but in that context that was the basis of what was said.
A. Chairman, he said 'I don't want to know'.

MR. MDHAK Sorry, he did not want to know -- sorry, Chairman, he did not want to be put in the position of being told sources --
A. But that was my whole point, Chairman; like, what were we doing there? why -- we are meeting to not tell the Tribunal anything. I mean --
CHA RMAN So the Tribunal is writing letters to people, and what's the result? I mean, either we So what is the result of the Tribunal writing letters to people?
MR. MDHAK We11, sorry, Mr. Chairman, this information
was put before you by the witness, the current witness, and my client in this case, Ms. McCann, has a different version of events in relation to this. It just so happens, for yet the second time, both the parties to it have a fundamentally different version of events than this witness has given. I am challenging her credibility --

CHA RMAN We11, if you want to put a different version of a conversation, of course you are perfectly entitled to, Mr. Mohan, and I would welcome that indeed.
MR. MDHAN We11, what I want to do now if I may -CHA RMAN No, but this is actually important, because we have been spending the last year-and-a-half trying to find out things that we have been charged by the Oireachtas to do, and it is, this is our country, we owe allegiance to it. We are tasked with trying to find this information out. Now, it's appropriate, if you have a different version of the conversation, to please put it.
MR. MDHAN Sorry, the different version I am putting is that, in fact, Ms. McCann did not, because she was not in contact with Nóirín O'Sullivan, ever say that Nóirín O'Sullivan had told her anything whatsoever. CHA RMAK No, no, and I appreciate that. But it is -the Tribunal went to a lot of trouble to write an awful lot of letters to an awful lot of people, and furthermore, there were back-up letters, there were follow-up letters, many people never replied, we had to follow up in the case of some people a large number of
times, and then, apparently, if anything comes up, well then I'm given a submission on this, that and the other. But this is actually important, and it's important from the point of view of the other person having the conversation. If there's a different version of this conversation, it should be put.
MR. MOHAK Well --
CHA RMAN I am not talking about Ms. McCann; I am talking about the conversation with Michael Keeley. I mean, that's what I am talking about, that. I mean, Mr. Mohan, vis-à-vis Mrs. O'Reilly and what she was told, what is was saying was, well, I don't know what was behind it, I don't know whether it was the fisherman's tale of getting the 50 -pound salmon or whether it was the truth, but what I am telling you is that it was said. So that's one thing, I appreciate that. But then the other thing is, okay, source or no source, the Tribunal had asked for information, and I am now being told that that was blocked. Now, that's important. If there is a different version, I really ought to know.
MR. MOHAN I have an account, which you don't have, of that attendance that Mr. Keeley prepared following his conversation with Alison o'Reilly, and I have checked it, for some reason that didn't appear, although difficulty with that being put in. It's Mr. Keeley's account. I can read it, if I may.
CHA RMAN We11, yes, of course, but it's not for me,
it's for the witness.
MR. MDHAN Sorry, you did ask me, I have an account -CHA RMAK Well, I don't know why everyone is arguing with me and parsing and analysing everything I say.
Look, it is a very fundamental principle of law. It's from the point of view of fairness to Mr. Keeley, from the point of view of fairness to the witness and also from the point of view of the functionability of a tribunal in this Republic, as to whether any such thing happened. Now, of course I had no notice, and neither did you perhaps have any notice, I don't know, Mr. Mohan, certainly it's no blame, I am not sending any in your direction at all, that in answer to your question Ms. O'Reilly would tell me what she's just told me. But from the point of view of fairness, if there is a different version of the conversation, it should be put, out of fairness to her and out of fairness to Mr. Keeley as well.

MR. MDHAN I wonder, I'm going to -- not to waste the court's -- the Tribunal's time, I will go on to another and come back to this. But in the meantime I will have this photocopied and circulated so everybody has a copy of it, and I will return to that point. And this will be the version dealing with the point that you have made, if I may deal with it that way?
CHA RMAK Well, it's not exactly as if I am making a point; it is pretty fundamental.

MR. MDHAN We11, no, I am happy to deal with it, absolutely.

CHAN RMAN We11, that's fine. Grand.
MR. MDHAN I can read the note, but I think it might be better if everybody has a copy.
CHA RMAN We11, I'm not trying to interfere. I think you should take your own course. And I appreciate the questions you've put. Look, Ms. O'Reilly is saying: I had the conversation, it was such and such. You are saying you couldn't possibly have, because you never had, for instance, the Commissioner's number, there was no record of any communication between them. That's perfectly and utterly fair. But in the event there is an allegation of obstruction on the Tribunal, well that should be dealt with today, if possible.

MR. MDHAN I'm going to get copies of the note made and I will return to that, if I may. Ms. Leader is going to make copies of it.

CHA RMAN Yes, we will facilitate you every way we can.

MR. DOYLE: Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt on behalf of Ms. O'Reilly. If an issue has now arisen about a conversation with Mr. Keeley which Ms. O'Reilly had and it is now going to be put to Ms. O'Reilly that a contemporaneous, or near contemporaneous, note made by Mr. Keeley supports Mr. Keeley's version of that conversation, I suppose I just want to put the Tribunal on notice that $I$ will be asking, in re-examination, to introduce a contemporaneous, or near contemporaneous, note made by Ms. O'Reilly of the same conversation with Mr. Keeley. I hadn't appreciated that it was going to
become such an issue for the Tribunal.
CHA RMAN We11, things come up and sometimes they seem to be important at the time and suddenly their importance gets lost and other times things come up which are not important and they assume importance later on. So let's not get too excited about it, but the reality is, this is important, because the Tribunal has been doing its very best to get information out of people, and I wouldn't like to think that it is obstructed and I wouldn't like to think that in the event that someone says it was obstructed, that the matter should be left unchallenged or at least an event should not be put forward, out of fairness to both parties, Browne v. Dunn. So we'll come back to that, and if you have --
MR. MOHAN I have no difficulty with that.
CHA RMAN Yes. No, if you have got something that you want me to photocopy, well then we'11 facilitate that as well, of course, and we'11 put it in the materials. If that's all right, then, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Mohan, we will carry on as best we can.

475 Q. MR. MDHAN Ms. O'Reilly, I will come back to that in a moment. But you know a Mr. Alan Crohan, is that correct?
A. I do, yes, yes.

476 Q. You give the same information to Mr. Alan Crohan in October 2016, is that correct?
A. I did, yes.

477 Q. And you gave that information to him because we know
that he wrote to Ms. Claire Daly TD with that information, isn't that correct?
A. I don't know.

478 Q. We11, it's in the Tribunal documentation, because, yet again, there are photo snaps of text communications between you and Ms. McCann which could only have come from you because they didn't come from Ms. McCann?
A. Okay.
A. I think he probably made that decision himself.
Q. Why were you giving the information to Alan Crohan knowing that he was going to give it to Claire Daly?
A. Well, I didn't know he was going to give it to Claire Daly, but I know now. But, I mean, I have given it to the Tribunal, it's the same thing.
481 Q. When you were giving it to Alan Crohan, what did you say to Alan Crohan about it?
A. I was just talking to him about what should I do about this.

482 Q. Were you disappointed when Claire Daly didn't raise it in the Dáil?
A. Not at all, no. Sure it's been raised now and we're here now.
record when you gave it via Alan Crohan to Claire Daly?
A. Not at a11. I had nothing to do with that.

484 Q. Sorry, you gave this same information to Alan Crohan, Alan Crohan gives it to Claire Daly, and I am suggesting you knew full well that that is what he was going to do with it and I am suggesting to you he told you that's what he did with it.
A. This is the first time $I$ have heard this.
Q. Is it?
A. It is.

486 Q. Are you aware that there are what are called photographs of texts that you had sent to -- you had sent and received from Ms. McCann contained in that information?
A. I showed them to Alan, I gave them to Alan. But, I mean, I've given them to the Tribunal.

487 Q. I --
A. I mean, it is not uncommon to share with your friends concerns that you have. And if he felt he wanted to raise it --

488 Q. Very we11.
A. -- that's fine.

489 Q. You see, why I want to put to you is that at the same time that you wrote to -- or gave this information to Alan Crohan and at the same time he wrote to Claire Daly, on 18th October 2016 you made a complaint to the Workplace Relations Commission about my client, your employer.
A. That's correct.
Q. Oh, you have, you have indeed. So that on 20th January, when you now know that the Labour Court won't
have a legitimate claim that I am taking to the High Court, Chairman, and it's got absolutely nothing to do with the Tribunal.

We11, you then at that stage were obviously
contemplating it, because the following month you, in fact, issued, if you like, a third prong of attack, you issued defamation proceedings against your employer?
A. I had been in discussions with my solicitor for months and months. The timing of it is the timing of it.
It's when papers are prepared and it's when your senior 15:09 counsel is able to sign off on them. And obviously you have to do it within a year. But, I mean, you're not telling the Tribunal any news. My defamation case and personal injuries case was in the Irish Times and a few other papers. Everybody knows, it's no secret. But I 15:09 just don't think it's anything to do with the Tribunal; it's a completely separate matter --
498 Q. Would it not --
A. -- that is before the High court.

499 Q. Would it not have been helpful if you had told Mr.
Howlin that you were at war with your employer, that he might have maybe had a more rounded picture, that you are giving hearsay evidence about what another employee in your employer's company had told you and yet you're having these conflicts with him? Do you not think that's relevant?
A. No, I don't. I actually told my friend and he -- I had been speaking to him for a whole year and had been getting support off him in relation to how $i 11$ I was,
so I'm sure he told George Lawlor and it's there on the Internet, people have written about it.

500 Q. No, I'm --
A. But it's got absolutely nothing to do with today, Chairman. I have an issue with my employers for a very, very good reason, but it's before the High Court and I don't wish to prejudice my case.

I can go into chapter and verse, but I am sure the Tribunal won't want me to do that and I'11 stay clear of it. But we know as a matter of record and as a matter of fact you have a three-pronged legal attack against your employer; I'm suggesting that would have been very relevant information, given that, what you are describing, was giving indirect information about what another employee had told you.
A. The issues with Maurice McCabe, Chairman, were in 2014, at a time when $I$ was being nominated as journalist of the year. The incident that happened with the Mail two years later was extremely distressing for me and my entire family. And just because I'm taking a legal case against my employers, which everybody knows about anyway, doesn't mean that my statement to the Tribunal is not correct. I've told the Tribunal everything. Do you not think $I$ would have considered all of these things?
502 Q. I am suggesting to you you should have given this information to the people you were, as it were, passing on indirect information, because $I$ am suggesting to you it had, and the desired effect was to, I suppose, cause
damage, reputational damage to your employer.
A. Chairman, I've told the Tribunal everything I know, and I don't think -- like, Dave Taylor was up in the Tribunal a few weeks ago and he's actually told the Tribunal he is Debbie McCann's source, which wasn't, he 15:12 wasn't cross-examined by the Mail. I mean, she has -I've just heard this morning she's effectively accepted a lot of the private conversations we had about Maurice McCabe. I've showed you text messages that contextualise that. But, I mean, just because I'm taking a legal case has nothing to do with this.

503 Q. But would it not have been better to let the people who gave you that information have that information so they could take a view on it?
A. Pardon?

504 Q. Would it not have been better to have given that information to the individual to whom you spoke so they might have had been in a position to take their own view on it?
A. which individuals are you talking about?

505 Q. I am talking about Mr. Brendan Howlin.
A. Well, George Lawlor knew very well that I was sick. I was actually confiding in him, and he is the one that put me in touch with Brendan Howlin, and I opened my conversation with Brendan Howlin saying I'm after on-line. I'm sure Mr. Howlin, with his years of expertise in the Dáil, did his own checks on me before he made his speech to the Dáil.

CHA RMAN Mr. Mohan, if I can just say, I have no problem if you feel that you should put the highlights, for instance, of the legal case and, for instance, what it is that is alleged to have happened. I am clearly not able to decide it, but there's now a disconnect vis-à-vis dates. You said your legal case was started in 2016 and all of the conversations vis-à-vis Maurice McCabe were 2013, 2014, so after. But I would assume that whatever the events were that 1ed to, and whatever it was, whoever is in the right and in the wrong, obviously you have my sympathy on all sides, but I'm not making a decision on it.
A. Sure.

CHA RMAN But I just don't know. If Mr. Mohan wishes to put when whatever you allege happened, happened, in terms of a date, it may help us, I don't know.

MR. DOYLE: Sorry, Chairman, again, I am sorry, on behalf of Ms. O'Reilly. In my respectful submission, if this is cross-examination as to credit, the Tribunal has been over that ground in great depth, and I would respectfully adopt the submission made by to the Tribunal by Mr. McGuinness in the early stages. But if it is cross-examination as to credit, I cannot see what else it is, I would respectfully submit that if the Tribunal is minded to allow the cross-examination to go 15:14 into the minutiae and the detail of Ms. O'Reilly's action against the Daily Mail, that that is not a place that the Tribunal should go.
CHAN RMAN No, no, Mr. Doyle, I see what you are saying
and I do understand, and certainly it's not my desire to chase a hare down a side alley and be stuck there for weeks or days, or even minutes or hours. But there is a disconnect in terms of time and one can describe these things, for instance, by saying on such and such a day did you issue a Plenary Summons alleging that on such and such a day so-and-so rolled over your foot in a car? Now, appreciating that if this is a stress case or a bullying case, it may be more difficult, but if I simply had the dates when what was ever alleged to have 15:15 happened, happened, I'd be content with that and I've no intention of following it up or allowing further evidence in relation to it. So that's what I was trying to say.
MR. MDHAN May it please the court -- Chairman.
506 Q. Ms. O'Reilly, you wrote an article in the newspaper on Sunday the 27th March which carried an interview following you attending at the home of a Ms. Louise James who had lost several members of her family, including her husband and two children, in a tragic accident when the car which they were in slipped off a pier in Buncrana, County Donegal, is that correct?
A. Yes, and I wrote it with two journalists from the Mail on-line also.

CHA RMAN Do we have a year for that? I know that -- $15: 16$
A. 2016.

507 Q. MR. MDHAN 2016. And you did so following you speaking to Ms. Louise James on Good Friday of 25 th March 2016, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

508 Q. And we know that Ms. Louise James then initiated legal proceedings against the newspaper on the basis of what she thought was the manner in which you had gained access and got an interview with her, is that correct?
A. We had been warned by freelance photographer -- or a freelance journalist, Stephen Maguire, the next day not to run the story. But they ran it anyway.
509 Q. You attended at her house accompanied by children of yours and were let into the house and had a conversation, which at that stage the bereaved widow wasn't aware was going to be treated in that manner, and she took exception to that, is that correct?
A. I made it clear to Ms. James, Chairman, that I was a journalist with the Irish Mail on Sunday, that I was doing a story and that $I$ taped it in line with what we normally do in The Mail on Sunday, we secretly tape things for our own protection in case you are accused of fake news or in case you are attacked.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, those seem to be the broad 15:17 elements of the thing.

510 Q. MR. MDHAN Yeah. And in any event, a settlement was arrived at between the newspaper and Ms. James, as a result of which an apology was published, and that apology was to the effect that they made it clear that: 15:17
"Loui se James understood that she was speaking to a reporter" -- which was you -- "in a purel y private capacity, and had not consented to bei ng intervi ewed.

She did not wi sh to gi ve interviews to media outlets, we are happy to make that clear. We apol ogi se to Loui se James and her family for the upset caused."

That was the apology published, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

511 Q. An investigation follows that and, in that, you were investigated --
A. I'd just like to say - sorry, if you don't mind - it had been fully accepted, chairman, that I had interviewed Louise James, it had been fully accepted that other journalists have brought their children on jobs in the Mail if you're stuck for a childminder, but there was a specific reason why my children were up there that day. Also --
CHA RMAN We don't need to go into it. I am not making any judgment either against you or for you, I'm not doing the case.
A. I just --

CHA RMAN No, no, no, I appreciate that.
A. I just feel it's pretty unfair. Like, these are my employers and this is a separate case.

CHA RMAN No, and I do appreciate that. I do, I understand. But do you understand the relevance of it?
A. I do, Chairman, but --

CHA RMAN Well, what is basically being said is that essentially you either take such a warped view of things that this stuff is coming from your unconscious and you don't know the difference between what's real
and what's unreal, or else that you're inventing the whole thing out of bitterness against your employer. That is the basic bottom line in relation to all of this. It may not be said to you, but that is what this kind of cross-examination is about. So if you just listen to Mr. Mohan's questions, that is what they are directed to. And by the way, it's nothing to do with him, he is a very nice man. This is what his instructions are.

MR. MDHAN Thank you, Chairman.
"I note the sanction. Just to be absol utel y clear, I fully accept my er ror of judgement. I want to put it behi nd me. I want to conti nue working for the Mail. I want the opportunity to prove myself. I look forward to working on feat ures and wel come any trai ning that would be gi ven and I embrace it. The last few months have taught me a lot of us here need to look at how we
work. On the basis of that, l accept the sanction and l ook forward to getting back to work. "

Isn't that correct?
A. I was very heavily medicated, Chairman, and to the point where Sebastian Hamilton had actually called my representative aside and said: Should we proceed with this? I have never seen her look so bad. And that was the advice $I$ was given in those circumstances.
CHA RMAN All right. Well, those are the ups and downs of it, Mr. Mohan, yes.

515 Q. MR. MDHAN And it's out of that you are challenging that sanction in those proceedings, as I understand it, isn't that correct?
A. No, I am challenging how Mr. Keeley got his apology from me and how I was treated by the company. But again, it's got nothing to do with this.
516 Q. Ms. O'Reilly, what age are you?
A. 43 .

517 Q. How many years have you worked as a journalist in the rough and tumble of the media world?
A. 23 years.

518 Q. I mean, with respect, are you portraying yourself as some kind of woman who is simply unable to cope with the stresses and strains of ordinary working life?
A. I don't know any journalist who was ever put at the heart of a fake news story that exploded all over the world and it had a very, very, very bad impact on me and I was very sick and, at the same time, running
paralle1 to that, Chairman, I had a very credible death threat against my life and I was receiving Garda briefings regularly, and those briefings continue, and the threat to my family has currently -- is currently being investigated by Gardaí.
CHA RMAN Al1 right, you don't need to go into that.
A. It's just a very difficult time.

CHA RMAN No, and I can appreciate it's a very difficult time. But again, we are coming off the point.
A. I never had an issue up until then.

CHA RMAN And I think the point is -- the point that is being made to you is you have an issue with Mr. Keeley, you have an issue with your employer and that, therefore, your evidence shouldn't be accepted. That's 15:21 what's being put to you.
A. I understand.

CHAN RMAN And it's fair to put it to you.
A. No, I do, I totally understand.

CHA RMAN And then I think if you want to answer that and make a comment about it, you are very free to do so.
A. Thank you, Chairman. I was in the middle of a security briefing, getting a very, very serious briefing about a death threat, when michael Keeley came down in a taxi to a Garda station and called me out of the briefing, a couple of hours after telling me the company had decided to apologise to Louise James, and got me to sign the apology in those circumstances. Three days
later, a fake news story was written about me, which Michael Keeley and my employers accepted isn't accurate and does not reflect what's in my recording, and I have a conversation with Conor o'Donnell, who told me that I did interview Louise James and that they only apologised to her because that is what she wanted, and he wanted to know if I was okay. And it was only then when I started saying please get that fake news down, that suddenly there was an internal inquiry. And that's what happened, and it was very, very difficult, Chairman. But again, I'm telling the Tribunal everything I know in relation to Maurice McCabe, and I have considered all of these things before I made my statement. It was very important to consider these things.
519 Q. MR. MDHAK Is the fake news story the apology?
A. No, a priest gave a fake news story to a newspaper that ran on the front page, a priest that wasn't even there. It circulated all over the world. I have text messages to michael Keeley the next day saying, please can you get this down, this is damaging my reputation, this is so bad, my children are being picked on, everybody -CHA RMAN No, no, I understand.
A. It was just awful.

CHA RMAN I think there comes a point where I have to say, having invited you to put the details, but the reason for my asking was to see how it fits in terms of time. So this is --
MR. MDHAK I will ask no more questions --

CHA RMAN So this is 2016 and it relates to that awful tragedy on the pier.

MR. MDHAN I am going to move away from --
CHA RMAN And everything that happened in relation thereto.

MR. DOYLE: Sorry to interrupt again, but you,
Chairman, have interpreted the line of questioning from the Mail, and I would like, if the Mail wants to put it to Ms. O'Reilly fair and square that her evidence to this Tribunal is not to be believed (a) because she is consumed with bitterness because of her ongoing legal action or (b) because she is deluded in some way, I would like that to be put fair and square to her by the Mail and not just through the Chairman.
CHA RMAN No, no, but I am -- calm is a great thing if we can ever achieve it. So you've heard what Mr. Doyle has said. Are you deluded, do you think, making very bad mistakes in consequence of being unable to discern fact from reality, or are you telling the Tribunal a whole load of lies about Debbie McCann because of bitterness against her or the Mail or Mr. Keeley, or anything like that?
A. Absolutely not, Chairman. CHA RMAN A11 right.
A. I love my job, I'm a very proud journalist and I keep myself to myself and I continue to work in the Mail. But I'm glad you raised this stuff now, because it's an eye-opener.
CHA RMAN Al1 right. Well, there it is.

MR. MDHAN Very good.
CHA RMAN If you are happy with that, Mr. Mohan?
MR. MDHAN I am indeed. Thank you, Chairman. I am now going to go back to the attendance. I wonder has that been circulated?

CHA RMAN It is. We have all got a copy, yes.
MR. MDHAK Ms. O'Reilly will have seen this before, Chairman, but you won't. And I'm going to read it into the record, because this is what Mr. Keeley typed up from his interaction with you and sent to you and I think you made amendments to it. I don't have those amendments here, but I will read this to you as it is Mr. Keeley's account and therefore his --
CHAN RMAN And you, as the client, have waived legal professional privilege in relation to this?
A. (Witness Nods)

CHAN RMAN You are telling me yes?
A. Yes.

520 Q. MR. MDHAN 5th April 2017:
"I met with Alison Ó Reilly in the Conrad Hotel.
Al ison has never been in contact with former Commi ssi oner Martin Calli nan and Commi ssi oner O Sullivan or Garda Keith Harrison. Al i son has met with Sergeant Maurice McCabe. She was put in touch
with Ser geant McCabe through contacts she had with Garda John Wilson. She met Sergeant MkCabe at his home. She thi nks that was late 2013 or early 2014. They had a lengt hy di scussi on about the issue of
penalty poi nts and thei r removal. Ser geant McCabe showed Al ison files he had on the topic but she did not read them He told her that he had been targeted by seni or Gardaí si nce he had rai sed the i ssue. He appeared di stressed to Al ison. Al i son asked Sergeant MLCabe if he woul d consi der telling his story to the newspaper, but he declined. Al ison was aware of the sexual assault allegation agai nst Sergeant McCabe before she met him She was not, however, told this by another garda. Ser geant McCabe deni ed the all egation to her. Subsequent to this meeting, Al i son spoke with Ser geant MLCabe on a couple of occasi ons by tel ephone. At the meeting and subsequently Sergeant McCabe was critical of Commissi oner Callinan and bel ieved he had a role in the campai gn agai nst him He was upset that a number of Gardaí were aware of the sexual assault allegation agai nst him Alison has no recollection of Sergeant McCabe ever mentioning Superintendent Dave Tayl or. Al i son has spoken on over five occasi ons to Superintendent David Tayl or. She did so on the tel ephone, either on her regul ar mobile or on an ofice phone, and he never mentioned Ser geant Maurice McCabe to her. She has never met Superintendent Tayl or nor does not know hi mwell. She tended to do so when Debbi e McCann was off. She remenbers speaking with hi m 15:27 in September 2013 about an allegation that the accused in the $X$ case was being investi gated over a rape allegation. Little came of this and no story appeared. No garda ever told Al ison of the sexual assault agai nst

Sergeant MkCabe. She does not know of the compl ai nant and never approached her or her family. She never spoke with Martin Callinan or John MEGui nness, TD, about their meeting on 24th January 2014. She di d not speak with Brendan How in, TD, and was not a source for 15:27 hi s Dáil statements about Sergeant McCabe on 8th February 2017."

That's Mr. Michael Keeley's note and therefore his account of what took place between you at that meeting. 15:27
A. As I explained to the Tribunal, Chairman, the reason why I didn't finish off that conversation with Michae1 Keeley, because he didn't want to know. And I looked at this, he sent this to me on e-mail, I read it, I didn't go through it line by-line, but I knew at that point that he would have known Debbie McCann was up at Ms. D's house, and I just reply to him, I asked him maybe to -- that Maurice McCabe didn't go through his files, or something like that, and, to be honest, I didn't go through it line for line. At that point I'd already made contact with Gus Cullen Solicitors and I had given him my notes of that meeting and I explained, because I made a phone call the next day, I was in Tuam, I made a phone call to him and told him. And then I followed what Michael Keeley had told the
Tribunal in its opening day and he hadn't told them anything. And at that point $I$ just said I'm going to go and get legal advice, because Maurice McCabe knows I was up at his house, he knows what I told him, John

Wilson knows, there's texts on my phone. Michael
Keeley told me that the Tribunal was sending out court orders or something to do with phones and I just said the best thing is, you know, to tell the Tribunal what I know, and that was the legal advice I received.
CHA RMAK Yes, Ms. o'reilly, do you have any -- and do you have any big problem with this insofar as it goes?
A. No.

CHA RMAN okay.
521 Q.
MR. MOHAN And just to finish off, Ms. o'reilly, at
this stage you must have been in and out with solicitors on a very regular basis; at this stage you have now three full-blown legal attacks against your employer in being, isn't that correct?
A. I continue to work there. I am still a full-time employee of the Mail, I like my job, but I am still entitled to tell the Tribunal what $I$ know and I am still entitled to take a legal case if I believe that I was defamed and treated very badly. I just don't see what the relevance is.
522 Q. I haven't asked you about any of that. I just want to -- I think you accept, therefore, as a matter of record, you're in conclave with your lawyers over many different types of issue, for whatever reason, at this point in time?
A. I have a legal case against my employer, everybody knows that.

MR. MDHAN Thank you very much.
MR. MARR NAN Sorry, sir, just before Mr. Mohan
finishes, a large portion, nearly an hour of the witness's evidence today, in the first instance, concerned conversations that the witness says that she had with Debbie McCann. A lot of that is highly significant as far as the Tribunal is concerned. It includes Debbie McCann's interactions, or stated interactions with Superintendent Taylor, how she came to know the address of Ms. D, her interaction with her own father. They're all set out there at page 3830.
That has been in circulation for a long period of time now, and, despite repeated requests of Ms. McCann, both by the investigators and by the Tribunal, we actually don't have a different version of events. And obviously under the rule in Browne v Dunn, there is an obligation on the party to put an alternative version of events, and I'm just wondering where the Tribunal stands in relation to this. Are we to take it that this evidence is accepted because it hasn't been challenged?
CHA RMAN We11, I suppose if I have to mention Browne ${ }^{15: 31}$ v. Dunn again, I will get quite excited, but in probably very much the wrong way. But it seems, Mr. Mohan, that there is a point there that Mr. Marrinan makes that needs to be considered. I mean, are you going to put your client's instructions in relation to these things? Because that's what this process is all about.
MR. MOHAN I appreciate that.
CHA RMAN And every single case, whether it is
criminal or otherwise, the Supreme Court has said it, you have to put your client's instructions to the person who is saying something against your client or something relevant to your client about which you, on behalf of the person, know something. That's the law.
MR MOHAK I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. And Mr. Marrinan very helpfully put my -- Ms. McCann's words on these issues that are contained in her statement, to this witness, and I have nothing further to add on it.
CHA RMAN So you accept it all?
MR. MDHAK I have nothing further to add on it. CHA RMAN No, no, that's not good enough, Mr. Mohan. Ms. O'Reilly is saying, she said these things to me. On behalf of your client, are you going to say, well, no, she didn't, and here is the alternative version of the conversation which I want to put to you, because -MR. MDHAN Sorry --
CHA RMAN -- this is more likely?
MR. MOHAN This was put this morning, and I repeat, this is a quote from the statement given to the Tribunal by Ms. Debbie McCann:
"I wasn't invol ved --"

This is at 169, page 3739, and I quote:
"I wasn't i nvol ved in any or chestrated campai gn to mal i gn Sergeant Mauri ce McCabe. I have no evi dence of
any orchestrated campai gn to malign Sergeant Maurice MLCabe. The allegations that we are looking at at the time were di scussed in the office. I certainly did not negativel y brief Al i son Ó Reilly. We certai nl y would have di scussed the allegations. As journalists we become aware of allegations all of the time. Our job is to investi gate themto see if we can substantiate them and publ ish them and if they are in the public interest. But until proven, they are treated only as an allegation. The allegations were di scussed in a pri vate capacity. They were never going to be ai red and shared with anyone el se. I work primarily on crime in The Mail on Sunday. Al i son would al so have worked on crime and we would have di scussed stories all the time together. She was a colleague and a friend at that poi nt and any di scussi on around stories were in that context. Just to say it wasn't a briefing in any description, it was a di scussi on among colleagues. To cl arify, any di scussi on was into the allegation they were looking at, as l've al ready descri bed above in my st at ement. "

And I can't put it in any further. That is her account of -- her recollection of events at that time.
MR. MARRI NAN with the greatest of respect, sir, that doesn't come anywhere close with dealing with the evidence that's been presented to the Tribunal. A witness cannot -- or a party cannot simply rely on a broad general statement when specifics have been given
of conversations had with the witness. Now, if the witness's evidence isn't being challenged, the Tribunal will have to take it, in my respectful submission, on the basis that the evidence stands.

MR. MDHAN I'm not offering any further submissions other than what I have already given to the Tribunal. CHA RMAN We11, Mr. Mohan, I am wondering is that wise? I mean --

MR. MDHAN They are my instructions, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Well, now, I mean, let's just take an example and let's move away from this, because it's your client, and Ms. O'Reilly is sitting there, so let's take an example; there is, let us say, a road traffic accident and Mr. A, who is sitting up in a window at the top floor of his home, witnesses the road 15:34 traffic accident -- and I don't know if you want to listen to me, Mr. Mohan or --

MR. MDHAN I am listening, sorry, Chairman. CHA RMAN And Mr. A sees a car going through a red light and causing an unfortunate motorcyclist to be hit 15:34 and, let's say, to lose his leg. Now, that is the witness statement that Mr. A, let us say, puts in to the solicitor appearing on behalf of the motorcyclist. But independent of that, Mr. A has a person with whom he talks quite regularly, let us say, in a pool hall, person in the pool hall, according to the person in the pool hall, which is to the effect that, no, the light for the car was green and the motorcyclist went through
a red light and he saw the whole thing perfectly but he had a great deal of sympathy with the young man. Now, let's suppose that evidence is given in a case. It's not enough, I don't think, in the event that the man in the upstairs window, who is the main witness, independent of the two parties, it's not enough just to say, well, my client is going to give evidence. I think in the event that the man in the pool hall has a different version of events to give, that needs to be put on behalf of the man driving the car and the specifics of it need to be put, because it's (a) in terms of fairness to the witness, and it's (b) in terms of actually the mechanics of any form of judgment-making, that I should have the opportunity, I should have the opportunity - and this, by the way, is my right - I should have the opportunity to hear what the alternative of the conversation is that is being put.

Now, how can any judge sitting in any court adjudicate on the basis that parties come into court and say, well, I'm saying silent in relation to all of this or I'm not going to put my clients' case, I'm not going to put an alternative version of this conversation, I'm not going to put the basis of a misunderstanding, or indeed to say instead, well, isn't there a reason you're bitter, but not put the alternative version? I think, Mr. Mohan, unless you have something to offer and unless I'm getting the law completely wrong, I
think that needs to be done. I think Mr. Marrinan is correct. I mean, I know it's shooting the breeze, I know they are all in a place together and they're talking about this, that and the other, but if there's an alternative, for instance, as to what the source of the information was, as to where Ms. D lived, her address, if she's saying no, I didn't say that to Alison O'Reilly, well then if she said something different, I think I actually need to hear that. I need to hear the response of Ms. O'Reilly to that. I mean, this is basic stuff.

MR MDHAK I think, again, I can only put it this way, Mr. Chairman. The very --
CHA RMAN No, I think you really ought to think about this, Mr. Mohan.
MR. MOHAN May it please you.
CHA RMAN You know, it may be that your client is taking a strong view I don't want Alison o'Reilly cross-examined, but, I am sorry, she can't take that view and, as counsel appearing on her behalf, you can't ${ }^{15: 38}$ take that view, because I actually have a right to hear what the alternative version of a conversation is. If the evidence were to be, for instance, oh, I don't remember any such conversation and it's highly unlikely that I ever had such a conversation, well that is an instruction. It may not be very satisfactory in terms of judging Ms. O'Reilly's reaction to it, but certainly many, many people have told me in this Tribunal, 'I forget completely', but that may be it. But if in the
event it's merely a question of forgetting completely and if ms. o'reilly has a very good recollection, well then I have to consider that when I go back to try and formulate a finding of fact on this. And it actually is important.
MR. MOHAN Well, maybe, in light of that, I will take further instructions on the issue.
CHAI RMAN Yes. I'm sorry if you have to come back tomorrow, but everyone is doing their best, and it's quite often the case that things happen and it seems that -- well, let's just carry on. So we'11 leave it until tomorrow.
MR. MDHAN May it please --
CHAL RMAN Will we call Mr. Howlin now then?
MR. MARRI NAN If at all possible
CHA RMAN Yes, well, I think it would be. And if we could -- I'm sure we could trot through his evidence and get away.
MR. MARRI NAN I'd imagine no more than five or ten minutes, as far as I am concerned
CHA RMAN Why don't we do that. And I'm sorry to interrupt your evidence and thank you very much for being here. You're coming back tomorrow.

THE WTNESS THEN STOOD DONW

MR. BRENDAN HOVZI N, HAV NG BEEN SVORN, WAS EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN

523 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Your credentials are well known to the Tribunal, so we don't need to recite them. You provided a statement to the Tribunal on 15th March of last year concerning your interactions with the last witness, Alison O'Reilly, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

524 Q. It's at page 1692 of the materials. And your
supplemental statement that you made to the Tribunal appears later on, but $I$ will come to that in due course. I think you refer to the fact that you returned to your Dáil office at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, 8th February of 2017, when you were told by your chief of staff, Neil Ward, that a journalist, Ms. O'Reilly, wanted to speak to you in relation to the ongoing Garda Commissioner controversy, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

525 Q. And I think that you telephoned Ms. O'Reilly from your office. And will you just tell us what she advised you?
A. We11, I made a note and typed it up on the day, and it's basically what I submitted in the letter to the Tribunal subsequently. She had contacted my she had taken a deep interest in the whole controversy about Sergeant McCabe, felt passionately that she had information that needed to be imparted, in fact put
into the public domain. She -- my parliamentary assistant rang my Dái 1 office. I was out of the office at that time. When I came back, as I say, I rang Ms. O'Reilly and she told me exactly as I set out in my letter to the Tribunal of 13th march. Do you want me to read through it?
526 Q. Yes, if you would, just, please, briefly. It's fairly short.
A. Yes. Ms. O'Reilly worked, as I said, in the office of The Mail on Sunday.
"She informed me that The Mail on Sunday crime correspondent, ME. Debbie MkCann, had ongoi ng cormuni cation with Garda Cormíssi oner Nói rín O Sul Iivan during 2013 and 2014. Ms. O Reilly said that
ME. MECann tol d her that the Cormissioner had gi ven information to her claiming serious sexual misconduct on the part of Sergeant MECabe. It involved a girl in Cavan whomit was alleged had been abused by Sergeant MECabe. ME. O Reilly said that ME. MECann, after the conversation, described Sergeant MECabe as a dirty $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{i}$ ng bastard. She said that these matters had been di scussed generally in the office of The Mail on Sunday. ME. O Reilly said that Superintendent David Tayl or and Commissioner Nói rín O Sullivan had both provi ded this type of information directly to Mb. McCann. She further informed me that she would be willing to make a statement to an inquiry on these matters."

527 Q. Now, I think she subsequently -- you spoke to her again by telephone just before you attended the Dáil for the Leaders' Questions, is that right?
A. That is correct. I obviously had to consider exactly what was happening, and I think probably putting it in the context of that week would be important. The previous day, Tuesday, the Cabinet had determined, on foot of a scoping report by Mr Justice Iarfh1aith O'Neill, to establish a Commission of Investigation. The terms of reference had been published by the government the previous day, that Tuesday, and they were to be debated that week in the Dáil. I think it is important to say that the normal course of events in terms of the establishment of a terms of reference for a commission of investigation, and I'm afraid we've 15:44 gone through an awful lot of them - in fact, I think there's another one to be established next Tuesday week, into another matter - but is that there is discussions with certainly leaders of Opposition. If you take, for example, the Siteserv one, there's been a 15:44 number of formal meetings with opposition leaders to discuss the terms of reference.

This was a particularly important commission because it went to the heart of policing in our country and it was 15:44 a cause of concern for me that we hadn't had discussions. In fact, the terms of reference were what were proffered by Mr. Justice Iarfhlaith O'Neill, and on foot of his report, which, in fact, was not
published or circulated. So the Dáil itself and I felt I, as a leader of a party in the Dáil, was put in a very difficult position in order to determine a terms of reference to an inquiry without any proper consultation. And I certainly felt, once I'd had that conversation with Ms. O'Reilly, that the import of that needed to be said, needed to be considered by the Oireachtas in the context of considering the terms of reference, and ultimately, as you know, it wasn't, in fact, a commission of investigation, but within a matter of days it was determined, because of the volume of information that came into the public domain in the couple of days subsequent, in particular the RTE programme, that there should be a tribunal of inquiry established to look into these matters, with much broader terms of reference.

In fact, on foot of that $I$ made a submission myself to the Tánaiste and Minister for Justice the following week on these matters. So I then formulated what I was 15:45 going to say in leader's questions on these matters, I telephoned Ms. O'Reilly in advance of going into the Dáil to make sure that she was comfortable with that, read exactly what I was going to say to her and she had no difficulty with me saying that. And I made my statement to the Dáil on that basis.

528 Q. And that's to be found at page 7360 of the materials, if that could be put up on the screen. The relevant paragraph is the second paragraph down:
"Thi s morning a journalist contacted me and tol d me they had di rect know edge of calls made by the Garda Commi ssi oner to journalists during 2013 and 2014 in the course of whi ch the Commissioner made very serious allegations of sexual crimes having been committed by Ser geant Mauri ce MkCabe. In 2015 the Garda
Commi ssi oner oversaw the investi gation whi ch examined the call logs of a Garda officer who was under suspi ci on of leaking material to the media. If it was 15:47 a fact that the Garda Commissi oner was in di rect contact with the media making allegation agai nst one of her own officers at around the same time, it would be quite extraordinary. I did not know whet her the charges that had been made agai nst the Garda Commi ssi oner are true or not."

And you made that very clear in your speech to the Dái1. Now, I think that later on, on the afternoon of 8th February, you again spoke with Ms. O'Reilly to make sure that she was all right with what you had publicly said in your Dáil statement and she said 'Well done, fair play to you', is that right?
A. That's exactly right.

529 Q. Now, I think that the Tribunal wrote to you on 13th 15:47 February 2018 with enclosures, which were the statements made by Ms. Alison O'Reilly. And that's at page 6380. You were here this afternoon, you heard me go through that with her?
A. Hmm .

530 Q. And there doesn't seem to be any real issues between the two of you in relation to your interactions. Are you happy enough with that?
A. Absolutely. I think we had some debate about -- you had some debate about the word using "direct" knowledge. But other than that, the substance of the information that she gave me has been confirmed by Alison, yeah.
531 Q. Yes. And we heard her make reference to the issue of privacy and whether or not her name should've been disclosed to the Tribunal in circumstances where you hadn't contacted her prior to doing that. Could you just tell us your view in relation to that?
A. Well, as I set out in my letter, it's one issue that I'm very, very careful about. I think there's a few of us, Chairman, who have experience of a previous Tribunal, I notice Mr. Marrinan and you, Chairman, and myse1f --
CHAN RMAN I'd gone by that point?
A. Oh, had you left the Morris Tribunal?

CHA RMAN I had. I'm very, very certain of that.
A. But in terms of protecting sources is a very important issue for me - in fact $I$ wrote it into a programme for government and we changed the law to protect the private communication with TDs. I think it's a really important issue and it's an issue that I don't make mistakes about, because it's important to me in relation to that. And that's -- it's why I read first
the statement that my informant was willing to give evidence to the Tribunal. And of course, the only time, the only time where $I$ mentioned either the names of Alison O'Reilly or Debbie McCann was in my letter to the Tribunal. I on no other occasion and in no other circumstance divulged those names.

But I thought in response to your request, Chairman, it was important for me to be completely frank in relation to that. And I certain7y was strongly of the view that 15:50 that was understood. I understand now there may have been a confusion on that matter, but my understanding was crystal clear. In fact I spoke to the Dáil the following day, 9th February and the Dái1 record will show, among other things, I've said:
"I can al so informthe house that my source for the inf ormation l put on the record yesterday has gi ven consent for their name to be provi ded to Mr. Justice Charlet on and has made clear to me their willingness to 15:50 provi de Mr. Justice Charl et on with all the information at their di sposal."

And that was my understanding and it remains my understanding.
532 Q. MR. MARRI NAN And indeed you were interviewed on Morning Ireland on the following day, 9th February 2017. And if we could just have 7366 up on the screen --
A. I think "interviewed" is a way of putting it, yeah.

533 Q. Yeah. But all that I'm concerned about in relation to this is you were asked the question:
"Can l check one thing first of all about you? The following conversation with a journalist, is the journal ist who spoke to you prepared to gi ve evi dence to the new i nqui ry under Judge Charl et on?"

And you answered:
"That ultimatel y would be a matter for the journalist concer ned. "

And then:
"You mean you don't know?
A. I spoke to the person yesterday and yesterday bef ore

I went into the Dáil l was told by that person that they would be willing to make the same statements in a public forum"

And that confirms what you've told the Chairman.
A. Yes.

534 Q. Is there anything else you'd like to add in relation to 15:52 your evidence?
A. No.

535 Q. Oh, sorry, just one matter that is a matter that we have been asking other members of the Dáil when they
come to the Tribuna1; had you heard any rumours circulating in 2013 and early 2014 in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. I confess I haven't -- I hadn't. I was fairly involved in government at that stage and I'm afraid I was completely focused on economic matters. So I didn't. I heard rumours later when we came out of government, but I hadn't been privy to those sort of rumours certainly in the years you mention.
MR. MARRI NAN And indeed Deputy Shatter 1ikewise hadn't heard rumours about it and he informed the Tribunal of that. Thank you very much.
CHA RMAK Any questions from anybody? You don't have any questions?
MR. DI GNMM I have some questions, Chairman, but they won't take very long.

MR. MDHAN I have some questions as well.
CHA RMAN That's fine. We11, who wants -- sorry, was that Mr. Ó Muicheartaigh? I'm sorry, I beg your pardon, I didn't -- oh, It's Mr. Mohan.
MR. MDHAN Sorry, Hugh Mohan --
CHA RMAN Sorry Mr. Mohan, yes. A11 right, if you want to ask questions then please go ahead.
MR. MDHAN should I go first?
CHA RMAN Yes.

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

536 Q.
MR. MDHAN Sorry, Mr. Howlin, just a number of brief
questions. You'11 know from your Morning Ireland interview, and indeed from the Ceann Comhairle's comments, what was being put to you there, and I'11 put to you again, what you were receiving basically was hearsay and you, by repeating it, was hearsay upon hearsay; do you accept that?
A. No. I never suggested, either in my Dáil statement or anything else I said subsequently, that I was suggesting that I'd spoken to somebody who'd had a direct conversation with the Garda Commissioner or a senior Garda. It was clear always that I was talk -that I was referencing somebody who had told me they had spoken to a party to that conversation.
537 Q. Yeah. That's hearsay.
A. It's not the same as I overheard it on the bus. If it's legally hearsay, I accept what you're saying to me. I'm not a lawyer.
538 Q. But the problem with that is that -- sorry, well, maybe I'11 come back to the problem with that in a moment; is that you were actually given the name of Ms. Debbie McCann. Did you not think it worthwhile maybe to call her or even to have a query or a conversation about 'well, maybe I should speak to her directly'?
A. I didn't give the name of Debbie McCann to anybody save to this Tribunal.
539 Q. No, sorry, I appreciate that, it's a different question I'm asking you. I'm going back to the morning; you get the call, you've the conversation, we've your account of it in the letter. And clearly you had been given
the name by Ms. Alison O'Reilly of Debbie McCann and what I'm querying with you now is why did you not say 'Well, look, we're all a bit' -- 'you're one step removed, I'm now two steps removed; I'm going to go in and I'm going to go in and I'm going to give information which is' - and I've used the word, you used the word "extraordinary", I used the word "explosive" - and it turned out to be so, certainly as far as the then Commissioner was concerned - 'I'd better just check this out maybe first hand with the person concerned, Ms. McCann'; did that not occur to you?
A. Absolutely not.

540 Q. why not?
A. Because $I$ couldn't set myself up as an investigation.

What was I to do, to ring Ms. McCann? And what was I supposed to do? If she says yes, take a course of action? If she said no, take a course of action? That would be an impossible. It was clear to me - and I believed what I was told by Alison O'Reilly - that this was a matter that was proper to be investigated by the Tribunal of Inquiry. But in the first instance, my role was a parliamentarian shaping the very terms of reference and the nature of that inquiry, so we needed to have that debate in the Dáil.

541 Q. I would be very sympathetic with somebody in your position who receives information like this, making it available to a Tribunal - and I appreciate the Tribunal hadn't been set up at that point - but it's a very,
very different thing going in making the information that you've been receiving, the explosive or extraordinary information, public in the Dáil. That had ramifications for the then Commissioner as we now know.
A. Well, the bottom line is that I was contacted by a journalist who was known to my parliamentary ]assistant, whom I had the discussion with, who had very significant information that I believed.
542 Q. But --
A. And it was important for me to, in my judgment as a parliamentarian, as is my right, to impart that to the Dáil in the context of the Dáil actually determining, firstly, the nature of what sort of investigation should happen, and secondly, the terms of reference, which I intended to have an input in shaping.
543 Q. We11, we now know that for whatever -- I'm not saying this is determinative, but both parties to that conversation, the then Commissioner Ms. Nóirín o'sullivan denies having that conversation and as I
understand it a trawl from her phone records will confirm she didn't have telephone conversations at least with Ms. McCann, and Ms. McCann also denies that she had a conversation. Does that not worry you now that that is the situation with both those parties saying what they're saying and knowing what the Tribunal has done on a trawl?
A. But that's why we established the Tribunal, to determine those very things. What you're suggesting to

We11, you heard, I presume you were here when I was putting to the last witness about her travails and troubles with her employer and about having legal disputes and issues. You didn't know that, for example. would that have informed your mind?
A. I was aware of those matters.

545 Q. You were aware that there were three legal actions being taken --
A. No.

546 Q. -- by that individual? what were you aware of?
A. I was aware that she was having problems with her employer and had taken legal action against them. The detail, the number, I wasn't aware of.
547 Q. So that surely would've put a red light on this sort of stuff to cause you some significant concern to say 'I better get some verification of this hearsay account before I go into the Dáil'. And forget about you don't name Ms. McCann, but you do name Commissioner Nóirín o'sullivan. And it was carried, as you know, I think it was the headline news that day, it was on the front page of all the main newspapers the following day, isn't that correct?
A. Well --

548 Q capacity of the Tribunal to take evidence under oath, check phone records and all the panoply of powers the Oireachtas gives this body. It would've been impossible for me. ber Isn't that correct first of all?
me is that I should've determined it in advance of the
549 Q. That it was carried as a main item of news.
A. Absolutely, yes.
550 Q. And it put significant pressure on the then
Commissioner. Do you not think having it checked out or having treated it with a greater degree of care might've been more appropriate?
A. You're suggesting that my statement in the Dái 1 came out of the blue, not in the context of the previous day the Government of Ireland had determined to establish a $15: 58$ Commission of Investigation, part of which, in the pub7ished record of the day before, was to traw1 through two years of records of the Commissioner to see was she involved in a smear campaign against a member of An Garda Síochána. There was nothing entirely new in what I was saying, save, I suppose, two points; one, I mentioned the word "sexual" crime for the first time, I think, in the public sphere, but that, of course, became greatly amplified by the RTÉ programme of the subsequent day, which went into the Tusla affair in very great detail. But it was certainly, it might've incrementally been an addition, but it certainly wasn't a new issue --
551 Q. What does --
A. -- to suggest that the Garda Commissioner might have been involved in a smear campaign against Sergeant McCabe. Sure that was the very thing that the cabinet had determined to investigate the day before.

552 Q. Sorry, Mr. Howlin, and I'11 read your own words: "In
di rect contact"; that was the key --
A. Sorry?
Q. The phrase you used:
"If it was a fact that the Garda Commi ssi oner was in
di rect contact with the media making allegations agai nst one of her own officers around the same time, it would be quite extraordinary."
A. Yes.

554 Q. That's the meat in the sandwich.
A. That was what I was told. And that was what --

555 Q. No, but that's what made it the key, that is what made it --
A. But that was what I was told and that's the evidence we've heard for the last number of hours from Alison O'Reilly, that it's her position. And I believed her then and I believe her now.
556 Q. And I suggest you ought to have done as you did previously, have gone not to a naming in public behind the immunity that the Dáil gives the statements, but to 16:00 the authority when it would've been set up. You did that before, isn't that correct?
A. Well, firstly, we were actually shaping the terms of reference for that and the information I was imparting I judged to be an essential part of that shaping and an 16:00 essential part of my role as a parliamentarian. And secondly, you say I did it under privilege; Dáil privilege is a feature of every parliamentary system and it's there for a reason, for a very good reason.

I am a parliamentarian of more than three decades' standing and I'm very conscious -- I'm a former Leas Ceann Comhairle of Dáil Éireann, as well as holding various other roles and I understand the issue of privilege very well. I would never seek to abuse it, but never not use it when $I$ believe it's in the public interest to do so.

557 Q. Ms. O'Reilly, when you spoke to her later on, said you seemed very happy the way things had gone. Is that a phrase that you would associate with how you felt?
A. No.

You, in your interview -- or, sorry, in your Dáil statement also referred to the fact, and I quote:
"This morning a journalist contacted me and told me they had di rect know edge of calls made by the Garda Commi ssi oner to journal ists."

You use plural in both of those. And when asked about
that the following day on Morning Ireland you didn't correct that. We now know that's not correct.
A. That is correct, I should've used "journalist" singular.
559 Q. You should've used "journalist" singular and "cal1" singular, is that right?
A. I wasn't aware of how many calls were made.

560 Q. And --
A. I understood there was calls plural from two sources,
one from the superintendent and one from the Garda Commissioner. That was what I was informed.
561 Q. You're asked the following day:
"I don' t want to go into the indi vi dual s.
Q. No, don't. But do you know who they are?"

And you say: "I di dn't ask for individual names." But that's again giving a complete wrong impression of what you were told, isn't that correct?
A. Well, let me characterise -- you're relying, you picked one interview. And the interview I did on Morning Ireland the following morning with Cathal macCoille, Cathal maccoille is an excellent journalist, but I think those of us in the political business would see that interview and if you read the transcript, I barely finished a single sentence without an interruption interruption, barely a single sentence. So it was more a political coursing than an interview, that particular occasion. I did a more reasoned long interview on Sean o'Rourke the day after, for example. But you picked this particular one and, as I say, you can pars and analyse the half sentences in that, but I'd be very happy it answer any question you approximate you the to me on it.
MR. MOHAN No, sorry, I was just putting it to you and you'd accept that you ought not to have said it in that context. No, I hope we give you more air time here. Thank you very much.

CHA RMAN A11 right. And then?

## THE WTNESS, WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. DI GNMM AS FOLLOVG:

562 Q. MR. DI GNMM Deputy Howlin, my name is Conor Dignam, I appear on behalf of An Garda Síochána and I'm going to ask you some questions, particularly on behalf of former Commissioner o'sullivan. I won't detain you very long, Mr. Mohan has asked a number of the questions that $I$ was going to cover with you and I'11 skip over those. But if I could just put this in some context. I'm sure you've been -- I think you've been here over the last day or two, you've been in attendance and I'm sure you've been following it in the newspapers, if not reading the transcripts. I'm sure you're aware that we now know that a number of people have been operating under a misapprehension or have been misled as to allegations that were in fact being made against Commissioner O'Sullivan; I'm sure you have 16:04 seen that --
A. Yes.

563 Q. -- at least in the newspapers, if not in person. You, I'm sure, are also very aware, having lived through that week from 8th February onwards, that it was a particularly fraught week, it was a controversial week, there was a lot of media coverage and public and political commentary on all sorts of issues involving Commissioner O'Sullivan, involving Sergeant McCabe, the

PrimeTime programme etc., so it was a very, very busy week from a public commentary point of view. I think you'd accept, I think, that your Dáil statement was one which had a tremendous impact and which was covered extensively in political and in media commentary over the course of 8th and 9th February, if not beyond that, is that fair?
A. That's fair, yes.

564 Q. And I think you -- part of the context is that you made that contribution during Leader's Questions. I think there was to be a debate on the terms of reference for the Commission of Investigation that afternoon, but you raised this during the course of Leader's Questions that morning, and I might just come back to that in a moment.

The other part of the context which you, of course, didn't know and wouldn't have known back then, but which we now know is that Commissioner o'Sullivan absolutely denies doing what she was alleged to have, or what she is alleged to have done, i.e. briefing Ms. McCann on any issues involving Sergeant McCabe, and there's a very full denial set out in her statement to the Tribuna1. I don't propose to bring you to it, because I don't think it's necessary.
A. No, I fully accept that.

565 Q. Yes. And indeed that Ms. McCann denies ever having that type of conversation with Commissioner o'Sullivan also. I'm not sure whether you are aware of that --
A. Sure.
Q. -- at this stage? So they are the, some of the factual contexts around what we're discussing. I suppose from your point of view, your experience, and you're well known to the Tribunal and indeed to the public, but I think you've held three ministerial portfolios: Health, Environment and --
A. Public Expenditure.

567 Q. -- Department of Public Expenditure. You've been the last Ceann Comhairle and, as you said just a few moments ago, you've been a TD for over 30 years. And if I might then just start with your Dáil speech, and I'm really going to focus on your Dáil speech in asking the few questions that $I$ have. That was a speech, as I say, that was made during Leader's Questions and you say at the -- shortly after your contribution began, you say that if it is, if it be the case that the Commissioner has been smearing or briefing or speaking negatively to journalists about a serving member, that would be extraordinary. And you fully appreciated at that stage that if a Commissioner was involved in that type of conduct that it would be an extraordinary state of affairs and would be a very important state of affairs for the relevant authorities - and we may caval about who the relevant authorities are, but it is an important and extraordinary state of affairs that should be brought to attention, is that fair?
A. Yes.

568 Q. Yes. You saw it as your role as a responsible public
representative to do something about it when this was brought to your attention, is that right?
A. Yes.

569 Q. Now, the time of your speech, I think it being in Leader's Questions, it would've been sometime after noon, isn't that right?
A. Yes. Twelve o'clock.
Q. Yes. And I think it was carried --
A. Leaders start, and I'm the third in sequence, yeah.

571 Q. Yes. And I think it was carried on the one o'clock news. So we know it was sometime between twelve and one o'clock. Could you tell us what time you spoke to Ms. O'Reilly?
A. Sometime after ten.

572 Q. okay. And if I understand you --
A. For the first time. I spoke to her twice.

573 Q. Yes. And if I understand you correctly, you spoke to her, you didn't take any of the steps which Mr. Mohan has asked you about checking the facts or speaking to either the people who were being alleged to have engaged in this conversation or spoken to anybody else, am I right in saying that?
A. That's correct, other than, obviously, my own advisors. Yes, and you've given the explanation for that and I don't propose to go back over that. But you did say that there was absolutely nothing new in what was being said by Ms. O'Reilly. Now, I have to put it to you that you're fundamentally wrong in that.
A. No, I didn't say that. I said nothing new, save two
things; one was -- in what I said, rather than in what Ms. O'Reilly said to me. One was I think it was the first public utterance of "sexual crimes". And then the second issue was the direct link with the Commissioner.
Q. Yes, okay. Sorry, I --
A. Save that. The point I was answering Mr. Mohan on was that this wasn't out of the blue; we were talking about setting up a Tribunal of Inquiry into all these matters in any event, including whether the commissioner, the then Commissioner was actively engaged in a smear campaign.
Q. Yes, I take that correction, Mr. Howlin. The point I want to get to is that do you appreciate the significance of your utterance in the Dáil linking the former Commissioner o'sullivan for the first time with being involved, directly involved in engaging in a smear campaign?
A. As I say, that was a very, the very matter that was to be investigated in. So if you like, there was to be an inquiry into these matters. I was presented with what I thought was creditable information that needed to be put into the context of formulating the terms of reference for that. Yes, it was significant and it was important.
577 Q. Yes. Now, when you say creditable information, that was creditable information based on your --
A. Creditable.

578 Q. Yes, creditable.
A. Sorry, I thought you said "questionable".

579 Q. No, no. When you say creditable information, your assessment of that was based on two telephone conversations with Ms. O'Reilly and nothing else?
A. Yes.

580 Q. Now, the significance though of the direct briefing, so to speak, by Commissioner O'Sullivan is that this was the first time that that allegation had been made and certainly the first time it had been made in public?
A. (Witness Nods).

581 Q. You know, I'm sure, that Superintendent Tay1or, even at the height of his case, says that Commissioner o'Sullivan, then Deputy, was aware of a smear campaign and nothing more than that?
A. Absolutely. I mean --

CHA RMAN We11, it's a wee bit more than that. I mean, $I$ know there's nuances of it and I appreciate you're putting it as best, but I mean, it's alleged that they had face to face conversations on the smear campaign. I mean, it's as serious as that.
MR. DI GNAM Sorry, yes, that Superintendent Taylor has said that he kept Commissioner O'Sullivan informed and briefed and they had conversations in relation to it, but he has never said that she herself directed him to engage in a smear campaign or indeed did it herself.
A. I'm sure that's true.

583 Q. Yes.
A. My role in this was simply to conduit the information I was given that day into the debate to ensure that these
things were fully captured and understood by the Oireachtas in formulating the type of inquiry to be established.
584 Q. Yes. And --
A. And a second point I should make, Chairman, which I also made public on that day, which was also important to have been made, I think, by others in the Dái 1 too, I also was very concerned if these matters were true and of course, I said repeatedly on every utterance I didn't know them to be true or not and everybody was entitled, including the Commissioner, to the presumption of innocence - but she, as Garda Commissioner, was the custodian of all this evidence, including mobile phones, including laptops. And I expressed concern that all of those would be, all of those would be available to this Tribunal or whatever Commission of Inquiry would be established to fully ventilate that and I was concerned that the best way to achieve that would be, as in normal practice, for the Commissioner to stand aside pending the determinations of whatever inquiry was to be set up.
585 Q. Yeah. And that came later I think. But your initial contribution was to simply disclose that this allegation had been made by Ms. O'Reilly to you?
A. Yes.

586 Q. Yes. Now, then turning to -- sorry, just in relation then -- do you appreciate, Deputy Howlin, the significance - and I take it that you do, given your experience in the Dáil etc. - the significance of a
speech, particularly by a party leader, particularly one with such vast ministerial and representative experience, the significance in the public mind that a disclosure of this type makes when made on the floor of the Houses of the Oireachtas?
A. Well, two points. Firstly, you have to understand it wasn't a speech.
587 Q. No, I've been careful to say "contribution".
A. Well, no, because it was Leader's Questions. And I chose to do it at Leader's Questions so that the specific questions could be answered by the Taoiseach. That's what Taoiseach's -- or Leader's Questions are for. So it wasn't a speech as such. But when you say to me did I understand that me saying these things would have an impact, I did and I'd to think about that for the amount of time I had to think about it and I made a judgment call, as in the last five or six years I've made very many in very tight circumstances, as you can imagine.
588 Q. Yes. Because I think -- I doubt if there's any dispute 16:14 but that it did have a tremendous impact. And I have to put it to you that it established, in the public narrative at least - and obviously this Tribunal is doing its work very carefully - but it established in the public narrative that the Commissioner was guilty of the offences with which she was charged.
A. I don't think that's fair. On that basis, you'd never set up any in inquiry, if you come to a conclusion beforehand. But in order to investigate any matter,
you have to set out the matters to be investigated without coming to any interpretation, without coming to any value judgment on it. And I was very clear to repeat, every utterance, I didn't know whether these matters were true or not and that the presumption of innocence was obviously to be afforded to everybody. 589 Q. Now, if I could then just turn to the text of your contribution, or of your leader's question. You say at the beginning that:
"This norning a journalist contacted me and told me they had direct know edge of calls" - plural - "made by the Garda Commissi oner to journalists" - plural. And you've already addressed this with --
A. Yeah.

590 Q. -- Mr. Mohan. But if I could just ask you then to turn to page 7366, which is the text of your interview --
A. In inverted commas, yes.
-- we'11 call it an interview, yes, with Mr. MacCoille.
And at the very bottom of that page he says --
A. Scroll it up a bit.

592 Q. Yes. The final question on that page. He says:
"What about the journalists" - plural - "about whose behavi our he spoke to you" - and that's Ms. O'Reilly obviously - "will they gi ve evi dence?"

And your answer was: "I don't know."
"Q. So you rai se behavi our on a hearsay basis by peopl e" - plural - "alleged by one person to you rel ating to other people" - plural - "and you don't know, do you know who they are" - plural?
A. Em, I don't want to go into the indi vi dual s.
Q. No, don't. But do you know who they" - plural are?
A. I di dn't ask for the indi vi dual names" - plural.

And then later on, towards the bottom of that page you're asked again "Di d you ask who they are?" And you say "I was gi ven one name."

Now, I have to say to you that in the course of that interview/questioning, your answers clearly created the 16:16 impression that there were several journalists, at least more than one journalist involved in being contacted by the former Commissioner.
A. Yeah. As I said, it was a rather fraught interaction, a more calm debate was had subsequently. But there was 16:16 two journalists in my mind, one was the journalist Alison O'Reilly who'd spoken to me and the second was Debbie McCann, who was the conduit for the information. They were the journalists, plural. I was certain that Ms. O'Reilly was willing to give evidence. I didn't know, because I'd no contact with Ms. McCann.

593 Q. Yes. In any event, you accept now that there was one journalist, that Ms. O'Reilly says that she had knowledge of contacts between the former Commissioner
and one journalist, Ms. McCann?
A. Yes.
Q. You accept that's the case now. And was that your knowledge at the time or did you believe that there may be more than one journalist?
A. No, the only one I ever knew about was the one referenced by Alison.
Q. And would you agree with me that the impression that there was more than one journalist being contacted by the Commissioner would also be of significance to the public narrative of what had been engaged in, or allegedly engaged in by the former Commissioner?
A. That might be the case.
Q. Now, you've already dealt with the question of direct knowledge. You say in your Dái 1 statement that you'd been contacted by a journalist who has direct knowledge of calls made by the Garda Commissioner. I think you've accepted that she didn't have direct knowledge?
A. The word used, it's my recollection - and if you look at my second letter to this Tribunal, I make that clear 16:18 - "direct" inasmuch as she had spoken to a party to that conversation.

597 Q. Yes. Now, you then go on to say that in 2015 the Garda Commissioner oversaw the investigation which examined the call logs of a Garda officer who was under suspicion of leaking material to the media. I take it that you were referring to Superintendent Taylor in that sentence?
A. Yes.

598 Q. I'm not sure whether you were knowingly referring to him at that time, whether you knew it was Superintendent Taylor or whether you've come to know that now? You might help us on that.
A. My recollection is I was aware of it, yeah.
Q. Now, you know now that Superintendent Taylor in fact has accepted that in fact he was doing precisely that, leaking material to the media?
A. Yes.

600 Q. Yes. He has also accepted that the investigation was conducted and overseen by Superintendent, or Chief Superintendent Clerkin. You're aware of that?
A. This is -- you're telling me the findings of a year's work of the Tribunal.
601 Q. No, no, I just want to ask you a question first of a11. 16:19
A. Am I aware of it now? Yes.

602 Q. Yes, you're aware of it now, yes.
A. After a year's work of the Tribunal.

603 Q. Now, did you -- what did you mean when you said that the Commissioner was overseeing that investigation? And 16:19 perhaps if I put some context on that; that has become of great significance to the Tribunal in this module because one of the allegations that had been made and has now been withdrawn was that the Commissioner was interfering in some way improperly in that investigation.
A. My understanding --

604 Q. Could you explain what you meant by that?
A. My reference was simply, as the chief police officer,
would have general oversight of all investigations. 605 Q. okay. And nothing more than that?
A. Nothing more than that.

606 Q. Now, you then, you go on to say immediately below that:
"If it was a fact that the Garda Commissioner was in di rect contact with the medi a maki ng allegations agai nst one of her own officers at around the same time, it would be quite extraordinary."

Could you just explain to me, why draw the link between those two things? Surely it would be quite extraordinary that the Commissioner would be doing that at any time?
A. It's true.

607 Q. Yes. So why the link between those two --
A. Doubly extraordinary in those circumstances.

608 Q. Well, you might explain why there was a link drawn, why you felt the need to insert the fact that she was overseeing an investigation into Dave Taylor in the very same short contribution --
A. It was simply the fact that the issue of leaking documents was of such moment, it would be doubly extraordinary if that issue caused an investigation to be put in place if at the same time it was a fact that the Commissioner was involved in the same thing herself.

609 Q. Yes. And just finally, Deputy Howlin, do you accept that if the information about Commissioner o'Sullivan
turns out to be wrong - and that's obviously a matter for the Tribunal to determine - that it would be very damaging and has been very damaging information to her position as Commissioner?
A. Well, the bottom line is, on that basis you'd -- unless 16:21 you knew the outcome of a Tribunal, you'd never embark on a Tribunal.
610 Q. Well --
A. Because what you're saying is unless you know what the outcome is, you shouldn't, because it's damaging to people's reputations.

611 Q. We11 perhaps you might just answer me firstly --
A. But you understand what I'm saying?

612 Q. I do. And I'11 give you an opportunity to explain.
But you might just answer me in the first instance. If 16:22 the Tribunal finds that that information was incorrect, do you accept that the information being put before the Dáil was damaging to Commissioner O'Sullivan's position?
A. The mere creation of the Tribunal, the decision of the government the previous day to check the phone records of the Commissioner for two years to see was she involved in smearing, all of that, by definition, would be damaging if it's all untrue. But there was reason for the Oireachtas unanimously to cause this Tribunal to be established to check those matters out. And as I say, you'd never have an investigation if your contention is you have to know the outcome before you start.
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Q. I'11 take that as a yes, with your explanation and your --
A. No, I mean, what I said was no more damaging than the actual Tribunal terms of reference, which surely the government making a determination that the phone records of the sitting Commissioner of An Garda Síochána for two years needed to be checked and a Tribunal, or at that stage a Commission of Investigation established to see was she involved in a smear campaign against a serving officer, all of that, sitting, if it all proves to be wrong, would be damaging. And of course I accept that. And my contribution and probably the contribution of every Deputy who contributed to the debate on the terms of reference would equally add to that. And I'm aware of that.

614 Q. But is it your position that an express statement by a TD with your experience and the position that you held at the time of making that express statement, that you had been contacted by somebody with direct knowledge of 16:24 wrongdoing on the part of Nóirín O'Sullivan, albeit with your qualification that you didn't know the truth or otherwise of it --
A. Well, that's a very important qualification.

615 Q. I appreciate that. Is it your position that that is no $16: 24$ more damaging than the establishment of the Tribunal in the first place?
A. We11, as I say, every contribution --

616 Q. Is that your position, Deputy Howlin?
A. Let me answer the question please. Every contribution to the debate on the terms of reference, that went through a variety of allegations, the discussions we had in relation to that potentially are damaging to a variety of people. And that is the nature of setting up an investigation. And we do probably have an awful lot of them in this country.
617 Q. We11, I'11 finish on this, Deputy Howlin, but is it your position that an express statement by a TD with your background and experience that you had been given information by somebody that Nóirín O'Sullivan was engaged in this wrongdoing was no more damaging than the establishment of the Tribunal in the first place? It's yes or no.
A. It's actually, it's not yes or no, because it's this: We were in the process of determining the nature of and the terms of reference of an investigation. There was all sorts of inputs into that. And if it helps you, I fully accept that me putting into the public domain the information I had was of particular significance, yes.
MR. DI GNMM Thank you.
CHA RMAN A11 right. Mr. Marrinan, do you have anything further?
MR. MARRI NAN No.
CHA RMAN There's nothing. Mr. Ó Muicheartaigh? No. 16:25 Well, I think you better speak now or forever hold your peace. A11 right, thank you very much, Deputy Howlin.
A. Thank you indeed.

CHA RMAK okay, I need to go through a couple of things
now if I may. Obviously my note is not necessarily like a stenography note, but --
A. Sorry, am I finished?

CHA RMAN Oh, yes, you are indeed. Thank you. But what Ms. O'Reilly said in relation to her conversations 16:26 with Debbie McCann - and what I'm interested in hearing, is there a different version, or if it is, what it is - is 'Once we were making a cup of tea in the Irish Daily Mail kitchen and she told me that she had penalty points quashed, that was embarrassing and her father was a Garda. I mentioned Maurice McCabe and that he was' -- she mentioned -- 'I mentioned Maurice McCabe and she said that he was a child abuser. The person was now an adult'. His motive was all to get back at the Gardaí because the Gardaí knew about this investigation, it is implied. She said 'I thought it was suspicious when I first heard it and then I asked myself the question as to why create a fuss if you have a background that you need to concea1?'

At some stage she said Debbie McCann said that her father confirmed the story. She said that 'Debbie McCann had told me that she had gotten the name and address of the person abused from someone high up in the Gardaí and she said she'd heard it from David
Taylor, that she'd heard it from Nóirín O'Sullivan. She never said much about David Taylor and all she said was that the girl was in a bad way'. And this was said apparently on the phone and in the context of

Ms. O'Reilly being upset vis-à-vis the Roma children and their story, their names going into the media, I infer.

Then she said 'Early in 2014, in the back office with others, Debbie McCann and I' - sitting, apparently, close to one another - 'were discussing stories or discussing stories to be pitched, whether she had anything decent to pitch and she said she had the details of this girl and was discussing a story with Robert Cox'.

Then we go down further on; vis-à-vis the Cavan visit by Alison o'Reilly, she said she didn't know who went to Cavan first, her or Debbie McCann and afterwards, after the visit by Debbie McCann, 'She told me she'd gone to the home of Ms. D and that she spent an hour with her and that Ms. D was in an awful state and was gripping herself - by which I understand to mean embracing herself with her arms and rocking, that kind of behaviour - 'and Maurice McCabe was responsible for it. She told me that Ms. D had told her that she'd been five, six or seven at the time and her father was also a Garda and they were at some kind of a gathering and that she, as a small child, was behind a couch and that Maurice McCabe had pushed up against her from behind with his groin. She told me that she continued to be in touch with her' - meaning Ms. D - 'I had no other information'.

The father, she said, had been friends and had fallen out. 'She told me that the story didn't, or would not make it into the paper and that she was annoyed and that Sebastian Hamilton, the Editor in Chief, had put an end to it or had exercised a veto' - I'm sure perfectly properly for his own reasons.

On another other occasion she said Debbie McCann told her that she'd tried to pitch the story green and it had been refused again. Then there was talk of a Tuesday conference, which is, I think, a pitching conference and going to their cars in Herbert Park and there was a somewhat tetchy debate and it was mentioned to Alison O'Reilly by Debbie McCann that the woman in question, namely Ms. D was going to meet with Mícheál Martin and with An Taoiseach Enda Kenny 'and I said to her are you getting this from your pal Nóirín? And she said yes'. And she said 'I believe this was before the Paul williams articles came out', the first of which was 12th April 2014, as we now. And then we have the texts, which are texts and they're expressions of opinion, but they're there.

So those are the conversations. And I'm just going to say this and I'm going to say absolutely or totally clearly whether you're in a criminal case or a civil case or you're before a Tribunal, you have an obligation to put your client's version of facts in
issue to a witness. It's a basic matter as to the administration of the justice, because justice is based upon what people tell a Tribunal or a court, it's not based upon, for instance, what a witness might like to be the case or what might be convenient for a case. If 16:30 a client, for instance, gives ludicrous instructions that couldn't possibly be true, while you can have a conversation with them, you're nonetheless absolutely and completely obliged to put that.

Now, I'm speaking not on my own authority, I'm speaking on the authority of the relevant decided case, which is

MEDonagh -v- Sunday Newspapers. If anyone wants to dispute that, we11, they can take another case to the Supreme Court. But there it is.

Now, there's a second thing that I need to say, and that is this: I'm running out of time. I'm in the Court of Appeal next week and then I'm back doing other work very shortly after. So vis-à-vis any submissions that people wish to make at the end of this - and I hope we are coming to the end of this and thank you all for your assistance - I'm not allowing any time, you can make your submissions and if you want to do something in writing, you should do it now. But what would help me most is if you would adopt a position and tell me why you're adopting a position, as opposed to giving me a big long elaborate exposition on documents and on the transcript, which, by the way, I actually
have already. So there it is. And we will continue on tomorrow.

Oh, sorry, and by the way, Mr. Mohan, I've arranged for the transcript to be printed out for you so that you have it.

MR. MDHAN Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN And Ms. Ní Ghabhann will give you a copy of that now.

MR. MDHAN Thank you very much, Chairman.
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[^0]:    "She had forgotten about the abuse for a number of years and then it all came flooding back."

[^1]:    "Everyone knows about what happened, frompolitici ans

[^2]:    "A file had gone to the DPP."

