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CHA RMAN Ladies and Gentlemen, just before we begin today, I think there are two things that I need to mention - they're interrelated. Firstly, those who are 10:06 following the website will be aware of witness lists and the future course of the Tribunal, which, with the assistance of counsel and solicitor and the legal team, we are attempting to keep to as best we can, both from the point of view of predictability and from the point of what lawyers in the old days used to call finis litium; in other words, bringing this matter to an end.

Now, let us suppose that the Tribunal has not discovered something, has not made an inquiry which it ought to have made, has not identified a witness who potentially might be of assistance to the Tribunal, we11, the parties are here and, in the event that there is something like that which, despite our best efforts, we may have overlooked, I'll invite the parties to write or to approach counsel in that regard.

It is to be appreciated, of course, that there are many people with issues and problems out in the general community, and indeed many of them have written to me heart-rending and very difficult to read and I've sympathy for those people. But it has to be borne in mind in making this request of the parties and the
wider pub7ic through the newspapers who are present and the media that I'm bound by terms of reference and I can't move outside of those. So if there is anything, just please draw it to our attention.

The second matter is this, that the legal system exists to serve the country, it is not a question of dodging and weaving and using legal rules for one's own benefit, or indeed for the purpose of sheer mischief. As I said yesterday, we actually own this country and we have a responsibility to it to do our best. Now, given that the Oireachtas has tasked this Tribunal to come up with answers in relation to matters which are serious and are of public moment, it seems to me that it is not a question of law, it is a question of right and wrong and there is a patriotic duty on any person in the country who knows anything which may assist this Tribunal to come forward.
of course, I called for that as of February of 2017, but it's necessary to reiterate that call, because the Tribunal is coming to an end and it would not be good enough for people, out of sheer mischief or perhaps out of a fear of consequences, to say 'I'm not going to come forward and tell the Tribunal what I know'. If there are people out there who know about what is relevant to our work, would you please come forward and tell us what you know? There is a patriotic duty in that regard and I put it no further than that. So
we'11 continue on.
MR. MARR NAN Alison O'Reilly, please.

## Mg. ALI SON O REI LLY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MDHAN AS FOLLOVS:

1 Q. MR. MDHAN Good morning, Ms. O'Reilly, Hugh Mohan here and I want to revisit a number of matters that were raised at the close of yesterday's proceedings. And just maybe if I can do it in this order; firstly,
Mr. Chairman, the texts that were included in
Ms. O'Reilly's statement are in fact the exchanges that did take place between Ms. O'Reilly and Ms. McCann, so there was no issue on that, they are Ms. McCann's texts. So I'm trying, Mr. Chairman, to make sure that I go through each of the points that you raised and I've an answer to them.

I'm going to get to the various issues that were raised, but, Ms. O'Reilly, I want to put this to you,
and we had this exchange yesterday and I appreciate that -- no one is here wishing to trip anybody up on a timeline, and you are saying that yourself, that you sometimes get a little confused about the timeline. It seems from my instructions and from now reconfirming this with Ms. McCann that the issue of Sergeant McCabe and the allegations about Sergeant McCabe really came into focus in January, mid to late January through to February, March and April of 2014. Would you broad7y
agree with that?
A. The issues they raised?

2 Q. Sorry, the issue, the question of Sergeant McCabe and the allegation of sexual misconduct. That seems to be the timeframe at which it came to the fore.
A. No, I remember it from the year before.

3 Q. You remember it from the year before?
A. Yes.

4 Q. And in what context do you remember from the year before?
A. Well, just - again I'm only going on memory - I just remember having a cup of tea with Debbie in the kitchen in the Mail and it was, I just think that somebody had got their penalty points quashed, $I$ don't know, maybe a Senator or something, o something -- you know, a few people had got their penalty points quashed. And Debbie had raised her concerns that she had hers quashed.
5 Q. Sorry, quite correct. And I was going to say that that was some time before, the penalty points, and again I don't want to be dogmatic, but that was certainly in 2013, early to mid-2013. And I want to put to you what Ms. McCann says about what you said in that regard.
A. Okay.

6 Q. She says that she did raise the issue of penalty points, she raised it at a conference sometime in mid-2013, she says that she herself had received penalty points for doing approximately five kilometres over the speed limit and that she had been caught by,
as it were, one of those vans, in other words she received an automated speeding fine in the post. She had written to the local superintendent - she didn't ca11 in any favour, either from any guard she might've known or certain7y not from her father - and she wrote to the superintendent in charge, saying that she was, broadly, at least that she was just a little bit over and that if she had been stopped by a guard, that guard would likely have used his discretion to not have done and awarded her penalty points and she'd heard no more than about it. She said that at a conference at which you attended and at which I think there were a number of other journalists who would've attended - this was on the issue covering the penalty points issue; do you remember that?
A. I don't, Chairman. And I recall that in my statement to the Tribunal I explained that Debbie said she had written to her local superintendent and had asked for them to be quashed. But $I$ have a clear recollection of a personal conversation we had in the kitchen and -7 Q. She absolutely denies that. She said she said it at the conference and it had nothing whatsoever got to do with the allegations of sexual misconduct against Sergeant McCabe, because they in fact came, as I say, much later.
A. Sorry, could you repeat the last bit?

8 Q. Yes, sorry. You tied that in, in your testimony, with her conversation about penalty points and Sergeant McCabe, you said that yesterday.
A. Yes, that's correct.

9 Q. I'm saying to you there were two -- she had a conversation at a conference, which you attended, about penalty points when Sergeant McCabe's issue wasn't even in the public domain.
A. Sergeant McCabe was in the public domain in 2013. We11, certainly --
A. As far as I remember. Sorry, not to the extent that we know he was laterally. In any event, the point I'm making to you is that Sergeant McCabe's issue was never raised and the penalty points was a separate issue which was, as it were, hitting the headlines in 2013?
A. Chairman, this is the first time I'm hearing this. I have never -- I mean, Debbie was asked all of these things. I have sat down with the investigators from the beginning. She has never said this before. This is news to me. And I've said set out my position very clearly a long time ago.
12 Q. That's her testimony and that's what she will give.
A. Okay. We11, I stand by what I said yesterday, Chairman. And I told the Tribunal that last year.
13 Q. Likewise, you raised the issue about the Roma children and we know that was, as it were, October of 2013. She recalls a conversation she had with you on the telephone and you referred, $I$ think, to a colleague, Niall Donald. I think Niall Donald is more than a colleague, is that correct?
A. Yes. You're in a personal relationship with him?
A. Correct.

16 Q. Yes. And she recalls that's the person to whom you spoke when you told us you spoke, in your direct evidence, about getting advice; is that correct?
A. Getting advice?

You referred to him, I think, in your direct evidence and in you statement as a journalistic colleague to whom you spoke about how you would take advice?
A. No, I didn't say I took advice from him. I said that I had just run the idea past him. He had heard a little bit about him. I kind of had to give him the details. And he just said 'Look, just be way of it'. Okay. Tell me, Niall Donald, who is he and what does he do and where does he work?
A. He's a journalist in Independent News and Media.

20 Q. I see. And you're in a personal relationship with him, is that correct?
A. Yes, I've just said that, yes.

21 Q. Thank you. She remembers a conversation on the phone about the Roma children where you put the phone on speaker and you were with Niall Donald and you were discussing the Roma children and that happened way --
again in 2013, before the Sergeant McCabe smear issue had come to the fore.
A. Chairman, this is all news to me. why would I put Debbie McCann on loudspeaker?
22 Q. I'm putting it to you you did. If you say you didn't 10:16 then I --
A. I absolutely didn't. I absolutely did not.
A. You're now including somebody else in a story that didn't happen.

We11, what you said yesterday was -- you're wrong about the Roma children and you're wrong about Sergeant McCabe. What I'm putting to you, if you look the timeline, that simply doesn't add up; they're at two different -- the timeline in respect of both are entirely different.
A. No, Chairman, I stand by what I said yesterday. We had a conversation earlier on in the year to the best of my recollection and it involved Sergeant McCabe, where she told me he was a child abuser. And that was the first time I'd heard it.

And for the record, I again took instructions expressly on that point, she never stated in any format, in that format in blunt terms, never did she say that to you.
A. Chairman, this is all news to me. I mean, I have --

I was read out parts of Debbie McCann's statement when the investigators came to my house and she never said any of his. This is all new to me.
27 Q. And --
A. I explicitly remember a phone call with Debbie McCann where it got very, very heated and that was when she told me that Dave Taylor had told her this girl was in a bad way.
And she will categorically deny that she ever said to you that David Taylor told her anything.
A. We11, this is news to me. And I stand by what I said, Chairman. I want to be clear that she will say at that stage you were in fact not just colleagues, but you were friends at that point in time; isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. And I said that yesterday.
Q. She will say that when this issue, from Commissioner Callinan's appearance at the Public Accounts Committee, which as we know was late January 2014, that the issue of what was or was not behind his comments, the "disgusting" comments, that journalists in every newsroom were discussing the issue and no less you had discussed it with Debbie McCann and Debbie McCann had discussed it with you, and she discussed it with you from January, February, March. And we know the timeline is that she went out on maternity leave on March 22nd and you were deputised to stand in for her, isn't that correct?
A. Well, not really, no. I just probably just would've
covered crime. I wasn't specifically asked to --
31 Q. Sorry, you're overlapping; you were to do some stories that she was involved in. I don't want to nitpick on it, but you were --
A. I suppose so, yeah.

Yeah. And so she had discussions with you. And she certainly did have discussions with you over the allegations about Sergeant McCabe, absolutely she did.
A. Yes.

But this idea that she was negatively briefing, in some 10:18 way demonic about him, being categoric about him being a child abuser is simply incorrect.
A. Sorry, I never said she briefed me. I said --

34 Q. Sorry, the phrase I'm using is that she was negatively briefing against Sergeant McCabe. That's maybe my phrase, but I think that's a phrase that was used maybe by the Tribuna1. But take it at as my phrase.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Mohan, I know you haven't been here for everything, and that's clearly not your fault and obviously I'm glad to see you here, but the issue
did arise in relation to, for instance, Sergeant Kennedy, who was driving one of the politicians who's given evidence and if it's a question of simply discussing a matter, that's different to negative briefing.
MR. MDHAN Sorry? I missed that.
CHA RMAN I think there's a difference between discussing a matter, in other words discussing a rumour, discussing around the rumour, as opposed to
being the author of the rumour or riding the rumour for a malicious purpose. And I wasn't, certainly, taking from the evidence that I have heard in the course of the last two days from Ms. O'Reilly that there was some kind of malicious intent --

MR MDHAK Sorry --
CHA RMAN -- that there was a point of view there was information certainly, but not negative briefing as such. I didn't take that from it.
MR. MOHAN Well, I'm grateful for your comments. And maybe Ms. o'Reilly was going to say the same thing, in fairness. (To Witness) Again I put it and I want to make it clear that when Ms. McCann does give evidence, she will, of course, say that you had discussions around this issue with her throughout those points, because you were (a) friendly at that time and (b) had a professional relationship in the sense that she was going to go out on maternity leave and you were to overlap - and I'm using that word in its most general sense - with the some of the stories she was working on; isn't that correct?
A. I was never asked to cover for Debbie McCann, Chairman. In fact I clearly recall two other female journalists being discussed and coming in and covering crime stories while Debbie McCann was off and it never materialised. But I was never specifically asked. But certainly I've told the Tribunal I was interested in crime. I'm not a crime correspondent.
CHAI RMAN All right, and I'm don't want to interrupt,

Mr. Mohan, but I'm going to take it that if somebody goes out who's kind of important in the paper and there's somebody there who's experienced, the inevitable thing will be you'11 be doing some of their work or perhaps following up on some of their leads and 10:21 that kind of thing.
A. Yeah, that's true. I just --

CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, 1et's leave it at that. We'11 just accept that as a given.
A. Yeah, that's true, yeah. That's okay, yeah.

MR. MDHAN And we'11 leave it at that. And in that context, both of you definitely did have discussions about the sexual allegations surrounding Sergeant McCabe and both of you discussed them on, she can't recall how many occasions, but off and on, there is no doubt about that?
A. No, there's no doubt about that, no.
Q. But what she does take issue with is some of the specifics that you've said, that she would've said in categoric terms that Sergeant McCabe is a child abuser. 10:21 She never said that in those terms. And it's - again my words - portraying her as somebody who is this categoric or demonic in her belief that that was so. That was never the way she had discussed it with you. CHA RMAK Sorry, Mr. Mohan, I don't know why we're introducing the devil into this. I mean, what's demonic about having a point of view? I mean, honestly --

MR. MDHAN I'11 rephrase it.

CHA RMAN -- I don't think the word is necessary.
MR. MDHAN We11, may I rephrase it?
CHA RMAN We11, of course you can, yes.
MR. MDHAN Sorry, that she was as adamant as you're portraying her being, if you will, outside of the argument, she certainly discussed it with you; that's what I want to put to you.
A. She discussed it with me for a very long time and she used very derogatory terms when she was describing him. And I think I've already put to you that she did not say to you that David Taylor had told her that. She did not say to you that her father confirmed the story she's adamant.
A. She didn't say what about Dave Taylor?

Sorry, you gave evidence yesterday that she told you that David Taylor had told her the story about Sergeant McCabe. She says that didn't happen.
A. She said Dave Taylor told her the girl was in a bad way.
41 Q. Yeah, she says that didn't happen.
A. As I said, Chairman, I stand over everything that I've said. And Debbie McCann has had my statement for the last year and this is the first I'm hearing of anything. The investigators came to my house and they said she disputed some of the things I said. But she never actually laid them out step by step, whereas I have. And she's had my statement for a long time.

42 Q. Well, in fact I'm doing this because it's necessary for the administration of justice that $I$ do this, so I'm
giving you an opportunity to comment and that's why I'm doing this.
A. To comment on which bit, sorry?

43 Q. To comment on what Ms. McCann is going to say on these specific issues.
A. I stand over everything I said yesterday, Chairman.

MR. MARR NAN I'm sorry to interrupt, Sir, but I think it is important, because the witness has said on five occasions now that this is the first time that she has heard about this, and it appears to me that the witness ${ }^{00: 23}$ is at a disadvantage as the procedure the Tribunal clearly set out in the interpretation of the terms of reference, and this should all be reduced to writing by Debbie McCann and the witness should be given an opportunity to consider it before she continues to give 10:24 her evidence in relation to it and to respond accordingly.

It is very helpful that Mr. Mohan is putting his client's case and is now engaging in the facts. These have been well known, as the witness has pointed out, to the parties before the Tribunal for a considerable period of time. And it's really not unfair that it's introduced at this juncture. I'm not blaming Mr. Mohan, it's done as a result of a prompt yesterday in relation to it, to be given the opportunity to put his client's case. But in case there's been some sort of a misunderstanding up until now, I think that it is only fair that Mr. Mohan should be invited to get his
client to submit a statement dealing with these matters to the Tribunal.

CHA RMAN Mr. Marrinan, I agree with you. But there's a "but" - and as my wife says, the "but" is the important part of the sentence - I really would like Ms. O'Reilly to finish. But I think, Mr. Mohan, you should reduce your client's instructions in this regard to writing and just send them into the Tribunal. Now, in the event that you feel at a disadvantage in simply answering these questions now on the hoof, of course I'11 follow that. But do you feel at a disadvantage?
A. No, I stand over everything I said. I would just like to clarify one tiny little thing in relation to Niall Donald. The conversation that I had with Debbie McCann I recall was quite late in the evening. I don't live with Niall Donald, I live alone with my children. CHA RMAK No, no, no, I --
A. He wouldn't have been there is my point.

CHAN RMAN All right. Well, there's a speakerphone o people can be in and out of people's houses.
A. Okay, sure.

CHAN RMAN So I understand that. Now, we're at the point -- in any event, you understand Debbie McCann denies that she had heard -- I'm sorry, I'm just, and Mr. Marrinan is absolutely correct in this respect, about David Taylor told her the girl was in a bad way, that's denied. And then the question of the name and address I presume is coming up now. So if we just
carry on.
44 Q. MR. MDHAN So, Chairman, I will continue with cross-examination, but forward an updated statement to the Tribunal.

CHA RMAN Yes. And you'11 get that. In the event that you want to come back and comment on it, you'11 be given that opportunity.
A. Sure.

MR. MDHAN May it please you, Chairman. (To witness) Sorry, I'm going to continue, Ms. O'Reilly. Now we get 10:27 to the issue of the trip to Ms. D or Ms. D's house. Ms. McCann will say that you may very well have known and she doesn't dispute that you would've know that she was going to make that trip, as it would've been an issue that was being discussed, either at a conference or in the newsroom. So she doesn't take issue with that. She would take issue with the fact that you might've known the details of it and I'm not sure whether you did know the details of it, because the specific details would've been only kept between her and Mr. Robert Cox, the news editor. Would you dispute that?
A. Oh, absolutely. No, she told me directly.

46 Q. She told you she was making a trip in a general sense, is that correct?
A. She told me she was making a trip and then she told me that -- the details of the meeting with Ms. D when she came back.

47 Q. Oh, sorry, I'm going to get to when she came back, and

I know what you've said in that regard. But she says -- I think you gave evidence yesterday that there was a discussion at the back of the newsroom. She has no recollection of that whatsoever. She will say she wouldn't deny you might have been aware of the trip taking place, but that it had been discussed at that level at the back of the newsroom, she doubts that. But maybe the import of that is all the same.

She'11 say that she received information from a number of sources, kept that detail to herself, had got permission from Robert Cox to go up to see, to, as it were, hopefully get an interview and her account or her recollection of what happened tallies in almost every respect with what we know Ms. D says in that regard. And I just want to go over that with you.
A. Mm hmm .

48 Q. She arrived at about one o'clock. She knocked on the door. Ms. D came out. She introduced herself. She was pregnant at the time. She gave her business card. She explained who she was and that she was a journalist and for who she worked. She recalls Mrs. D being somewhat upset because at that time the one o'clock news was on and there was a story about Sergeant McCabe and she said that that had upset her. There was a conversation about that which lasted about two or three minutes. She said 'Would you like to speak? We can do a story'. She said 'I really need to think about that'. And there it ended and she left. The
conversation, she says, at most five minutes but probably only two to three minutes. And she got into her car, she drove to a nearby filling station, got out of the car, rang two people, Val Hanley, a reporter, Robert Cox, who we know was the news editor and told both of them that the story was, as matters stood, a no-go. Both of them -- or, sorry, certainly Robert Cox is certainly in a position to give evidence to this Tribunal to confirm that. And then she returned to Dublin. But in the course of that conversation Robert Cox had told her that on the same day - this is her recollection - you had gone up to see John wilson. Do you remember --
A. The same day?

49 Q. She recalls being told by Robert Cox 'Oh, by the way', 10:30 that you were travelling to talk to John wilson at that time.
A. As I said, Chairman, I don't know who went up first or on what days, I don't dispute that. And again, I'm not privy to the conversations that Debbie McCann had with Robert Cox or Valerie Hanley, I can only tell you what she told me. And I stand over what she told me. And again I just want to reiterate this is the very first time I've ever heard this.
50 Q. According to you, she told you that she conducted an interview indoors with Ms. D in that house; is that correct?
A. That's correct.

51 Q. And you gave an account of, according to your -- the
version that Ms. McCann told you, that Ms. D was clutching herself and giving an account of the sexual misconduct, as it were, in the terms that you've outlined?
A. That's correct, yes.
A. Oh, I've said it doesn't look like it did happen. But

53 Q. Sorry, it doesn't look like it did happen?
A. I agreed that yesterday in the Tribunal.

54 Q. Yeah, but it doesn't look like it did happen or do you accept it did not happen?
A. No, I accept what Debbie McCann told me, Chairman.

This is the first time I've heard this story. Debbie McCann has had my statement, which outlines exactly what I've said about Ms. D in the statement, she's had it for the last year and that is my clear recollection of that conversation.
55 Q. Ms. O'Reilly, I'm asking you a different question. Do you now accept that Debbie McCann did not meet Ms. D on that occasion?
A. As I said yesterday, she either wasn't telling the truth then or she's not telling the truth now. But it looks like she --
CHA RMAN All right. Well, we can kind of get perhaps confused on this. It's very often the case that counsel will ask a question, something to the following
effect: 'You say you met my client at a particular place, but my client has an air ticket and was somewhere else'. So that's the kind of thing you're being asked. I think it's up to me to accept, but the evidence seems to indicate that Debbie McCann didn't get into the house and didn't have --
A. Hmm .

CHA RMAN -- have any conversation with Ms. D, but with Mrs. D on the doorstep over a very short period of time. And I have evidence of that from Mrs. D.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So what counsel is now putting to you is, given that that seems to be the case - and that does seem certainly to be the case --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- you couldn't probably have had the conversation with Debbie McCann that you're recounting. That's the question.
A. Oh, no, I definitely had the conversation.

MR. MDHAN And I just want to follow that through in your testimony. According to you, Debbie McCann is annoyed and upset that her that story is not being, as it were, followed, isn't that correct?
A. That's what she said, yes.

57 Q. Yeah. And not only -- she didn't give up the first 10:32 time, she tried on a number of occasions and as I understand it - and I'm paraphrasing your testimony, we can go over it - that Robert Cox was happy enough to run with it, Conor McDonald -- O'Donne11 was happy
enough to run with it and only Sebastian Hamilton, who I think is the overall editor, at the last hurdle said 'No, that's not running'?
A. That's what she told me, yes.

58 Q. That's what she told you? so let's just work that out. So we now know that that didn't happen. We now know that the journalist who you were then friendly with, Ms. McCann, was pushing to have included for publication and had convinced her news editor and Irish editor and that newspaper was going to run with a fake story about meeting Ms. D and Mrs. D, a story we know now couldn't have happened, simply fake and that she had gone to all these lengths and only at the very last hurdle the overall editor had called a halt to it that this story would have been published?
A. Again, Chairman, I can only tell you what Debbie McCann told me. I wasn't there for any conversations, I didn't see any story, I didn't watch her writing one up, I wasn't there for conversations with Robert or Conor or Sebastian. No story ever appeared.
59 Q. If that fake story had appeared, or if it was even as close to appearing as you suggest, it would've closed the newspaper, and rightly so; isn't that correct?
A. But we send in stories all the time that don't run. I don't know. No, no, this is very different. We now know it didn't happen. So you're saying that this clever journalist who you had seemingly had respect for, was a hard working professional journalist?
A. Correct.

61 Q. Al1 of that. who seems to have been somebody who was particularly concerned to get facts right, would you agree with that?
A. Absolutely.

62 Q. To the point of being sleepless about stories being published that she couldn't stand over and make sure she had the facts right, is that the type of journalist?
A. I didn't say she was sleepless. She --

63 Q. We11, I'm portraying her in this way and this is the evidence she will give, that she is absolutely particular about what she publishes. would you agree with that?
A. Well, I don't follow her work religiously. But yes, she's a good reporter.

64 Q. A good reporter and a professional reporter?
A. She's a good professional report --

65 Q. Takes her job seriously?
A. She does.

66 Q. Would hate to publish something that would be fake?
A. We11, she wouldn't have published it, her editor would've published it.

67 Q. Sorry, her byline on a published story that turned out to be an utter fake?
A. But we have so many stories we're working on that come and go and don't go in and do go in. I'm not keeping account of what Debbie McCann did or didn't write. I wasn't there. A11 I can do is te11 you what she
said. And I stand over what she said, I've a very clear recollection. And there is absolutely nobody else who told me that story.
68 Q. Sorry, Ms. O'Reilly, I'm putting a number of questions to you that, if you're right, if she told you that, therefore she was trying to get published and had convinced her line managers to publish a story which she knew to be fake. That's the import of what you're saying.
A. Again, I can only tell you what she said. And this is all news to me. I never -- Debbie's never said any of this before. This is --
69 Q. Well, she will deny not only that Robert Cox and all of those people I mentioned, Conor McDonne11, Sebastian Hamilton, are aghast as what you're suggesting.
A. Well, that's fine.

70 Q. You see, the alternative is hat she never said it to you and that you're making that up.
A. Chairman, I'm not making it up. It's very specific and very detailed. And that is exactly what I remember and that is what I told Tribuna1. And I told them this last year. Debbie had a whole year to tell the Tribunal this version of events that I'm just hearing this morning for the first time.
71 Q. Al1 of the material that you've included in that had been published by the time your statement had gone to the Tribunal.
A. Pardon?

CHA RMAN I'm sorry, I don't follow.

MR. MDHAN Soy, the material, the detail of, I suppose, Ms. D and maybe, I suppose, the personal material contained in those descriptions had already appeared, $I$ think, in the Conor Lally story in --
CHA RMAN Sorry, no, I understand, Mr. Mohan. So just 10:37 to clarify --
MR. MDHAN Sorry.
CHA RMAN -- what's being put to you is that you've made this up on the basis of material that's publically available, such as, for instance, the tribunal papers.
A. I didn't, Chairman.

CHAN RMAN Yes, all right.
72 Q. MR. MDHAN I also want to put to you that she never at any stage had said to you that, I think the phrase you used was "getting it from my pal Nóirín", she never said that to you.
A. She did.

73 Q. And again I'm -- she will challenge and she's annoyed at the suggestion that she was pushing to get this put in the paper, that she was somehow obsessed with running this particular line - and that's, I suppose, my characterisation of your testimony. She was investigating a story, following a line, it had been stopped, but she was doing no more or no less than a that a good reporter would do.
A. Chairman, I can only tell you what she said again. I'm sorry to sound like a broken record, but I've said all this to the tribunal in the past year and this is the first time that Debbie McCann has denied these
specific -- she's denied specifics here and I've not heard them before.

74 Q. And I think --
A. And really, to be honest, like I don't expect anybody in the Mail on Sunday to support me. I'm up here on my 10:38 own. So to be honest with you, you know, this is all news to me that's just been landed this morning. I'm happy to answer the questions, but I stand over everything I say. It took me a long time to come forward in the situation that $I$ was in. But I stand over everything I said yesterday.

77 Q. He was aware of it. You didn't tell him.
A. I absolutely told Brendan Howlin. And it's all over the internet, Chairman, it's in all the national newspapers, it's on-1ine, it's thee. I mean, just Google my name and it comes up.

78 Q. You see, Ms. McCann takes exception to the to phrase used yesterday, and it may have been used by Mr. Marrinan in the context of what was being put forward, that she spun yarns. That was the phrase used. Ms. McCann takes huge exception to that. At no stage did she spin yarns.
A. I can't remember saying spin yarns.

But that was put -- when this type of information was being put to you about her attending at the $D$ household, for want of a better word, about some reporters exaggerate, some don't, some spin yarns. Ms. McCann, when she takes the stand, will take grave exception to that. She is a hard working professional reporter whose integrity is very much intact.
A. And she's entitled to say that. But again, she has not 10:40 said this before, she's not said any of what was said this morning. And to be honest with you, you know, she pitched that story because she was interested in it. She was went after that story because she was interested in it. She didn't like Maurice McCabe.
80 Q. Sorry, there is no difficulty pitching a story or following it. she did that. It was never published, because it didn't stand up. That's how professional hard working reporters work. There's a big difference to that and to you coming in and saying that she was telling you things that we all know now never happened, because I'm suggesting she never said --
A. I utterly refute everything that you're saying and I stand over every single word I said yesterday. And
as I said, Debbie McCann had a whole year to lay out these specific responses that she's now putting before me on the day I'm giving evidence.
MR. MDHAN Thank you. I think they're all of the
issues that you asked me to deal with, Chairman.
CHA RMAN There's just one missing.
MR. MDHAN Sorry.
CHA RMAN "Debbi e MECann tol d me she' d got ten the name and address of the person abused fromsomeone hi gh up in the Gardaí. She said she' d got it from David Tayl or, she' d heard it from Nói rín Ơ Sullivan".

So I think those two things are important. But I mean, if there are --
MR. MDHAN No, no, for the record, Ms. McCann
absolutely denies that.
CHAL RMAN No, no, sorry, Mr. Mohan, I mean, you said, you know, she got information from a number of sources, I did note you as saying that, on the basis of Debbie McCann's story --
MR. MDHAN Well --
CHA RMAN Just give me a second, if you wouldn't mind. MR. MDHAN Sorry.
CHA RMAK But I mean, if that is indeed the case, so she says she didn't say that, I'm not asking her to o'Sullivan, who has waived any privilege in that regard or David Taylor, who has explicitly and on oath in the witness box waived any privilege that he may have.

MR. MDHAN Sorry, Mr. Chairman, you're quite correct. And for the record, Ms. McCann denies that she said that.
CHA RMAN Al1 right.
MR. MDHAN Thank you.
CHAN RMAN what do you say to that.
A. She got the information from somewhere, Chairman. I can tell you what she told me. And again
I completely and utterly refute what Debbie McCann is
alleging today. And she had a long time to come up
with those answers, but she's just put them before me today. And I have answered them as honestly as I can, Chairman.
MR. MOHAN Thank you.
CHA RMAN Thank you, Mr. Mohan. Did you have any
questions, Mr. Doyle? Oh, sorry, the Garda
Commissioner --
MR. DOYLE: I understand Mr. O'Higgins is going to ask her a few questions.
MR. KELLY: Sorry, Chairman, Kieran Kelly, for the D
family.
CHA RMAN Oh, I beg your pardon, mr. Kelly.
MR. KELLY: Sorry, I just have a few short questions. For Ms. o'reilly.
CHA RMAN And just if you wouldn't mind introducing 10:42 yourself?

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

81 Q. MR. KELLY: Yes, I'm Kieran Kelly, you know me.
A. Yes, I do.

82 Q. I'm here for the D family and I just have just a few short questions for you.
A. Yes. Yes.

83 Q. Obvious7y there's a central issue here is the conversation that Debbie McCann did or didn't have with you. I'm just going to ask you about the D family's interaction. The Chairman has already said to you that 10:43 Mrs. D has said she only had a very brief encounter with Debbie McCann at her door back in 2014. And that's her position. And she said that she told Debbie McCann, at page 136 of the transcript of July 17 th 1ast: "' We're not speaking to anybody' and that was all the deal ings I had with her." Do you accept that was her evidence?
A. I do accept that, yes. Yes.

84 Q. And Mr. D, at page 62 of the very same day, he said that -- he repeated what his wife had said, that out of the blue Debbie McCann called and "asked if we would be willing to speak to her" and Mrs. D said that she now politely declined. Do you accept that was the evidence she gave?
A. Again I can only just tell you what Debbie told me, that's all.

85 Q. Then your counse1, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh on the day, he, at page 108, asked Mr. D:
"Did you have gi ve an intervi ew to Debbi e MkCann at that time?" And he said:
"No, I didn't. No, I didn't give an intervi ew "

Then your counsel asked Mr. D:
"Did she call at your house on any occasion that you know of?" And he said: "Not that I rementer. I think she just called to the door and Mrs. D more or less
said we weren't going to talk to a journalist about it at that stage."

And then he's asked: "Did any other menber of your family give an intervi ew to Debbie MECann?"

And he said:
"Not that I amaware of, no."

And that was his evidence. Do you accept that?
A. I do, yes.

86 Q. And then Ms. D herself gave evidence first on that day and she said at page 53 of the transcript, she was asked about contacts with journalists:
"Can I ask you to confirm aml correct in my understanding you were not intervi ewed by a journalist called Debbie MECann?"

And she answered:
"I never ret Debbi e McCann. "

And then on page 11 there's one other matter I think she is asked where, in late January 2014 she's asked:
"There were certain journal ists trying to make cont act with you."

This is according to documentation which has been put in to the Tribunal. And she's asked:
"Do you remenber that at all?"

And Ms. D said:
"At that time l was down in the southeast, as l said, for return to college and I got a couple of calls from my mum and dad to say that they had a couple of reporters who had called to the house and actually called to our doorstep. I wasn't there obvi ousl y for that but my parents didinformme."

So Ms. D wasn't at the family home in that area at the time - we're not naming the town.
A. Yes.

87 Q. She was in the southeast. So she couldn't have been
there at the time that Debbie McCann called. Do you accept that?
A. I do, yes. And again I just reiterate, this is only what Debbie McCann told me.

88 Q. Yes. And one matter arises, you gave evidence of this yesterday and it's in your statement at page 3832; you say:
"Debbi e" - this is Debbie McCann - "told me there was no Pulse number for the case and it was a cover-up."

And then you put in your statement that she was stil1 in touch with the woman she met.
A. That's correct. That's what she said. I had certainly felt from speaking to her that they had formed some sort of a relationship, just from speaking to Debbie. But just to say to you, like, I have had no interactions with the D family, I don't know who they are, I don't know where they live, I don't know anything about them, I don't know their names.
89 Q. We11, you see, that was never put to Ms. D by your counse1 last year.

CHA RMAN No, but I think, Mr. Kelly, there's a difference and I think it seems to be this, and I used yesterday the fishing analogy of the fisherman who says 10:46
'I caught a 50 pound salmon'. I mean, they may not have caught anything, a minnow, whatever. I understand that. Those are the facts on the ground. There's no dispute about the facts on the ground and you very
accurately put everything, indeed I think the only thing that's missing is that I think that the reporter at the door said to mrs. D 'I know you've been through a hard time'. But that's just a very peripheral detail, it's the kind of conversation that emerges.

I don't think the witness is challenging in any way anything that the D family say about these encounters, but she's simply recounting a conversation that someone else told her about it. So in other words, we're moving from the realm of hearsay evidence to original evidence, its importance that it was said.
MR. KELLY: Yes, Chairman. The point is this -CHA RNAN And perhaps there is a fact also included in what was said. No, but I see what you're doing, Mr. Kelly, and I've no problem with it, but I don't think Ms. O'Reilly is in any way challenging the veracity of any account given by the D family.
MR. KELLY: Well, your counsel never asked Ms D last year if Debbie McCann remained in phone contact with Ms. D. And what I'm saying to you very clearly is Ms. D says she never had any phone contact with Debbie McCann at all.
A. Okay.

90 Q. Okay. Do you accept that?
A. Yes. Yes, I do.

MR. KELLY: That was the point, Chairman.
A. Again, I can only just tell you what she told me, that's it.

CHA RMAN No, and I do understand the difference between what someone tells you and whether things actually happened that people tell you. No, I understand that. Maybe others don't, but I think I do. MR. KELLY: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, Ms. O'Reilly.
A. Thank you.

# THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR M CHEÁL O H GG NS AS FOLLONG: 

MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Ms. o'reilly, my name is Michael O'Higgins and --
CHA RMAN And again, I'm sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, in the event that -- I'm going to go back to the 50 pound salmon; maybe some people in the room actually do fishing, fishermen boast about catching something. That doesn't necessarily mean they caught anything. So I don't see Ms. O'Reilly as saying anything directly against the Gardaí, I see her as recounting a conversation.
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes.
CHA RMAN I don't see her as saying 'We11, I was in contact with Nóirín O'Sullivan and she told me the following' or 'she gave me the following'. She's not saying that at all. She's saying somebody else said that to me. Now, that may be important, I may be act on it, I may not, but --
MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: I'm obliged, Chairman --

CHA RMAN -- it's important that it was said and it may be that within hearsay evidence there's something that the Tribunal can act on, but I'd have to analyse al1 the evidence before doing so.
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes. And, Chairman, if I may say, it is my intention, for that reason, to, as it were, stay out of any dispute between this witness and Ms. McCann as to what was or was not said, but just to put the accounts, I suppose for the record really, it's really a book-keeping exercise in relation to my two accounts.

CHN RMAN I'm sorry for being amused, M. O'Higgins, but the record and this mysterious thing that people keep referring to, I have tow visions; one is the National Archives and the second is my own brain. Honestly, I'm listening to absolutely everything everybody says, whatever the record is. But you fee1
$\qquad$
MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: I'11 work on that basis.
CHA RMAN Yes. We11, you feel you need to put things. 10:49 Please do.
91 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: And I'11 endeavour to do it with dispatch. (To witness) So just, you're clear on that, Ms. O'Reilly --
A. Yes.

92 Q. -- I'm going to be staying out of the dispute, as it were, between yourself and Debbie McCann as to what was or was not said.
A. okay.

93
A. Yes.

A11 right. And you -- can I just start then with John McCann? I just want to mention this to you so you're clear on it; his position in relation to the question as to whether he shared any information with his daughter concerning Ms. D or the investigation, the matters pertaining to the investigation is to be found on page 7407 of the materials, and I'11 just very briefly mention it and it ask for your comment on it.
A. Okay.

96 Q. And he's asked there on page - we11, it's page 3274 of the old materials, but $I$ think it's 7407 of this module's materials - and he's asked in line 116 whether he facilitated contact between Ms. D and his daughter, Debbie McCann and a crime correspondent with the Irish Mail on Sunday. And he's asked the reason why he facilitated such contact and all attendant circumstances. And he says:
"No, I did not. I have no i dea who Ms. D is, ot her than what I have read in the newspapers in the recent past."

And then he's asked:
"I have been asked to detail any contacts l had with Debbie McCann rel ating to Mb. D, Ser geant Maurice McCabe and/ or the current Commissi oner Nói rín O Sullivan, what was di scussed because the type of contacts l had with my daughter in this regard, i.e. face to face, tel ephone, e-mail et cetera."

And he responded in this interview as follows:
"I never spoke to my daughter about Mb. D. No more than any ot her father speaking to his daughter about current affairs, the ongoing controversies in An Garda Sí ochána would have been di scussed, but any di scussi ons rel ating to Maurice McCabe or any parties asked of me
or the ongoing controversies took place after my retirement. These were informal chats. I had no know edge or invol vement in any of the investi gations and as such had no firsthand know edge ot her than what I read in the newspapers or gleaned from TV and radio. As I say, these were informal chats."

And that was his position. Now, in relation to the -CHA RMAR But are you inviting a response?
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Just in relation to that --
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, are you inviting a response?

MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: If I could --
CHA RMAN So you've no additional or extra information
about superintendent McCann, you possibly have never even met the man in you life?
A. I don't even know what he looks like. I've never met him.
97 Q.
MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: Just to fill out that
factually, in the same statement, retired Superintendent McCann indicates that he retired on 28th July 2013. All right? So to just to factor that in to what he says. Then the second person who is the subject potentially of the disputed conversation you had with Debbie McCann is, of course, Nóirín o'sullivan.
A. Yes.

98 Q. And if you don't mind, I just want to mention to you what her position on this on these matters is.
A. Yes.

And she -- I think perhaps the best place to locate her position in relation to the crisp issue as to the disputed conversation is on page 804 of the materials. And she's asked towards the bottom of page 804 at line 146 the following question:
"I have been asked whether I gave any other information to ME. MECann of $f$ the record and asked her not to quote me. If so, I have been asked to provide details and
all attendant circunstances."

And she replied:
"I can confirmthat I did not gi ve any other i nf ormation rel evant to the terms of reference to Mb. MkCann of $f$ the regard record and $I$ asked her not to quote me."

Then this next question perhaps is a little bit more germane. She's asked the following:
"I have been asked whet her I gave inf or mati on to Mb. McCann in rel ation to Ms. D, her family and/ or the allegati ons she made agai nst Sergeant McCabe in 2006 and, further, whether l ever provi ded with her with any inf ormation in rel ation to referral recei ved by An Garda Sí ochána from Tusl a on 2nd May 2014 contai ni ng the incorrect allegation agai nst Ser geant MkCabe. If so, I have been asked to provi de details and all attendant circunstances."

And what Nóirín O'Sullivan says, Ms. O'Reilly, is the following:
"I can confirmthat l never gave any information to Ms. McCann rel ating to the matters stated above."

So you're clear on her position?
A. Yes, I am.

100 Q. She indicates she gave her no such information.
A. And again I can just only tell you what Debbie told me. I didn't have any consideration with Nóirín O'Sullivan,

I don't know Nóirín O'Sullivan -- we11, obvious7y I know of her.

101 Q. Yes.
A. But I wouldn't have a --

102 Q. I understand.
A. Yeah.

103 Q. A11 right. We11, can I ask you then - and you'11 be glad to hear I'm coming towards the end of my questions to you - can I ask you then in relation to your own statement as to what you say Debbie McCann said to you? 10:55
A. Yes.

104 Q. Could I ask you to look at your own statement on page 3830, which is your statement made to the Tribunal on 7th June 2017? Do you see that there on screen?
A. Yes.

105 Q. And you say in this that --
A. Excuse me, sorry, do you mind just scrol1ing down a little bit, if you don't mind?
106 Q. Yeah, so just if we stop it there. So just pick it up from the top. It says:
"Towards the end of the 2013 and early 2014 my colleague with the Irish Mail on Sunday Debbie McCann told me that the Garda whi stlebl ower Ser geant Maurice MECabe, who had lifted the lid on the penalty points scandal, was a child abuser. She told me that Sergeant McCabe and John Wilson had caused a lot of trouble within the Gardaí for doing what they did. I asked her what she meant when she said he was a child abuser."

And then you say the following:
"Debbi e said all of the Gardaí knew he was invol ved in abusing a girl, who is now an adult, and that there had 10:56 been a bi g cover-up within the Gardaí about it because he was a Sergeant and a friend of the girl's father who is al so a Garda."

Now, can I just ask you about that?
A. Yes.

107 Q. Is it your position that an important aspect of what was said to you by Debbie McCann as to the alleged smear campaign was that there had been a Garda cover-up of the Ms. D allegation and that there had been a cover-up because the subject of the investigation, Sergeant McCabe, was a guard himself?
A. Yes, that's what $I$ understood it to be.

108 Q. Right. You see, the point --
A. But again I don't have any independent verification of that, or either that all the Gardaí knew.

109 Q. We11, I suppose the point I want to ask you to deal with is, that being the case, because that was an important strand of what you say was said to you by Debbie McCann --
A. Mm hmm .

110 Q. -- it would make little sense, I'm suggesting to you, that Nóirín O'Sullivan the Commissioner of Garda Síochána then, could've been the source for that
alleged information, because it's not consistent with the facts as they were known to Nóirín o'Sullivan and it's an account that's unfavourable to Garda Síochána.
A. Mm hmm .

111 Q. Do you see the point I'm making?
A. Mm hmm .
Q. It's an account of a cover-up?
A. Yes.

113 Q. Which obviously is -- and it's an account of a cover-up in which the beneficiary of the cover-up, if we play it 10:57 through, was Sergeant McCabe himself.
A. Mm hmm .

114 Q. And the point I wish to make to you is that that would be completely inconsistent with any suggestion that Sergeant McCabe, for instance, was motivated to get revenge against the Gardaí, because in fact he had been the beneficiary of any such cover-up?
A. I think what she meant -- well, certainly what I understood from the conversation was that it was covered up because he was a sergeant and it was sort of 10:58 not something that you'd want in the public domain. And secondly, she had said to me that Maurice McCabe had a falling out with his superiors and as a result of that, he started doing all the whistleblowing stuff.
115 Q. The other thing I wish to suggest to you is that that account of the alleged smear campaign is also at odds with other accounts of the alleged smear campaign, for instance the account put across by Superintendent Dave Taylor on his case. Do you understand the point I'm
making?
A. I do. And again, I don't know Dave Taylor, but I can only tell you what Debbie McCann told me, and I've recalled those conversations to the very best of my knowledge.

116 Q. All right. Can I just, finally, just one more question, if I may?
A. Yes.

117 Q. Could I ask you to deal with a telephone conversation, as I understand it, that you had with a representative of the Tribunal itself? And would you mind turning then to page 3807 of the materials. If we could just -- so just to set it in context for you, this is an attendance - if we hold it there for a moment - an attendance of 30th May 2017 of, as I understand it, a phone call that you placed to a representative of the Tribunal itself. And it says:
"Al i son had called and left her number for re to cont act her" - and the number is given - "I called her, 11:00 I eft message. She phoned back. She got her letter yester day."

And there's a reference then to Michael Keeley that needn't trouble us. And then it says in the next paragraph:
"She wants to clarify what is in the Brendan How in statement, she says it's not correct"?
A. Sorry, I -- oh, yes. Yes.

118 Q. Do you have that there?
A. Yes.

119 Q. And just this next aspect is what I want to canvas with you:
"She di d hear rumours, but from other journalists, not the Gardaí. '

And that's something you told --
A. Yes.

120 Q. -- a representative of the Tribunal?
A. Yes. Journalist it should be. And I didn't have several meetings with Michael Keeley.
"She has been to $M$ chael Keel ey several times to gi ve hi minf or mation. "

No, I only met Michael Keeley once.
121 Q. And you're confirming there you did not hear rumours
A. Absolutely not.

MR. MC CHEÁL O H GG NS: Thanks very much.
CHA RMAN Yes, just from the point of view of this mysterious record which we're all hearing about - and investigations that are certainly central to this: One is the investigation in relation to $D$ allegation and I think I've said before, and I'm saying it now, it was
clearly a first class investigation; the second one was the Clerkin investigation in relation to David Taylor, and again that seems to me to be an absolutely first class investigation. So I have no notion in my head and I'm not steering in any way towards any notion that 11:01 anyone was covering anything up, apart, of course, from what we're dealing with, which is the central smear allegation issue.
MR. ḾCHEÁL OHGGS: May it please you, Chairman. CHAI RMAN So just to make that clear. So, Mr. Doyle.

## THE WTNESS MAS RE-EXAM NED BY MR. DOYLE AS FOLLOWG:

122 Q. MR. DOYLE: Just a very few things arising out of your evidence and your cross-examination, Ms. O'Reilly -I'm Declan Doyle and I'm appearing for Ms. o'Reilly, as the Tribunal knows. Can I just clear up with you some dates which may be of assistance to the Tribunal arising out of things that were put to you yesterday about your motivation in giving evidence to the
Tribunal? The incident in Buncrana which give rise to the report which give rise to your action against your employers, the issue -- the tragedy in Buncrana, as I understand it, happened in March 2016, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

123 Q. The events followed then, you are still in dispute and are suing the Daily Mail both for defamation and for the damages for negligence giving rise to injuries,
isn't that so?
A. Yes.

124 Q. There was a grievance procedure in October of 2016, isn't that right?
A. An internal grievance, yes.

Yeah. That ended up in the Labour Court in January 2017, isn't that right?
A. Hmm, it went to the Work Relations Commission and the Mail blocked it and then it went to the Labour Court and the Mail blocked it in January.

126 Q. Yes. And the proceedings which you have issued against the Daily Mail $I$ think were issued in the defamation action in March or April 2017, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

127 Q. And the proceedings claiming damages for the injuries 11:03 which you sustained were issued, having gone through the Injuries Board procedure, those proceedings were issued in September or October of 2017, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

128 Q. Your statement to the Tribuna1, which is at 3830/1/2 and those pages, that statement was made by you on 7th June 2017, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

129 Q. You then met the Tribunal's investigators on 12th October 2017, does that sound right.
A. Sounds right, yes.

130
Q. And it was at that meeting that the statement of Debbie McCann was put to you and you were asked for your
comments about Ms. McCann's statement at that time; isn't that right?
A. Hmm. The full statement wasn't put to me, just, I think, as far as I can remember, maybe three sma11 sections of her statement. And we asked why and we were told it was because she had only referred to me in those three or four sma11 paragraphs and that's why we weren't receiving the full copy of the statement.
131 Q. Yes. Well, those --
A. But I eventually saw it, yeah.

132 Q. -- those statements are all before the Tribunal.
A. Yes.

133 Q. And I don't intend to go over them now. Just three other brief matters. It, I think, was being suggested to you yesterday that the paper didn't run with your story about Maurice McCabe and the paper didn't run with Debbie McCann's story about Ms. D for kind of the same reasons.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hmm}$.

134 Q. I think it was being suggested to you that, well, you
pitch a story and if it stands up or if the editors like it, the paper will run with it, but that neither your story about Maurice McCabe nor Ms. McCann's story about Ms. D were run by the paper and I think it was being suggested to you that, largely for the same reasons, that these things happen in a newspaper. Am I right in saying that your story about Maurice McCabe could never have got off the ground, because Maurice McCabe flatly refused to cooperate in any such story?
A. We11, I actually didn't arrange to go and meet Maurice McCabe or door-knock him, it just emerged from a meeting I had with John wilson and I had been given permission to go to that. And then, as I said, you have to make decisions on the ground and I knew I was dealing with a sergeant, $I$ knew $I$ was in safe hands, so I went to his house. And from thee, as a journalist, you ask yourself sometimes --
I'm not -- I'm sorry for interrupting, but I'm not asking you about that. But there really was no story about Maurice --
A. No, there was no story.
Q. You didn't pitch a story about Maurice McCabe --
A. No, no.

137 Q. -- and the paper decided not to run with it?
A. No, I didn't expect to meet him, I just met him by chance. And when I had him there for those few minutes, I put a journalist's question to him. But nothing emerged from it, there was no --
138 Q. So there was no story?
A. There was no plan, no.

139 Q. And it's not right to say that there's a similarity between --
A. No. Completely different.

140 Q. -- a pattern between those two things? A11 right.
Another thing that was put to you yesterday was that you were lying to the Tribunal and lied to your employers -- sorry, that you couldn't be believed before this tribunal because you had lied to your
employers in your interaction with Michael Keeley, the solicitor for the mail, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

141 Q. And in support of that contention, a document was circulated which was an attendance of 5th Apri1 2017 of 11:07 Michael Keeley the solicitor, an attendance which he did of his meeting with you in the Conrad Hote1. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.

142 Q. Do you have that document in front of you? 11:07
A. Not yet, no.

143 Q. Sorry, it was circulated yesterday and it wasn't part of the Tribunal papers.
CHA RMAN No, it was, it was actually read out to you yesterday.
A. Yes, it was, yes.

CHAN RMAN So we've been through the thing.
A. Yes.

MR. DOYLE: Yes.
CHA RMAN I think it's in our papers now, isn't it, at 11:08 page -- it's the very, very end --
MR. DOYLE: It was added yesterday I think.
CHA RMAN -- of the last book? If you want to get anything on the system, just give us a page number. Do we have a page number? We've been through the Michaet 11:08 Keeley thing yesterday, so there's no --
MR. DOYLE: I don't have a page number for that document yesterday.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, we11, give you a page
number.
144 Q. MR. DOYLE: 7514. And down at the bottom, the very last paragraph, which is a one-sentence paragraph:
"She di d not speak with Brendan How in and was not his source bef ore hi s Dáil statements about Sergeant McCabe on 8th February 2017.'

And that was put to you in support of the contention that you were a liar. It was mentioned that you had also made a memo of that meeting with Michael Keeley, and that memo is in the Tribunal papers at page 3863 and 3864. Could I ask that to be brought up on the system? And that's a memo, it's two months later, isn't that right.
A. Well, I wrote my notes immediately afterwards. So the handwritten notes are with Gus. And I telephoned him and then he asked me to type them up and I typed them up.
145 Q. Yes. Could I just take you down through that? I'm trying to do this as quickly as I possibly can. It's agreed that you met Michae1 Keeley in the Conrad Hote1, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

146 Q. And that meeting was to do what?
A. It was to discuss the disclosures Tribunal and, I think, letters we had received from the Chairman.

147 Q. Yes. I suppose the bits at issue are, if you go down about half way down the page:
"He asked me did I meet, contact or intervi ew Sergeant Maurice MsCabe and di scuss the rumours with him I said yes. I told hi m Sergeant Mauri ce McCabe seemed di stressed. "

Do you have that in front of you, Ms. O'Reilly?
A. Yes, I have, yes.
Q. "I told M chael I felt sorry for Ser geant McCabe. He i mmedi ately stopped writing, put his pen down and
looked at me. I felt I wasn't supposed to make those comments or M chael didn't want to hear them M chael then said 'You know, no one comes out of a tribunal l ooking okay, even if they're trying to be the good guy'. I felt slightly threatened by his remarks, regretted telling himl felt sorry for Sergeant McCabe, I said 'I don't want to be in a Tribunal Mchael' and M chael sai d 'Good' ."

Can you go over the page then and get to the piece where you record, four paragraphs down, but the second paragraph is only one line:
"Bef ore we left, M chael Keel ey said 'One more thing. Brendan How in stood up in the Dáil and said a journalist told himthey had direct information regar ding Nói rín Ơ Sullivan telling a journal ist that Mauri ce McCabe was i nvol ved in sexual misconduct. Were you hi s source?' "

You have recorded there:
"I said no, because l don't believe I was and al so because I did not tell Deputy How in that I had direct i nf ormation about Nói rín O Sul livan speaki ng to a reporter. I have clarified this to the Tribunal and Brendan How in clarified it in the afternath of his Dái l statement."

And you telephoned your solicitor the following day to raise your concerns about your meeting with Michae1 Keeley. Insofar as they're not expressed in that document, what were those concerns, Ms. O'Reilly?
A. I just felt I was being told not to speak to the Tribuna1. And I didn't feel that was right. And I suppose later on in the e-mails, the exchange that I had with michael Keeley, it says in those e-mails 'michael' - I'm paraphrasing now, because I don't have them in front of me - but I do say in those e-mails, in 11:12 follow-up to this 'michael, I'll tell you everything now'. And he never responded'.

I just felt I was told not to speak to the Tribunal and I felt threatened. You know, like, I've been made redundant three times as a journalist, I have a mortgage and children, it's quite a frightening experience, because it's a tough enough industry as it is, so it's twice as hard if you don't have a hard and

I just felt really, really worried.
149 Q. All right, the last thing I wanted to raise with you then, if you look at your statement at 3832 in the Tribunal papers, it's a small matter but I think it may have been suggested to you this morning that Debbie McCann will deny that she said "It was my pal Nóirín" and so on. My recollection was that it was you who used the term, if you like, "your pal Nóirín" and it's at the bottom of that page --

CHA RMAN Yes, the question put, as I remember, Mr. Doyle, was 'Was that your pal Nóirín?' - that was you - to which the answer was --
A. To me.

CHA RMAN -- in the affirmative in some way. Yes. 'Are you getting this from your pal Nóirín' and she said yes.
A. Yes.

150 Q. MR. DOYLE: Yes. So insofar as Ms. McCann denies that she ever came up with the term "pal", that was your characterisation?
A. I know I said that, it was me that said that.

151 Q. And where did that characterisation, "your pal Nóirín", where did that come from?
A. I suppose it was just an expression. As I said

I always felt that Debbie was very impressed by Nóirín o'Sullivan and that's her right to be and so it was a bit sort of "your pal Nóirín". That was all really, nothing to it really.
MR. DOYLE: Thank you. I don't have any further
questions for Ms. O'Reilly.
MR. MARRI NAN I have no further questions.
CHA RMAN A11 right. Thank you very much for coming, Ms. O'Reilly.
THE WTNESS: Thank you.
MR. MEGU NESS: The next witness, Chairman, is
Ms. Justine McCarthy.
MR. DOYLE: Before Ms. McCarthy comes up, Chairman, I'11 take on board what the Tribunal said this morning about coming back and then if necessary, I know

Ms. O'Reilly said in the witness box, no, she wants to deal with matters today, but can we have liberty to community with the Tribunal?
CHAN RMAN We11 no of course. That goes without saying, you don't have to ask me, Mr. Doyle. And if you want to be back for Debbie McCann's evidence, it is your entitlement to do so. I can't force people to take up Haughey rights, they are just there, and you take your own course.
MR. DOYLE: Thanks, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much for being here.

## MG. J USTI NE MCCARTHY, HAV NG BEEN SWORN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NESS AS FOLLOVS:

MR. MEGU NNESS: Ms. McCarthy's statement --
MR. KENNEDY: I wonder, Chairman, just before the witness commences -- sorry, Chairman.

CHAL RMAN There you are. Yes?
MR. KENNEDY: I should perhaps formally identify myself. Brian Kennedy appearing on behalf of Ms. McCarthy instructed by Paula Mullooly of A\&L Goodbody solicitors.
CHA RMAN Yes. Well thank you, Mr. Kennedy for being here.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Chairman, for the benefit of everyone here Ms. McCarthy's statement is contained in volume 18 at page 4857. Ms. McCarthy, I'11 be referring you to a 11:15 very small number of documents and if you wish to consult them in a paper form they are all in the volumes on your left-hand side or if you want to see them on screen or both you are welcome to do so.
A. Thank you.

152 Q. You have been with journalist since 1979; isn't that right?
A. Yes, I have.

153 Q. And I think your present position is as a senior writer with the Sunday Times?
A. That's correct.
Q. The Irish edition, based in Dublin?
A. That's correct.

155 Q. And I think you write as a columnist and as a political reporter?
A. That's correct.
Q. I think during the period that the Tribunal is primarily concerned with from July 2012 to May 2014 you were a columnist and general reporter in the newsroom?
A. That's correct.

157 Q. You report to both the editor and the news desk editor and also to the associate editor as a columnist; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Do you have a lot of contact with crime reporters, security reporters in your own paper?
A. In my own group?
Q. In your own group, yes.
A. Not generally, no. I'm based in Leinster House for most of the week. So I have a lot of contact with other political reporters.

160 Q. Yes, okay. Now, I think in February of 2017 you wrote an article that was published in the Sunday Times on 12th February of 2017 and it was, I think, had the heading: "Name and share the rumour-mongers who sl urred Mauri ce McCabe."

I am sure you recall writing that?
A. Yes, I do.

161 Q. That's contained in our papers in volume 27, page 7145, and if you could just look at that for a few minutes. I think in the first paragraph you draw attention to an article which was written by Mr. Williams which you were obviously conscious of at the time, I take it?
A. Yes.

162 Q. And in the second paragraph you appear to be saying that anyone who read that recognised Sergeant McCabe as the person being referred to, that is anyone who was
covering issues of Garda reporting on misconduct et cetera?
A. Yes. I said any journalist who was contemplating it would have recognised him.
163 Q. Yes. Then you say: "For we had been warned to treat MLCabe with the ut nost suspi ci on. Generally, it was crime reporters who recei ved the warning fromthei $r$ Garda sources, and rel ayed a tread-caref ully SOS to non-crime beat colleagues, who get shorter shrift from the Garda press office."

Now, I think just to clarify your own position, I think you made it clear in your answer to the questionnaire sent by the Tribunal and to the Tribunal investigators that you were never negatively briefed by Superintendent David Taylor?
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. In any of the senses set out in the terms of reference?
A. No.

165 Q. And I think you also confirmed you were never negatively briefed by either former Commissioner Callinan or former Commissioner O'Sullivan in those terms either?
A. No, I was not.

166 Q. And in fact you were helpful enough to also exclude the 11:19 fact that you were never negatively briefed by any guard about Sergeant McCabe?
A. That's correct.

167 Q. I think you did point out to the investigators in the
course of your interview that you had in fact received a positive briefing in favour of sergeant McCabe from a member of Garda Síochána?
A. Yes, a guard I spoke on the record spoke very positively about Maurice McCabe.
168 Q. Yes. Just this passage here now in the second paragraph, you were writing about, commencing:
"Generally it was crime reporters would recei ve the war ni ng. "

Is that something you were informed of by journalists within your own paper or other crime reporters?
A. I was writing this in an opinion column.

169 Q. Yes.
A. So I wasn't stating that, I suppose, as a fact. This was my impression --

170 Q. Yes.
A. -- knowing how the system works.

171 Q. Yes. obviously at that time in time, you refer to
Superintendent David Taylor in the next sentence, you were obviously aware that he had come out as the former head of the Press office claiming to have done this?
A. Yes, I was.

172 Q. Just I suppose from the point of view of completeness, you yourself have no evidence of his campaign in that regard in any direct sense?
A. No. To my knowledge I have never had any dealings with him at all.

173 Q. Yes. You draw attention anyway in the next number of paragraphs to the timing of the publication of Mr. Williams' article, his second article then and third article. At the end of that first page, at the bottom of 7415, you are asking:
"Is it a coincidence in timing that this is happening at the same time that we now know that Tusla had opened the file rel ating to Ser geant MkCabe's children in particular in rel ation to that error."

You are raising the issue there as to whether it's a coincidence?
A. Yes, that's right.

174 Q. Obviously that's something that the Chairman has been 11:22 considering at length?
A. Yes.

175 Q. I take it you - this is something you also confirmed to the Tribunal investigators - you had no knowledge or information relating to the Tusla file or the erroneous 11:22 error that had been made in relation to that?
A. No. When it was reported by Katie Hannon in RTÉ was the first I had heard of it.
Q. Yes, and that's the Prime Time programme in February 2017?
A. That's right.

177 Q. On the second page of the article you draw attention to a number of other features there relating to Ms. D, wondering why she would have been in contact with the
crime writer and how he got in touch with her et cetera, and you had no information on that yourself --
A. No, I didn't.

178 Q. -- at that time. You have probably followed the evidence of the Tribunal to some degree in relation to that?
A. As best I can.

179 Q. Yes. You also put it in context, but in the third last paragraph, having referred to Mr. Williams' article and Mr. Reynolds' broadcast, you say:
"None of this is to impute wrongdoing by Willians, Reynol ds or their colleagues. Journalists rely on contacts for information, protecting source's anonymity is a cherished principle of the trade, but in this case ${ }^{11: 23}$ trust was denol ished in the rel ationship bet ween some journalists and their sources. The debt is cancelled. Even in media outlets that refrain fromreporting the spurious clai ms, the campaign to vilify McCabe exerted a chilling effect and is partly the reason this controversy has gone on for years.

Apart fromthe angui sh this caused the sergeant, his wife and thei $r$ children, the relentless deni gration of MECabe put the safety of Irish citizens at risk by deferring urgent examination of what is rotten in the country's law enforcement. That is not to mention how such vi ci ous campai gn has accel erated the di sintegration of public morality.

Journalists, even if inadvertently, facilitated it by not properly interrogating the fal se rumburs agai nst McCabe. There is an onus on us now to correct the
record. We can start by di spensing with the shi el d of protecting our sources. Why protect a source on whom you cannot rely to tell the truth? Those of us who know the identities of the rumour-mongers have a duty to the Charl et on Commi ssi on and name those names. The journalist's first obligation is to the truth."

And obviously there, you have put it in terms of the first person plural, but you are writing this on your own behalf, as it were, reflecting your own opinion in the matter?
A. That's correct.

180 Q. I mean you're not necessarily reflecting the position of the Sunday Times as an organisation or other journalists in the Sunday Times?
A. No, it's entirely my own opinion.

181 Q. Yes. Just to focus on a number of parts of that, if we way. You refer there to: "The rel entless deni gration of McCabe put the safety of Irish citizens at risk by deterring urgent examination of what is rotten in the country's I aw enf or cement."

I take it you would agree that this identifies a significant public interest in the current law being enforced in terms of its rules and regulations and
practices in relation to road safety matters?
A. This story?

182 Q. Yes.
A. I thought it was a huge public interest story, yes.

183 Q. Yes. You obviously, it would seem, linked the campaign to denigrate him in some way to, as it were, lessen the effect of the exposure of that or downplay its importance?
A. As I watched it unfold. Yes, I believe that to be the case.

184 Q. So if there was a concerted effort from the very top of Garda Síochána to do that, you would see a great public interest no doubt in exposing that and stopping it?
A. That's what we do as journalists.

185 Q. Yes. And the truth coming out about that?
A. Yes.

186 Q. You also mention what you appear to identify as another significant issue there, the disintegration of public morality, what had you got in mind specifically when you are including that phrase in the article?
A. I suppose what I was talking about was the use of State agencies to undermine a whistleblower who was trying to put into the public domain information that was in the public interest.
187 Q. Yes. May I take it that if you look at one side of it, 11:26 if that had happened and it was possible to do that, that would be an astonishing subversion of democracy, to put it at its highest, but of control of the police force, exercising power over journalists and allowing a
campaign of besmirchment to succeed?
A. It would be deplorable.

Yes. would you degree, therefore, that there is a significant public interest in determining whether in fact such a campaign had existed, who was involved in it, the extent of it and the extent of its reach into the media?
A. I have no doubt that that is essential.
Q. Now, you refer to the issue of journalists protecting our sources and why protect a source on whom you cannot 11:28 rely to tell the truth. You seem to have foreseen the clarion call of the Chairman to ask people to come forward and identify parties who were involved in that and presumably you still support that effort on the part of the Chairman to discover the truth of what was being said to whom and in what circumstances?
A. I certainly do, yes.

190 Q. You helpfully replied to the questionnaire furnished to you by the Tribunal relating to the terms of reference, and I'm not going to go through that, it's at page 4874, but you did touch on the issue of journalists sources and the necessity to protect them in your letter to the Tribunal of 5th December 2017 and if we could just look at that, it's at page 4873.

In the middle paragraph there you say: "My vi ew on journalists obligations to protect sources is that it is a fundament al val ue designed to facilitate the emergence of information which is in the public
i nterest. However, I bel i eve that the obl i gation."

Is that fails or falls?
A. Falls.

191 Q. "Falls if a journalist's source knowingly conveys fal se 11:29 inf ormation for the purpose of danaging somebody's reputation. In those circunstances l believe it's a journalist's duty to expose that wrongdoing. This doesn't prevent the difficulty of course of ascertai ni ng the source's intentions and know edge about the veracity or lack of it of the information conveyed. "

As I understand that what you are seeking to convey is that a journalist when he receives information from a source, he obvious7y has to evaluate that, but he cannot necessarily know at the time whether the source is deliberately misleading him and knows that what is being conveyed is false?
A. That's correct, yes.

192 Q. Obviously we're in a position now and the Chairman is in a position, the public is in a position to see and has heard Superintendent Taylor's evidence and statements, but I take it that you are aware that, first of all, Superintendent Taylor has waived any possible assertion of privilege on his part as being a source of information?
A. I have read that.

193 Q. Presumably you understand that he is saying he was in
fact being deliberately tasked with the job of besmirching sergeant McCabe and doing so on the basis of a reliance of an allegation of sexual assault that was false?
A. I am aware he said that, yes.
Q. Does that affect your view of the issue of the journalist duty to expose that wrongdoing. Because, if that analysis is correct, would you agree that it's now known that Superintendent Taylor was deliberately doing that with this malign intent?
A. Well, he has said he was deliberately doing it.
A. We don't know. It would appear that he has said that he put out false information at one stage. So any journalist will have to decide at which stage was he giving false information and at which stage is he giving true and correct information.
Q. Yes. I think, just from your point of view, you confirmed to the Tribunal that you were told about the allegation, that is the 2006 allegation, by another journalist?
A. Yes.

197 Q. And I think you have -- obviously the Tribunal question that was asked of you was in terms of were you briefed by anyone and you said 'yes, by a journalist'. I think 11:32 you clarified that in your interview with the investigators that you wouldn't really use the term 'briefed' because nobody was trying to persuade you to do anything in relation to Sergeant McCabe, but you
were told of it by another journalist?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And from the point of view of dealing with that issue of a source, you don't know where that other journalist got that information?
A. No, I don't.
Q. You don't. And you are not in a position to assist the Tribunal as to where that journalist may or might have got that, you just don't know?
A. No, I didn't ask the journalist.
Q. It didn't arise in your discussion?
A. No.
Q. But can I ask you just a couple of questions about the timing of that. Can you recollect when you were told that?
A. In my interview with the Tribunal team I said I thought it was 2013. Since then I have checked back to see when I wrote my first story relating to the whole Garda whistleblower's issue.
Q. Yes.
A. And it was in March 2013 I wrote about the profiling of a Traveller baby on the Pulse system in March 2013 and it was after $I$ wrote that story.

203 Q. Yes.
A. Sometime after I wrote that.

204 Q. Yes, shortly afterwards.
A. I think it was around late 2013.
Q. Yes. Just in relation to that Pulse, the story about the Pulse entries relating to Traveller children, it
would seem that that was on one view broken by Ms. O'Doherty who had written about it in --
A. She wrote it a year later, yes.
Q. She wrote it a year later?
A. Yes.
Q. It would seem that you weren't intent on writing a story about Sergeant McCabe at the time and you didn't make any note of what the other journalist told you about the details?
A. I didn't need to make a note because I was stopped in my tracks by what he told me. I was horrified. I have written a huge amount over the past two decades about child sexual abuse, I would nearly say it was my specialist subject, and the idea that this man had been accused of sexually abusing a child utterly shocked me.
209 Q. Yes. Can you recall the terms in which it was described to you?
A. I can't remember the specific words that were said to me, but the impression I came away from the conversation with was that Sergeant McCabe had been accused of sexually abusing a child and that the issue had not been concluded.
210 Q. Yes. So it was your understanding that it wasn't something that had necessarily, from the information you had, that had been investigated to conclusion?
A. My impression was that it had not been investigated to conclusion.

Q. And I don't think the parties were identified to you at that point?
A. No, I didn't know the name.
Q. You didn't know them yourself?
A. No.
Q. I think you had ordinary dealings with the Press Office yourself and you were never negatively briefed by anyone in the Press office in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No.
Q. You do refer at page 4863 to a rumour about the car, the so-called car park meeting, and if we could just look at line 102 at page 4863. You say:
"The onl $y$ thing l was aware of was that there was a rumbur going around that Commissi oner Callinan had made certain allegations agai nst Sergeant Maurice McCabe to John MEGui nness TD at a meeting at the Red Cow. I bel ieve ot her journal ists were al so aware of these rumours about this meeting about what was said.
I attempt to ascertain if the rumours were true but l failed."

Now, can you assist us in trying to place when you heard that rumour?
A. I believe it was in late 2016.

215 Q. Late 2016?
A. Yes.

216 Q. Okay. So would it have been after Deputy McGuinness
had referred to it in the Dáil that he had met him?
A. I'm not sure. Do you know when Deputy McGuinness?

217 Q. Yes, that was in May 2016.
A. It would have been after that.

218 Q. It would have been after that, okay.
A. Yes.

219 Q. So there was a public revelation of the fact, was there a lot of mystery about what was precisely said?
A. Yes, there was.

220
Q.

Did you attempt to ascertain from Deputy McGuinness as to what was said to your recollection?
A. I attempted to ascertain by speaking to a contact and I failed to establish that it was true.
All right, okay. Now, at page 4864, line 118 , you told our investigations that when you were originally told about the allegation you made your own enquiries and you appear to have been able to learn that there had been a Garda investigation, a file had gone to the DPP and that there was no prosecution and that you had made these enquiries in 2013.
A. (WITNESS NODS)

222 Q. Was that relatively quickly after you had learned of this from another journalist?
A. It was, I would say, within days.

223 Q. Yes.
A. Can I just say the reason why --

224 Q. Yes.
A. -- my source was able to satisfy me, in covering child sexual abuse stories over the years, I am aware, I have
interviewed survivors of abuse whose abusers have not been prosecuted where decisions were made by the DPP that perhaps, because of the time lapse or a lack of evidence, that there would be no prosecution.
A. So it was that I was told that not only had the DPP decided not to prosecute but the DPP had said no offence had been disclosed. That satisfied, was one of the reasons that $I$ felt satisfied in my mind that the information that $I$ had been given was not true. Yes. But can I ask you this: The information that you received, it wasn't accompanied in any sense by a negative briefing about Sergeant McCabe, that this was a reason that had given him, it had given him a grievance in some respect or that he was motivated to make all of his whistleblowing allegations because of something connected with it?
A. You mean by the journalist?
Q. Yes. No, the link at the time here, when you made your enquiries there was no, was it accompanied by any negative briefing of Sergeant McCabe?
A. No.
Q. No.
A. No.
Q. And it wasn't being linked to his whistleblowing in any 11:39 way, in your mind anyway?
A. The fact that this was being said about him?
Q. Yes.
A. Hmm --

231 Q. We11, when you checked it, that's really what I am just focussing on.
A. All right. No.

232 Q. Do you see the sentence is --
A. In that conversation, no, there was no link made.

233 Q. There was no link. There was no attempt to besmirch?
A. By the person I spoke to?

234 Q. Yes.
A. No, no.

MR. MEGUNESS: A11 right. That's just what I was 11:40 anxious to determine. would you answer any further questions, Ms. McCarthy, that anyone else may have.
A. Thank you.

MR. MEDONELL: No questions, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. DI GNAM AS FOLLOVS:

MR. DI GNMM I just have a few questions, Chairman, Ms. McCarthy. My name is Conor Dignam, I appear on
behalf of Garda Síochána and I just have - including former Commissioner Callinan and former Commissioner o'sullivan - and I just have a few brief questions just to deal with your opinion piece in the Sunday Times and then I will focus on what you say in your interview to 11:40 the Tribunal in asking you some questions.

235 Q. But that article, as I understand it, was written on or was in the paper on 12th February 2017 ?
A. (WITNESS NODS)
Q. Would you accept that it was a particularly fraught time from a political and public controversy point of view in relation to the penalty points issue and indeed Sergeant McCabe and indeed former Commissioner Callinan 11:41 -- O'Sullivan?
A. I wouldn't disagree with that at all.
Q. There had been Deputy Howlin's contribution to the Dáil on 8th February, there had been a series of radio broadcasts, newspaper articles et cetera and then the Prime Time programme had made its revelations about the Tusla notification?
A. (WITNESS NODS)
Q. So it was a highly politicised, highly controversial period of time and you wrote your opinion piece in that 11:41 context, is that fair?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. And, just to clarify, it is an opinion piece, it's not intended as reportage or an article containing assertions of fact but an opinion piece; is that right? 11:41
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. In relation to your correct categorisation of, if this type of campaign was going on, it would be high7y significant to the workings of the institutions of the State et cetera; does it surprise you that we have heard evidence from a number of people that they became aware that this type of briefing or smear campaign was going on but they did nothing about it, and by that I mean politicians and some journalists?
A. I'm not surprised by that, but I wouldn't 100\% agree with that.
Q. Yes. I suppose the point I'm getting at is that you have some journalists and some politicians who, on their account of things, were either told that one or both of the former commissioners were conducting a smear campaign against Sergeant McCabe by alleging various things against him but including this no-smoke-without-fire concept in relation to the sexual abuse allegations and, on one journalist's account and two politicians' accounts, this allegation was made to them directly by former Commissioner Callinan, but they didn't pursue that either as a political matter or from a journalist point of view as a story, does that surprise you?
A. No. No, that doesn't surprise me to write a story like that would have been extremely hard and it would have been very hard to find an organisation that would have published it. That's the first thing.

The second thing is that, just because journalists didn't write this story, doesn't mean that they didn't disseminate the information.
242 Q. I appreciate that. But the evidence which has yet to be heard but from what we know from statements given to 11:44 the Tribunal is that this information was simply received and nothing further was done. I take it your point about the difficulties of publishing a story like that, the difficulties of proving facts et cetera, but
presumably a journalist, and particularly an investigative journalist's modus operandi and objective is to dig out difficult stories and to hold power to account as we have heard over the last couple of days, but no such steps were taken to even investigate the story that the Commissioner was involved in or participating in or conducting a smear campaign?
A. The first time $I$ heard of a campaign was in relation to what David Taylor said.
243 Q.
Could I be clear, this isn't a criticism directed at you, Ms. McCarthy?
A. No, I understand that. No, I am just trying to explain that before the Taylor claim of a campaign I wouldn't have thought of a campaign in my head. But there certainly were people spreading this story about Maurice McCabe.
244 Q. Yes. There was a rumour going around?
A. Yes.
Q. Now if I could then just turn to your statement. You have already dealt with Mr. McGuinness in relation to hearing the allegation or the rumour from a journalist colleague?
A. (WITNESS NODS)
Q. And you then, on page 4859 , on line 37 you describe what the allegation you heard at that initial stage was 11:45 and that's where you describe it as, your understanding was that it was unresolved, the investigation was unresolved?
A. (WITNESS NODS)

247 Q. And then on a later page, page 4864, you indicate that you made some enquiries with a source and that they gave, brought some further clarification or clarity to the position and the Tribunal has that.

But if I could just ask you to turn to page 4863 where you deal with hearing of the rumour going around that Commissioner Callinan had made certain allegations against Sergeant Maurice McCabe to John McGuinness TD at a meeting at the Red Cow which for shorthand has become known as the car park meeting.

You told Mr. McGuinness that you heard that rumour in late 2016; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.

248 Q. Yes. Now, I'm not sure whether you are able to track back that far, but in fact Deputy McGuinness had disclosed having had this meeting and he described vile allegations as having been made by former Commissioner Callinan in that meeting on 29th May 2016 on the floor of the Dáil, and I think you are based in Leinster House; isn't that right?
A. That's right.

249 Q. Yes. He also then gave or was on at least two radio programmes over the course of 2016 very shortly after this Dáil speech and then in October 2016 also referred to that car park and these allegations being made by former Commissioner Callinan; were you aware of Deputy McGuinness' Dáil speech and/or his radio
contributions?
A. I would have been aware of the Dáil speech at the time.

250 Q. Yes. I am just curious about why you describe them then in your interview as a rumour going around, if Deputy McGuinness had said this in the Dáil why describe it as a rumour?
A. The rumour was a specific word --

251 Q. okay.
A. -- that Mr. Callinan was reputed to have used in that conversation.
252 Q. okay. So it went further than what Deputy McGuinness said, okay.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, how did you become aware of that rumour?
A. A contact told me about it.
Q. Now, you then say that you attempted to ascertain if the rumour was true but I failed, could you tell us what steps to ascertain if that rumour was true?
A. Well, there were two people purportedly involved in that conversation, so, you know --
255 Q. Yes. Well, could I ask you then to look at page 4867 of your statement or of your interview, please. You are asked by the interviewer:
"I have been asked to detail any contact as may have
been had by me di rectly with Gardaí of whatever rank as to the character, real or supposed, of Sergeant Maurice MsCabe and the detail and provenance thereof.
A. One Garda spoke to me about Sergeant McCabe's
character in whi ch the guard spoke of Sergeant MLCabe in a very positive manner."

Now can I take it from that that the person you had a conversation with about the car park meeting was not a Garda?
A. I am not going to answer that.
Q. Now if I just put, my instructions are that Commissioner Callinan never had, former Commissioner Callinan never had a conversation with you about his meeting in the car park, I just have to put that to you formally?
A. No, he didn't.

257 Q. Now -- just bear with me for a moment.
A. Okay.
Q. Just for clarity sake and for completeness sake, I think Mr. McGuinness has already asked you, but on page 4863, 1ine 89 to 95 , you are asked, and I am going to summarise rather than bringing you through it, but you are asked whether Superintendent Taylor ever spoke to you and negatively briefed you and whether former Commissioner Callinan or former Commissioner o'sullivan or any Garda member ever spoke to you or negatively briefed you in relation to Sergeant McCabe and you answer no to both of those questions; isn't that right? 11:50
A. That's correct.

MR. DI GNMM Thank you.
MR. MEGU NESS: Just one matter.
MR. KENNEDY: I should say, sorry, Chairman, I have no
questions for the witness.
CHA RMAN Yes, all right. Yes, I see you, Mr. Kennedy. Thanks.

## THE WTNESS MAS RE-EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS AS FOLLO/6:

259 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just one further matter, Ms. McCarthy. In your interview with the investigators your attention was obviously drawn to the different waivers that had been executed by, respectively, Superintendent Taylor, Commissioner Callinan and former Commissioner o'Sullivan, and you were asked obviously about the issue of source protection. You said, inter alia, that:
"No journal ist should ever lightly di spense with the protection of a source, it's a core principle of journal ismto protect sources to allow information in the public interest to enter the public domain."

But you went on to say but if that is abused by somebody maliciously disseminating untrue information then in your opinion that confidentiality falls, and that is your view then?
A. It is my view, yes.

MR. MEGUNESS: A11 right. Thank you very much. CHA RMAN Right. Thank you very much, Ms. McCarthy. THE WTNESS: Thank you.

ME. LEADER: The next witness, sir, is Mr. Colum Kenny. His statement appears in volume 15 beginning at page 3866 of the materials.

MR. COLUM KENNY, HAV NG BEEN SUORN, MAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MG. LEADER AS FOLLONE:

260 Q. M. LEADER: Mr. Kenny, you are a journalist of long experience and I wonder could you outline to the Tribunal both your experience as a journalist, your academic qualifications and any institutes that you are attached to, please?
A. I have been a journalist for many years. I was employed full-time with RTÉ television as a reporter and presenter of radio and television programmes in the 11:53 1970s into the 1980s. I was then recruited by Dublin City University to help set up the State's first university level journalism programme and communications programme there. The university encourages staff to be involved, so I have continued to ${ }^{11: 53}$ work as a journalist writing for national newspapers, doing further work for RTÉ. The national newspapers I have worked for and written for have included the Sunday Press, the Sunday Independent, the Irish Times and others. I have also done some work for newspapers 11:53 abroad and I have written extensively in academia -- in academic journals and elsewhere about journalism and am other matters. I have set up and taught courses in broadcasting policy and practice, journalism, media law
and other communication courses in Dublin City University.

I have also been a member of the Broadcasting Authority of Ireland for two periods and have been on the broadcasting compliance committee that decides on complaints about balance and fairness.

Al1 right. Now, you are being called as a witness to this Tribunal both as a witness to fact and also to give the Tribunal the benefit of your expertise over many years, and I wonder could we start with the evidence as to expertise in journalism in matters of this nature. So you set that out very helpfully in a statement that you provided to the Tribunal which begins at page 3900 of the materials and you set out your qualifications, 3900.
A. Yes.

263 Q. Yes.
A. It's an ethical obligation to persons with whom journalists are in contact. First and foremost it's about giving one's word and keeping one's word in appropriate circumstances and cultivating sedulously sources that may be valuable in the public good and may
be necessary to quote anonymously or otherwise when writing articles or making programmes.
All right. I think you then continue on in your statement to say that a number of matters arise for consideration in respect to the doctrine of sources and 11:56 you break those down to different categories, and that appears at paragraph 10. The first thing you look at is the definition of a journalist and you set that out, and I wonder could you explain to the Tribunal for present purposes what you regard as the definition of a 11:56 journalist?
A. We11, I suppose the easiest way perhaps to do that is to say that journalist certainly include those people who work for the media and write stories of a factual nature that are intended to impart information of public interest. Questions arise around the edge of what constitutes a journalist essentially in the context of the internet, I suppose, nowadays.

But I think, in relation to the national newspapers and $11: 56$ licensed broadcasters in Ireland, there could be little question as to the fact that people who work for the news and feature programmes of those may be considered journalists. I think more difficult questions can arise for courts in relation to a person perhaps writing a blog online and claiming privilege, as to whether or not they may be a journalist. Professional journalists may baulk as the notion of such people describing themselves as journalists, but I don't think
that this is really something that arises in respect to anything that I have said in my statement. I think we're talking here about a very clear area of national media. I think in that context journalists are those people who would normally wish to belong to an organisation such as the National Union of Journalists.
265 Q. All right. Now, if we can go on to what a source is, Mr. Kenny, and maybe you would give the Tribunal the benefit of your thoughts on that, please. It starts at page 3903 of your statement, it might be of assistance to you.
A. Well, I would say in the first instance that a source has to be the source of a story, and the basis of the relationship between a journalist and their source has to be an understanding or even an undertaking in the context of there being a real possibility of writing a story based on the information provided. If a person is offering without agreement information that is unlikely ever to be the basis of a story, either because it's highly defamatory or for any other reason, 11:58 then I think there has to be a question as to whether such a person is a source to begin with.

Sources are complex. Sources have to be worked by journalists and that's why there are beats where there are specialist correspondents because media hope that by cultivating sources, in the best possible sense about getting to know people, getting to understand them, that they would be more open with information.

And that's perfectly reasonable and it's important that we have specialist correspondents in the media. There aren't enough of them in my view.

I mean part of the problem at the moment - I want to make clear that $I$ am not attacking the media in any way, $I$ regard myself as part of the media in many respects, and the media is under a lot of pressure at the moment of different kinds and there aren't enough specialist journalists being employed. So I have no problem with the specialist journalists, be they political correspondents, security correspondents, agriculture correspondents. But I think every journalist knows that there is also a danger to that relationship, that you get captured by your sources, that you get too close to them and when you get close and dependent on them we11 it's very hard to bite the hand that feeds you, and either conscious or unconsciously you may slip into a relationship that's either psychologically dependent or professionally dependent on getting sources.

So a good editor sees that and when it comes to a stories, I think, such as the Sergeant Maurice McCabe story, a good editor should be conscious of that fact and be prepared to put journalists working on that story who may not be too close to the Gardaí, for example, in this instance.
266 Q. All right. In relation to on the record and off the
record sources, do you regard the Garda Press Office as a source?
A. It certainly is a source, yes.

267 Q. Do you regard it as a confidential source?
A. I don't. I think the Garda Press Office wouldn't generally be giving you that kind of confidential information. In my limited experience, I'm not a specialist correspondent, but over the years at various times and in various ways $I$ have had to go to the Gardaí for information in relation to stories. I am very conscious of the fact that that is a difficult situation because the Gardaí are people who are frequently in possession of information that nobody else has.

I had a very early lesson in that myself at the time of the heavy gang and all the sallins train robbery affair when I was doing a story for RTE and I was given a briefing by Garda in respect of somebody who I was talking to and they told me that this person, I didn't this and I didn't know that about them and I should know they had been arrested and they had been found with this and that and the other.

That has a tremendous chilling effect because you are not going to be able to use it because it's said off the record and, at the same time, you can't ignore it. I mean professionally you are hardly likely to proceed unabashed in the knowledge that senior Gardaí or other

Gardaí have given you that kind of information.

So the Garda are a particularly useful source on occasion but also one that has its own peculiarities because of its special access to information that nobody else is likely to have.

A11 right. If I could just go back on that for a minute. So, as I understand your last answer, at least in part, there are two streams of information coming from the guards; is that correct?
A. Absolutely, well of course. There are individual Gardaí who will talk to you and there is the Garda Press office.

269 Q. And in relation to the Garda Press Office do you in your opinion regard any confidentiality attaching to that particular stream of information?
A. Obviously if somebody says 'this is off the record' then you have to decide whether you agree or not to be briefed. Sometimes it's better not to be in fact for the reason that I have just highlighted, that what you are told off the record can have a certain poisonous or chilling effect. I'm not as experienced as many journalists in dealing with the Garda Press office. In my experience they generally don't go off the record in any major way, certainly with somebody like myself who would be an occasional journalist contacting them. It tends to be you go to the Garda Press Office for an on the record statement, that's the whole point or perhaps for some guidance of an unofficial nature which

I wouldn't quite call off the record. It might be helpful advice as to the parameters of a story or something like that, but you don't really expect to get something extremely significant being handed up by the Garda Press office and at the same time be told 'well this is off the record, you can't use it'. It doesn't work like that.
Q. In relation to off the record dealings does that happen with the Garda Press Office or other guards, is there a distinguishing feature in your view in relation to that?
A. Well, there is plenty of guards who talk to the media off the record on a personal basis.
271 Q. Yes.
A. I think that's -- it goes without saying. It would then depend on whether or not -- it could be useful information or it could be given for all kinds of other reasons, personal reasons of Gardaí who want to glorify themselves or who want a particular story line to get out there for good, bad or other reasons. It could be any number of reasons that people give Gardaí and others - give off the record briefings. So you have to assess every individual case. This happens frequently.
272 Q. All right. Now, if we could just turn then to, you have information, you have got it from a source, what then is your obligation with regard to that information?
A. Well, first of all I think you have to be careful
before you -- if it appears that a source is likely to have contentious and defamatory information that they want to impart to you confidentially, I think the first thing you have to do is establish if there is agreement between you and the source on two things: first, if they are giving it to you for a story; and, secondly, if they are giving it for a story, is it likely to be a story that you can write. Why are you taking it otherwise, that information. And I think that's an important first step.

So if you take that information then from that source I think there is a strong reason to keep that source confidential normally. You must try and assess whether or not there is a malice involved. I mean if you think 12:05 that the source has something in the public good to impart then to sedulously foster that source in the public good seems to me to be acceptable. But the personal journalist is asking themselves all the time what's going on here, is this really about a story that 12:06 I want to write and is it telling me something valuable. Now if the source then gives you information that's high7y damaging to somebody who is another party to the story, it seems to me absolutely an ethical responsibility on the journalist - and I know some of my colleagues don't agree with this - whether or not you subsequently write about that story or not, to go to the person involved and to say to them 'look a source has told me that you have engaged in, we will
say for the sake of argument, criminal activity'.
273 Q. Yes.
A. Now there's two reasons for this. First of all, it helps you to assess the source, and, secondly, it helps you to advance the story by assessing the defamed person's reaction to that story. Now of course it is quite possible that both parties are lying. I mean every journalist is fully aware that, as every lawyer is, that people get into a situation where they will give a version of events that may be incompatible, none 12:07 of them may be entirely true, but not to go to the person who is defamed in those situations but somehow to rely on that source either by repeating what they say or, even worse, by writing publically about it seems to me a complete failure of the journalist's responsibility to the alleged source. I'm not even sure there is a source if it's a defamation, because it's not the source of a story, it's the source of a defamation.

274 Q. A11 right. In relation to deciding whether or not information given to you by a source is worthy of publication or is to be pursued with a view to publicising it, do you think the journalist has any obligation to try and figure out the motivation of that source?
A. Absolutely. You have an obligation to try and figure out everybody's motivation, including your own, as a journalist. We all have baggage and you would be a very poor journalist if you weren't asking what that
person's angle is. I mean it's the most common question probably in newsrooms, what's the angle on the story, and everybody has an angle on a story and I think every journalist should be questioning why they are being given information in a particular set of circumstances. okay. And in relation to journalists talking amongst other journalists in relation to stories, do you have any views on that and how that should be properly dealt with?
A. Yes, I do. Obviously there is a camaraderie among journalists who work close to one another, so there is a natural inclination to share information and gossip and that's part of the working environment. But I think before you share information that has come to you from a source that you are saying is confidential, before you share that information I think you do need to ask what's the impact of my sharing this information if it haven't checked it particularly with other journalists.

I mean there have been instances we have seen of sources sharing damaging information in the United States, for example, in relation to CIA members; in Britain in relation to the Kelly arms case where the about sources, but the excessive sharing of information has arguably led to very serious consequences for people who provided that information. So for that
reason alone I think you need to be careful.

But in respect to something that's potentially defamatory of an individual and where the source might have a motivation other than pure truth, then I think you have to be especially careful of how you share that information. Now you will obviously want to go to your line management and unfortunately you probably have to engage a lawyer because that's pretty much unavoidable since everything gets legalled these days in the newspapers and in broadcasting that's in any way substantial, and that's the proper way to approach it. And if you have trusted colleagues that you feel you need to talk to, I see nothing wrong with that.

But I think while it may be tempting and it may be understandable that people sometimes repeat such rumours beyond that, $I$ think it's certainly not desirable.
276 Q. A11 right. Now, I wonder could you speak to the Tribunal about dealing with or distinguishing between sources, in particular bona fide sources and malicious sources?
A. There's no simple answer to that. You have to use your instinct as a journalist to try and assess whether somebody is a good source. Obviously there's the old question in whose interest is this information which you can ask yourself. I think all you can do at the end of the day, you have to try and write an article
that is accurate so you are going to have to do fact checking. So if the source is not giving you facts then it's of a certain limited value in directing you in a particular direction, but I think the best safeguard is cross checking. If you are told something 12:12 by a source then you check it where you can. If that source tells you something about an individual then the easiest way to check that - or at least to test it, I should say, because as I say going to the person who is defamed doesn't necessarily gets the truth, it gets another point of view - but at least by going to that person and putting it to them that this is being said about them it's likely to advance the story to some extent.
277 Q. All right. Now, you have been here for the evidence of 12:12 Ms. McCarthy who, as I understand it, expressed the view that malicious sources shouldn't be protected and I don't know if you have anything to say in relation to that, whether you agree with it or not?
A. I certainly think the journalist has a substantial ${ }_{12: 12}$ responsibility to ask in the first instance is the information $I$ am being given likely to be usable as a story. Because if there's no story likely to come out of the information that's being proffered or if it's proffered without being sought I think that really is a 12:13 very difficult situation for the journalist because what are they doing listening to malicious information about a party to a story if that information is in no way valuable to them.

But it is possible that a malicious person could give you information that was relevant about somebody. They could tell you the truth even though they were malicious.
information but not in respect of a particular alleged criminal act. I do think there is a limit there realistically. I would be afraid that journalists who invoke privilege in respect to every circumstance will undermine the doctrine of privilege both in law and in relation of journalistic ethics.

The Society of Professional Journalists, for example, the very old United States organisation of professional
journalists has elaborated this complexity perhaps a little bit more, with more nuance than has the NUJ itself, although the NUJ itself, I am a member of the NUJ and I stand by its ethical position on this. But I think it needs greater elaboration perhaps than has been sometimes given in the past. And when you tease it out I think it's not black and white because if we try to claim privilege for everything in every single circumstances, regardless of whether or not we are protecting someone who is doing wrong or protecting a story, then I think we bring the doctrine of privilege into disrepute.

In a case where the source is doing wrong, is committing a civil or criminal wrong by giving information that's inaccurate or misleading, we are not then protecting a story, we're not protecting the source of a story, we're protecting the wrongdoing itself. I think there should be a distinction between those two things.

I go back to what I said earlier which is based on a Canadian doctrine articulated in a case involving the National post and earlier, that a confidential source may be sedulously fostered in the public good, and that's the important thing; was this information in the public good, did the journalist have a relationship of trust based on a clear understanding that the information provided was to be the basis of a story in
the public good or was this story being provided being provided maliciously, was the information being provided maliciously or otherwise for ulterior motives that had nothing to do with establishing the truth in the public good. These aren't easy questions to answer 12:16 by the way, people may have different ideas.

I mean if a Garda tells you something about a person such as the case I mentioned earlier, in the Sallins train robbery, may think he is acting in the public good. I mean whether or not the information is verifiable. They may believe that they are putting you straight in a manner of speaking. So these aren't simple, but I'm also saying that they are not black and white. You cannot simply claim every source should be protected, malicious or otherwise, in every single situation regardless of whether you are protecting the wrongdoing or protecting a story.
279 Q. Right, thanks. Now, if we could just look at the situation where a particular source waives any confidentiality in relation to providing information to a journalist, do you have any opinion in relation to retaining a privilege over that in a journalist -- from the journalist point of view?
A. Unless one feels there is some reasonable grounds for believing that a person has come under undue influence or unfair pressure of some kind or improper pressure to waive that privilege, I can't see how any relationship of privilege remains if the source themselves is saying
they don't want it to remain, particularly if it may be in that source's interest for you to confirm that they have given you some information. There might be theoretically a situation in which to do that might expose a third party identity as a source of other information and that might be a separate set of circumstances.

But unless you can clearly articulate a real and present danger that you are somehow exposing either the 12:18 source themselves or a third party who you don't want to identify to identification, then I don't see any reason why you wouldn't be willing to confirm what that source now wants you to confirm.
280 Q. okay. And if we could just bring that maybe two steps further. If a source has said that they spread a story about somebody which wasn't the truth or which was spread in an effort to malign somebody, even though at the time they thought they were doing the right thing but now actually recognises that it was wrong and waives any confidentiality in relation to spreading that story, do you believe there are any circumstances where a journalist can correctly claim privilege over receiving that information?
A. If there are I cannot see them.

281 Q. Al1 right. Now, if we can just go back in relation to identifying a group source, do you have any thoughts on that, or the group that a particular source emanates from?
A. In a situation where you are still trying to protect a genuine source?
Q. Yes.
A. We11, if there was a very small group obviously of five people and you said it wasn't A, B, C and D you have identified source E. So, yes, in a very specific set of circumstances then it might be necessary to decline to identify the source in that set of circumstances where by doing so it exposed or, sorry, by ruling out somebody as a source I should say.
283 Q. Yes.
A. That could expose a genuine source. So there could be an issue there, yes. But in a very large group of people, like if I said a teacher told me and then you asked me a question, $I$ said 'well it wasn't teacher Mary Murphy', well there is thousands of teachers so that doesn't really identify the other people. It would to be in a very specific set of circumstances that that would arise in my opinion.
284 Q. All right. Now, there's one thing I should have asked you in respect of a waiver of any confidentiality, there has been a relatively recent case in the European Court of Justice which says that the waiver of confidentiality by a source isn't determinative of a journalist claiming privilege, it's just one of the factors, do you have anything to say in relation to that or does it change your opinion in any way as you have provided it to the Tribunal?
A. If by that is meant that where a source waives
privilege that may not be the only factor. 285 Q. Yes.
A. Then I agree with it, it may not be the only factor. As I have already said there may be circumstances in which the sources come under pressure or where to agree 12:21 with the source is somehow to expose someone else if the source has other reasons to waive that privilege. so again it has to be looked at in the round and I would agree with that.
All right. Now I think you have put forward in your statement to the Tribunal how important it is to have a strong media, maybe you would like to articulate that here now?
A. Oh, yeah, I think the media is in an extremely besieged situation at the moment with cutbacks of all kinds, and 12:22 some of this is not visible because it's below the surface. Papers are striving to survive with less staff, younger staff, less experienced staff, staff expected to do far more stories, turn over stuff. Newspapers, broadcasters and so on with competition from fake news sources, from sources on the internet that don't subscribe to the same kind of journalistic principles that the NUJ articulates, people are under a lot of pressure.

There is defamation laws in Ireland where the punitive damages are crippling. we need a very strong media, we need it more than ever. We see scandal after scandal in Ireland from the Gardaí to the health service, right
through this society, we need people who are able to tell the truth and to allow us to make informed decisions and I think it's extremely difficult. So journalists are working under a lot of pressure and nothing I am saying here today is critical of the media ${ }_{12: 22}$ in general in Ireland. I think we have generally a very good media in Ireland both at the national, at the tabloid level and in the local and national
broadcasting area. That doesn't mean I wouldn't be critical of particular journalists or sets of journalists in particular circumstances obviously.

But I certainly think in relation to the Gardaí, the failures in the Maurice McCabe case from my point of view are failures of the State and of Garda management first and foremost, although I think also he has been let down by elements in the media. But I don't think the media is to blame for what has happened.
287 Q. All right. Just for this particular question, leaving out the specific issue of maurice McCabe, you have provided a detailed statement to the Tribunal setting out your views as an expert on media and sources and it is available for everybody, but other than going through it line by line I take it you stand by everything in the general sense you say in relation to journalism and media sources and relationships between sources and the media?
A. I do, and I hope it reflects the professional consensus, which I believe it does, in respect of the
high standards people aspire to and the NUJ seeks to uphold. I don't believe there is anything exceptional in it. Of course my point is just one point of view, others may disagree with me in respect to aspects of it.

288 Q. Okay. Now, if we turn to the Sergeant McCabe story, if I can label it in that sense. I think since April of 2013 you began reporting in relation to the Maurice McCabe story; is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

289 Q. And I think a list of the articles, you have helpfully set them out in Appendix 1 to your statement which begins at 3910 in reverse date order. I think the first one would seem to be from 7th April 2013; is that correct, and that's at page 3912 of the materials?
A. Yes, I believe so, whatever is there. 7th April. I believe that was the first piece I wrote, correct.

290 Q. All right. And it continues on to a list of articles, if I can go through them this way: "Penalty points fiasco, cost 8 million in lost revenue, thousands of motorists had offences set asi de." That's the 14th Apri1 2013.

The next one in the Sunday Independent, also on that date: "Who guards the Gardaí, who wat ches the
wat chmen. Justice M ni ster Al an Shatter's response to the penalty points scandal is i nadequate."

Then we have one on 21st Apri1 2013: "Gardaí list
grounds for setting asi de fixed fines." Sunday Independent, 21st Apri1 2013. And it continues on.

So the list of articles is there for everybody to see, but I think it's a fair enough categorisation to say that those articles were questioning of Garda power?
A. Of Garda power?

291 Q. Of Garda exercise of power, or maybe you would like to correct me on that.
A. It might be. I don't want to avoid giving you a yes or 12:26 no answer.
Q. Yes.
A. But perhaps $I$ can just elaborate it a little bit.
Q. Yes.
A. I didn't jump into this story deciding one day I wanted 12:26 to cover what was happening.

294 Q. Yes.
A. Which at that stage was not much in the public domain. Memory is a funny thing. I mean a lot of time has passed and people forget now how little was then in the 12:27 public domain and how close to being shut down the whole story was. I was in DCU working one day, it was during the year, I was very busy with exams and papers and so on, I was also finishing a book for an American publishing house and I got a phone cal, and I was invited to take an interest in this story which I did. I went and made it my business to meet Maurice McCabe and his family and I found the man under intense pressure, really I think feeling besieged and bemused.

I very quickly formed the view that here was something that needed to be properly dealt with by proper processes and I couldn't see that these processes were really dealing with it in a way that one might hope.

I never intended to cover the substance of the story. The kinds of complaints that were being made, I mean first of all I was not a full-time journalist, I was a professor of communications. I wrote features for the newspapers, but I would hope that other journalists might come on board along the way and investigate some of what was taking place. I mean the stories that were evident there, there was great material for any journalist, in my view. These ranged, as I quickly became aware, from the remarkable story of the confidential recipient to incidentals -- I don't want to take up your time, Judge, I don't know how much of this is -- I mean I saw a man, he had written to the Attorney-General in confidence and had documents sent to the Department.

The thing that really appalled me was, I mean I was really shocked by the matter of the disciplinary proceedings to which he was being subjected. I couldn't understand. Here was a case which I thought 12:29 in its right security correspondents should be leaping out. The loss of a sex abuse perpetrator's computer, this was a subject that -- I mean I covered abuse in relation to the Catholic church, $I$ had attended quite a
few bishops' press conferences. I had been involved in reading a report for the Secretariat General of the EU on the use of the black internet by child abusers.

Here was a case where a priest had been arrested, charged, convicted and sent to jail and his computer had never been sent in the normal way for forensics to Dublin. Now, years later, when nobody had been disciplined, and McCabe wasn't even involved in the investigating team, he was a sergeant in charge of the station. Here they were bringing disciplinary proceedings against him and only him and this was dragging on and dragging on.

He didn't even seem, the odd thing was this didn't even 12:30 seem central to him. I saw this and I did a double take on it. He was concerned at that time about just getting some voice, he felt he was going under $I$ think. The penalty points thing seemed to me to be so obvious. I mean when you look back now at what was being said, what turned out to be the case was actually much more extensive than even what might have appeared to be the case at the time.

But it seemed to me a simple matter. Here was a story to write about process, and a lot of what I had written was not directly about power, maybe it was more about power in the Department of Justice because I felt there was a very, very poor exercise of power on the

Department of Justice too. But I think I was writing about process. I thought once this got an airing that surely the government would step in and appoint or ensure that procedures were followed that would simply deal with the thing. It wasn't rocket science. We didn't have to end up here years later with 50 lawyers in the Aberdeen Hall doing this. It could have been dealt with at the time, nipped in the bud and it wasn't. And that was, I am afraid, partly my colleague's fault who in the security correspondent area didn't seem to have enough zest to take up this story and to run with it in the way $I$ felt it should be run. So I ended up writing maybe 30 stories over the past few years on aspects of this, but never fundamentally about the substance. I wasn't in a position to check his allegations against other Gardaí, nor did they interest me. This was a matter for, the ins and outs, $I$ mean somebody in this situation would start to complain and you just know I am never going to be able to stand up those stories. Perhaps some other journalists would, it would have required the kind of internal investigation that eventually took place to do that. And the same with penalty points, I wasn't -but I was hearing enough to know that something very odd was going on, that the penalty point record on knew that people could get penalty points fixed, but I mean I think nobody was quite aware of the extent to which it was systematic.

So that was my principal motivation. I was never in a hurry to stick with the story, but I felt that I should stick with it because I felt Maurice McCabe and his family were in a very difficult position. Here was a man who had been sent in to establish discipline in a local Garda Station and he didn't seem to be getting much thanks for his efforts it seemed to me.
CHA RMAN Right. We'11 leave it there for an hour, if you don't mind. Thank you.

## LUNCHEON AD ORNMENT

THE HEARI NG RESUMED AS FQLLONS AFTER THE LUNCHEON AD OURNMENT

CHA RMAN Sorry, I was delayed.
Mb. LEADER: Mr. Kenny, please. Yes, Mr. Kenny, just before lunch we were referring to a series of articles you'd written in relation to the whistleblowers' concerns and I think you were supportive of what Sergeant McCabe was trying to do at that time?
A. Hmm --
for pieces that I write and I cautioned him that I wasn't his friend and there might be writings he wouldn't like. And indeed when I wrote for the first time about the disappearance of the computer in the sex abuse case, I remember being quite concerned at the impact on him and his family of that publicity. Because there's nothing worse in Ireland I think, is there, than being accused of sex abuse and, by implication, the investigation, as far as I was concerned, of the loss years earlier of that computer 13:42 in the sex abuse case, the way it was targeting McCabe could be read by people, the public, as somehow pointing an accusatory finger at him. I remember being so concerned that I pulled over on the way home one
evening when I filed a story to alert him to the fact that this story was coming up.

So I don't think I was being supportive of Sergeant McCabe. I saw his position, I saw the position of his family who were very supportive of him and of his wife who was very concerned as well and I felt that I would just write stories. I mean, I wasn't doing anything, I was paid to write the stories, it wasn't a charitable act, but I was writing stories that I felt were of interest to the public and raised serious questions about policing. Not least about the penalty points system, which I did feel, knowing people who have had penalty points and suffered the consequences of that on their insurance and how it can affect people's job opportunities, I saw these things as something that should be investigated.

So the articles were really, I suppose, just the normal journalistic exercise of telling a story and in the process hopefully managing to achieve some resolution of it.

298 Q. Al1 right. Now, you've referred to publishing a story about the lost computer and I think you raised the issue with the Garda Press Office and you provided that 13:43 exchange to the Tribunal earlier on last year, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

299 Q. And that appears at page 3893 of the materials.
A. Sorry, you'11 just have to give me a moment. 3893?
Q. Yes. It will come up on screen as well, but it might be --
A. I wonder is this the right book?

301 Q. Volume 15, sorry.
A. Volume?
Q. 15 .
A. 16 .
Q. 15, one five.
A. Sorry. Okay. 3893?

304 Q. Yes. Just if you scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh.
A. That's -- perhaps I'm mishearing, three?
Q. 3893.
A. Okay.

306 Q. I think.
A. I have it now, yes, thank you. Sorry about that.

307 Q. That's a11 right. So in March 2013 you sent an e-mail to the Garda Press Office and you set out that: "You were writing an article about a serious matter concerning a sex abuse case and would be grateful for the following inf ormation today and certai nly no later than tomorrow morning pl ease. "

Then you set you the circumstances that a computer with a hard drive was seized during a search of a premises, that Father Molloy subsequently pleaded guilty to charges of defilement of a child and the Diocese of Kilmore has sought the return of that computer, but I am told has been informed that it cannot be found.

Then you proceed on to ask a series of questions in order to check whether that story was correct or not: was the computer lost, was there an investigation and so forth, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

308 Q. And I think the answer of the Press Office was that they don't comment on individual stories and you pursued it with them a little bit, but no further information was forthcoming, is that correct?
A. Correct.

309 Q. And you set out the chain of the e-mails there. Did you have any other interaction with the Press office in relation to Sergeant McCabe on your memory of matters?
A. On this matter?

310 Q. On Sergeant McCabe matters generally.
A. Hmm --

311 Q. If you can't remember that's fine.
A. I can't remember. I mean if there was something that needed to be confirmed or $I$ felt there would be a necessity for the Gardaí to make a statement I would normally often have sought it, even if I expected an answer that there was nothing to be said.
312 Q. Al1 right.
A. But sometimes where you know there is nothing to be said there is no point even seeking a comment.
313 Q. A11 right. The answer you got from the Press Office in relation to the computer query, is that typical of answers you receive from the Press officer, sometimes is there more information forthcoming?
A. I wouldn't regard the Garda Press Office as a tremendous source of information in more controversial kind of circumstances. They're very good for factual information of a certain type, they can be very helpful on occasion in respect of particular matters. I thought they might have been a little bit more helpful in this instance because the case was long over and done. In fact I think the perpetrator was out of jail, perhaps, even by this stage. And the fact that the computer might have on it information relating to other victims and other perpetrators I thought was of particular sensitivity, given our appalling history in relation to child sex abuse in Ireland, $I$ thought the Gardaí might have been a little bit more forthcoming, but neither they nor the Director of Public Prosecutions felt that it was appropriate and that is their prerogative.
314 Q. All right. Now, I think in, you've set out in your statement that you've particular concerns in relation to the Garda Inspectorate report on the penalty points issue and the leaking of that report. Now, you'11 appreciate that this Tribunal isn't looking into those publications, but I think they're matters which you were concerned about, is that correct?
A. Yes, indeed. Early last year when the terms of reference of the Tribunal were being set up I wrote to the Minister for Justice, I was concerned that people might think this Tribunal was about getting to the bottom of the McCabe affair, which of course it isn't.

It has very specific and in my view has quite narrow terms of reference on one reading. I didn't think I could dislodge that significantly, but I did write to the Minister for Justice and asked that two particular matters be added which I felt were highly relevant. One was the manner in which Sergeant McCabe was, had disciplinary proceedings taken against him in relation to the matter of the lost computer in which he was not a member of the investigating team, $I$ felt that was very significant in terms of any question of pointing fingers at him in relation to sex abuse.

And the other matter was, because they had added a term of reference relating to an RTE report, I couldn't fathom how they could not also look at the way that RTE reported the Garda Inspectorate report, which I; had felt was out of order, to put it bluntly. Now, RTE has done some very good journalism on this affair, very fair, Prime Time and other programmes have done, and the news at times. So I'm not criticising RTE as a whole or any particular journalist generally, but I felt on this report, on this matter, RTE had said to the public the night before any other of the media seemed to have access to this report that they had seen the report and they proceeded to present a version of that report which, in my opinion, is at variance with what other media understood from the report when they got it the next day.

The report also contained an unchallenged interview with Alan Shatter, the Minister, and no person from the opposition. There was a complaint, I think, from a Fianna Fáil, if not an informal compliant quoted in the media from Fianna Fái 1 about the absence of an opposition person.

And this report, the Garda Inspectorate report, had not even gone to Cabinet and my understanding, it was only available to a less than $a$, fewer than a handful of people in the Department of Justice and the Gardaí. Now, I remember at one stage being part of a team working on a programme about the Irish Hospitals' Sweepstake in RTE, a programme that was suppressed subsequently. The team had in its possession a number of Cabinet documents relating to the affairs of the Irish Hospitals' Sweepstake that was due to go to Cabinet. I remember we were being warned that we would be prosecuted for breach of the official Secrets Act. so it's a serious matter and good luck to any journalist who can get their hands on such a document as far as I am concerned so long as they use it fairly.

I was not convinced that RTE had seen the whole report. In my judgment RTE had only seen part of the report. And again that's perfectly legitimate provided the media organisation says 'we saw parts of the report' or 'we saw a summary of the report'.

When I asked RTE to confirm whether or not they had actually seen the whole report, because $I$ believed that was the only reasonable interpretation of their statement on air that they had seen the report, RTE refused to do so, they said they would put their sources at risk or words to that effect, which I felt was nonsense. They were perfectly capable of saying they had seen the whole report.

So I felt that it was a clear example of spin, whether
it came from the Department of Justice or the Garda Commissioner, I don't know, or elsewhere. I cannot imagine how it could have, since the people who wrote the report were saying they had only furnished a very limited number of copies, four, if I remember correctly, to the top brass in justice and the Gardaí. But, wherever it came from, it seemed to me clearly to be spin and to be spin that was very unfavourable to Sergeant McCabe.

So I wrote to the Minister last year and suggested that this and, as I say, the other matter relating to the lost computer that has possibly got information on it about other victims and perpetrators of sex abuse, that they be added to the terms of reference of this
Tribunal and I got an acknowledgment from the Department of Justice.
315 Q. They are matters you felt strongly about and still feel strongly about?
A. We11 I fee1 if you're going to have an inquiry and spend the incredible amount of money that is spent on inquiries like this, $I$ think, even if it is not as broad as I would like to see it, and I would have liked to have seen it broader. My fear was that by focussing 13:52 on the Garda Commissioner and the Deputy Garda\#Commissioner it would put the Tribunal into a position of apparently, from the public's perspective, being seen to find that there was no whispering campaign against Maurice McCabe of any kind. I felt, 13:52 you know, to get a more balanced perspective on what was actually going on it might be better for the Commission if these, for the Inquiry, Commission of Inquiry if these matters had been included and I regret that they weren't included.
316 Q. A11 right. I think you attended at the Public Accounts Committee hearings in January 2014?
A. I attended some of them, yes, that's correct.

317 Q. And were you there on 23rd January 2014?
A. Is that the date that Mr. Shatter gave?

318 Q. It's the day Commissioner Callinan gave evidence.
A. I was certainly there the day Mr. Shatter gave evidence.

319 Q. Okay. A11 right. So in early 2014 there were committee hearings in the Dáil, is that right?
A. That's right, downstairs in the committee rooms, yeah.
Q. All right. And were they the ones in relation to the penalty points issue?
A. I believe that was part of what they were looking at.

There was so much going on at that stage, so many questions were being asked at those committees that they were covering a variety of things, but that would have been one of the matters certainly that was being questioned at the time, yes.

321 Q. At the time. I think two journalists told you a matter in relation to Sergeant McCabe that you hadn't heard previously, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

And, first of all, could you tell me what they told you?
A. We11, I approached these journalists because I wanted to sound them out, I was interested in understanding where security correspondents were coming from in relation to the matter of the disappearance of the computer in the sex abuse case and the proceedings being taken against, $I$ felt that this was a clear matter -- I didn't really want, as I say, not being a full time journalist, I didn't really feel, you know, that I could take that matter as far as others might. I approached them to just sound out their views on that. And they responded, I think perhaps they thought me, I was a bit of a naive at large, but they responded by telling me did I not know that McCabe was under investigation for alleged child abuse and that the Gardaí up there. Basically I felt I was being told to, you know, cop myself on really, that this was a person who shouldn't be taken perhaps at face value.

323 Q. A11 right. Now, if I could go back and just, you say that Sergeant McCabe was under investigation. You're sure that was said at that time?
A. It was --

324 Q. It was an ongoing matter?
A. I formed the impression from what was said to me that it was an ongoing matter, without a doubt. And certainly nothing was said to me about the fact that this matter had been disposed of years earlier and that there had been a finding which we know of from the
Tribunal that not only had there been no offence, but that the fact that is alleged didn't even constitute an offence. That was not said to me.
325 Q. Okay. And then they continued on, it was child sexual abuse, am I correct in that or was it sexual abuse?
A. Yes.

326 Q. It was child sexual abuse?
A. Yes.

327 Q. Were any other details of the child sexual abuse given to you?
A. No, no. I think these people were probably trying to put me straight, you know. Maybe they did it with the best of motives, I don't know. I felt that they were rubbishing his character by what they were doing. I was really shocked. I hadn't heard this perhaps because I don't move in newsrooms or didn't move in newsrooms at that stage. It came as a bolt out of the blue. The first thing you do, and it's an illustration of the chilling effect of this, is you wonder have you
been making a fool of yourself talking to this guy, you know, and writing about it in a way that, you know, hasn't taken on board this information, or that you haven't found out this information yourself.
328 Q.
okay. Now, I think the next thing you said that they said was the Gardaí were full of this. Did they say who in the Gardaí were full of this?
A. No.

329 Q. okay. It was as general as?
A. It was a general statement. I didn't ask specifics. 13:56

330 Q. okay. And the next thing, as I understand it, is that you should talk to Gardaí up there. Who did you understand you should talk to by that??
A. I understood to mean I should talk to people up in the Cavan/Monaghan area.
331 Q. And were any particular names given to you?
A. No names were given to me, no. No.

332 Q. Yes, all right. And in relation to, you say you felt you were being told to cop on; did you understand that that was to cop on in relation to your coverage of Sergeant McCabe related matters or the loss of the computer?
A. Oh, no, not in relation to the loss of the computer. I think they were talking kind of, they were just putting me right, $I$ think, in relation to a matter that 13:57 was in, seemed to be, as it now appears, a lot of people seem to be talking about. I hadn't heard about it at that stage in any, in this way certain7y, I hadn't heard about it until they put it to me and

I took it very seriously coming from them. They were respected, you know, journalists and have done very good work.
A11 right. And I think you've given already a description of those two journalists, that they are security journalists, is that correct?
A. Yes.

334 Q. And you say one of them is a broadcast journalist who works for a national broadcaster?
A. That's correct.

335 Q. Are you prepared to name those two journalists at this stage?
A. I'd rather they named themselves. I don't see why they wouldn't, it was only general information. I don't see this going -- I mean if this was a question of naming particular people it would be more complicated. But, you know, if people are saying the Gardaí are saying this, then I cannot see how the doctrine of sources even arises at stretch, just to repeat that information. I don't want to embarrass anybody, I mean I don't see why they wouldn't tell you themselves to be quite honest.

I notice a lot of people don't want to mention people's names. But it's really, Judge, what's helpful to you.
I mean I don't see any reason why not. I'm not criticising these individuals professionally. I do have certainly criticism of them and some other security correspondents for the way they covered the

McCabe case, I don't think they did it well, and that's a matter of opinion, and I think what they said to me had the effect of rubbishing his character, but I don't think they set out to rubbish his character in any
general sense.

I had a phone call from another security correspondent a few weeks ago asking me to know was I naming names. There's something about this that's unfortunate.

I really don't see, you know I think it's in the interests of journalists for journalists to come straight. And if it is the case -- I think in fairness to the security correspondents too, it may well be that these two people say I'm talking through my hat, my recollection is totally false and $I$ have got it all wrong and, like we've heard other people contradicted here perhaps the best thing is to say who they were and give them the opportunity, because I'm not saying they did anything grievous7y wrong as such. It wasn't a confidential discussion, I mean I wasn't --
CHA RMAN I appreciate that and I know the distinction that you are making between someone who is perhaps being the victim themselves of something or being credulous and thinking well somebody told me something and I kind of believe it and putting you right in case you are making an idiot out of yourself, and on the other hand what's a bad thing is to maliciously, as I have phrased it, ride a rumour to a conclusion, in other words to destroy someone's character. I mean,
that's -- those are the two things. Now, I have heard so much evidence about these rumours and so many people have said 'well, the rumours were there, I can't really say who the rumours were coming from, it was circulating around Leinster House or it was circulating in or around Garda circles or whatever'. None of that, I suppose, really helps me very much, apart from showing, I suppose, the currency of this story or stories about Sergeant McCabe.

What does help me if it leads to the identification of anyone who was talking to anyone in headquarters, that is what would help me. Now, if you like, what you could do is you could perhaps write down the names and we could write to those persons and ask them for their assistance and it may be, as they say, they have no recollection, it may be that they would rubbish what you would say, I don't know what they will say, but I'm trying to get to the bottom of this. It may come as a surprise to know that we have written so many times to so many people in the journalistic world, asked numerous questions, had circulars sent out. We have had so many delays, so little in the way of co-operation, apart from missives being sent in about journalistic privilege on an academic basis unrelated to any facts. My object is to try and test David Taylor's evidence and to see where we stand in relation to it. That is my object fundamentally and any assistance in that regard you feel you can give, do.

I don't want to take offence in relation to any claim of privilege you might wish to assert in these circumstances, I'm not sure it arises. But that is one possible way of doing it. We will write and pursue our own inquiries. And there it is. You're not asking me for a direction at the moment. I mean, it is simply evidence of yet further rumours of people being taken in by this.
A. That's very helpful, Judge, I appreciate that very much. I think that's a way forward. Because clearly in a way my evidence is, I suppose, hearsay, and if you write to these people, if I give you the names in private and you write to them and they deny it all then I suppose it's of very limited value.

I have to say I mean one of these people in particular I've written about before, that he had taken on the Minister in relation to the Minister's appointment of the confidential Garda recipient who turned out to be so problematic ultimately and I had written in support of him against the Minister's attack on him for that. But, you know -- so it's not, I'm not, both of these people are long standing and respectable journalists. CHA RMAN well I mean that is a possible way forward and we'd carry out our own investigations, but I think I need to say to you, so as we are being absolutely honest, is that this Tribunal doesn't do anything private. I mean, all of our documents, people can look at them if they want. Obviously the parties get the
documents when they are parties, but in due course they will be put into an archive. I am not trying to do anything secret and we don't have any secret discussions with anybody at any time. But I mean, we could pursue the enquiry and just see where we stand and it may be they will know something, I don't know.

But what I am interested in is David Taylor, Martin Callinan and Nóirín o'sullivan and the terms of reference do require me to look at any other senior Gardaí there implicated in the, with the wording. So they may know something, they may not, I don't know.
A. Well I doubt if they would have said it to me unless they had heard it from senior Gardaí, but I mean they didn't say who, absolutely not. And again I want to stress that, insofar as they were trashing Sergeant McCabe's character incidentally, I don't believe that, you know, they were personally motivated in any way to do that, it was my perception of it. I felt put in an awkward position and I immediately took steps to verify or establish whether or not this was the case and very quickly found out what any security correspondent could find out, which was that, you know, it was not true, that this was something that had been dismissed by the DPP as having, as being baseless and also that it occurred in very particular circumstances of which the Tribunal is aware.

So I'm certainly here to assist the Tribunal for the
reasons you outlined at the beginning today and I will --

CHA RMAN Well I don't see any reason for a big public fuss about it, but if you wish to simply indicate your recollection, we will follow the matter up.
A. Very good.

CHAL RMAN And we will ask the persons involved where they stand in relation to matters. They may wish to cross-examine you in relation to things, but I am not sure that's going to be necessary. And I do understand the difference between being effectively the victim of a rumour and actually hearing something and being perhaps credulous about it and on the other hand being a malicious spreader of a rumour. I think there is an a big difference actually.
A. May I say judge, I mean whatever about the specifics of what was said, and I'm quite happy to believe that I have given you a very accurate account, I can tell you one thing: Before that conversation I hadn't heard this and after that conversation I knew it and took steps immediately to check it out.
CHAN RMAN Well you might have been lucky enough to have sources who could tell you what was written to the State solicitor.
A. Pardon?

CHA RMAN You might have been lucky enough to have a source who would tell you what was written to the State solicitor, I suppose many people didn't.
A. Oh, I don't think that would have been too difficult
for security correspondent or other serious journalist to have found the information. I got it, had seen a copy of the letter that had been sent to Sergeant McCabe from the DPP or on behalf of the DPP or subsequent to the DPP's decision, I think that would have been easy.
CHA RMAN Yes. It's not my line of work, I am being a bit naive maybe. So would you like to carry on, Ms. Leader?
M. LEADER: Did you discuss the matter with Sergeant McCabe after hearing of the allegation of sexual assault
A. I did.

337 Q. And did he tell you what happened in relation to the D investigation in 2006, 2007?
A. He told me exactly what had happened.
Q. All right. Did you discuss the matter with either Superintendent Taylor, former Commissioner O'Sullivan or former Commissioner Callinan?
A. No.

MS. LEADER: Okay. If you'd answer any questions anybody else might have.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MEDOVELL AS FOLLOVS:

MR. MEDONELL: Just one matter. Michae1 McDowe11 is my name, I am appearing for Sergeant McCabe. There is just one matter I wanted to ask you, Mr. Kenny. can half point a finger that they mightn't have expected, but you are correct in the broad outline of what you say, definitely.

341 Q. I mean for instance I think it was, I asked
Q. Yes.
A. Because when the phrase 'it is understood' is used it maybe you can tell me whether I'm right or wrong, that off the record can be in various different categories; I mean off the record could be 'it is understood that the Gardaí believe $\mathrm{X}^{\prime}$, and that's off the record, it's not attributed directly to the Gardaí, but it's fairly clear where it's coming from, that's one category; and another category, which is at the other end of the spectrum is not for publication in any circumstances, sort of deep background information which the source is giving on the absolute understanding that neither the identity of the source nor the information will be used in the story. Is that a fair summation?
A. Yeah, it's fair enough. It isn't always so clear in practice, but that is true, that's how it is, how it may be used. I think there's responsibility on the journalist to make sure the source understands, which is -- sometimes I think sources are a little bit surprised.

340 Q. Yes.

Superintendent Taylor this, from memory, it would be a remarkable thing if it had appeared in a newspaper: It is understood that the Gardaí suspect Sergeant McCabe of sexual abuse. That would not be what he would have intended or what one would expect a journalist to publish if they were given such a deep background briefing, is that correct?
A. Yes, I mean anybody circulating that rumour must have known that it was impossible for any journalist to have published it. No lawyer legalling an article would ever have let that. In fact when I first wrote about the child sex abuse computer case - and remember then people didn't - there was a certain attitude of disbelief. Now we know a lot more has happened than we realise, but the lawyers took chunks out of that article because, you know, they were being extremely, and rightly so, cautious. People should understand the extent. And I think the people, if they were circulating rumours like that, knew full well this was never going to see the light of day as a story per se.
342 Q. Thank you. I was only trying to emphasise that it's not just simply a binary choice, on the record or off the record, there are degrees of off the record, is that a fair summation of it?
A. (Witness Nods) Yes, there are ways of, some people are 14:10 happy for you to say it's understood, as long as they understand how that's being used. As I say, sometimes to use that without clearly clearing the lines with the source leaves the source feeling a little bit exposed.

But, absolutely, you are right, of course.
MR. MEDOVELL: Thank you.
ME. BURNS: No questions, Chairman. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. G LLANE AS FOLLONE:

MR. G LLANE: Good afternoon, Mr. Kenny, Sean Gillane is my name. I appear for RTE, Philip Boucher-Hayes, John Burke, Ray Burke and Paul Reynolds.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

343 Q. I have a sma11 number of questions for you and I hope you will bear with me in terms of asking those questions and I just want to divide them up into separate categories, if I can. Firstly, just in
relation to journalism and the question of sources as you treat of it in your statement, it does seem to be, if I can put it this way, more of an art than a science, if I can put it that way. There are a variety of views held by respectable honest people within journalism on those questions and those views differ from each other. Is that fair to say?
A. Well it's not rocket science, certainly. I don't think it's very complicated. I think journalists know full well what a source is and how they should protect it if 14:11 they are given, you know if that source has put themselves as hazard in relation to the truth about a certain matter and particularly if they have exposed themselves. So whether it's called an art or a science

I think it's fairly clear to most journalists what the ethical position is.

Well, perhaps my question was inelegant. What I am getting at is that very senior people, experienced people, decent and honest people in your business, journalism, have very, very different views on the question of how far one should go to protect sources?
A. I don't necessarily think so. I think everybody has a view on protecting sources that are legitimate and that are giving you information, you know, that is
sedulously fostered in the public interest, to use the phrase I have cited before from the Canadian law and I think it's a very useful one. I don't think it's that complicated. I think there may be different kinds of sources, I mean, protecting, for instance, an
individual's specific source who has spoken to you as opposed to protecting a broad category. Like there is a big difference between saying 'well the Gardaí told me $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ or Z and saying that Sergeant X of the Gardaí told me that'. So there you have gradations of understanding as to what sources in the particular circumstances should be protected.
345 Q. Al1 right. We11 I will try and be a bit more specific so that we can try and tie this down.
A. Sorry.

346 Q. The Tribunal circulates papers amongst the various interested parties running into thousands upon thousands of pages, hundreds of statements and last night in anticipation of your evidence, $I$ don't know if
you've seen any of these, I was doing a tot, I was just counting up the number of statements that have been circulated from reputable people in journalistic circles who have views on privilege that appear to be very different from you. I mean, for example, there's a statement from Gerard O'Regan, I don't know do you know him?
A. Mm hmm .

A respectable individual within the business, who, when asked by the Tribunal investigators about whether waiver affects privilege, he responded that privilege should be protected in all circumstances. I'm not saying he's right, $I$ am not saying you are wrong, I'm just saying that was a view.
A. Well, I'd agree that privilege should be protected in a11 kinds of cases, but it begs questions about what is privilege.

348 Q. No, no, he says in all circumstances, when specifically asked about the effect of waiver.
A. Well privilege should be protected in all circumstances. But what is privilege and where does it arise?

349 Q. No, no. But that view appears, and maybe I have got the wrong end of the stick, to be very different from your view about the effect of waiver on privilege. Again I am not saying he is right and you are wrong, it appears very different.
A. I am not in a position of having read these, I am not legally represented here and I haven't been circulated
with these documents.
350 Q. And that is fair enough, and I don't want to be unfair to you. But I can also indicate to you Cliff Taylor, I think Frank Fitzgibbon, Stephen Rae, Alan Steenson, Conor O'Donne11, Sebastian Hamilton, they were all asked this question and they all seemed to have a view. Again as I say they might be wholly wrong, just different from you on that question of the effect of waiver on privilege?
A. Well, if it were the case that journalists were being gossiped to by Gardaí and repeating these defamatory and unfounded accusations against Maurice McCabe and if this was circulating and nobody was doing anything about it, then arguably it had a chilling effect and would help to explain some of the slowness of taking up 14:14 aspects of this story and it would put the media, any media people who were involved in that in an awkward position of having to justify why they didn't check them out with Maurice McCabe or anybody else and why they didn't make a story out of the fact that some people were circulating these rumours. I think that is a story in its own right.

So, you know, people come to this from different perspectives. They have different perspectives on it and perfectly legitimate ones too. I mean one may take different views. I understand why the media is slow about seeing judges or anybody else attack journalistic privilege, they see it as the thin end of the wedge and
sometimes it is the thin end of the wedge.
351 Q. Al1 right.
A. May I finish the answer to your question? I mean I have seen in the past, I would have supported I mean the Irish Times in the Mahon case for instance, even though I mean I think lawyers could not have supported that. But I respect and trust journalists such as Kevin o'kelly too who have gone to jail to protect their sources regardless of what the law says in particular circumstances. So $I$ would be at one in general with such people. It all boils down to the specifics and you cannot have an absolute privilege, it brings the whole doctrine of privilege into disrepute in my opinion.
352 Q. All right. I couldn't agree more, but within that, if I can just try and reach a common ground then: You accept that there are legitimately held differences of opinion within the business on these questions, legitimately held?
A. As I have explained to you I think everybody agrees there's privilege. The differences that arise in the specific cases as to whether or not they are ones to which privilege appropriately applies.
353 Q. All right. And context, I think you will agree, is everything?
A. Well context of course is always a very relevant factor, yes, absolutely.
354 Q. I mean we have seen it here today with our own eyes and heard with our own ears, I think it was Ms. McCarthy
this morning refuse to answer a question from Mr. Dignam. You saw that?
A. I think I know what you are referring to. I was here, I think, I believe.
And the question $I$ think from memory was a simple one: Can you confirm that your source I think wasn't a Garda source, and she said I am not answering that question.
A. Well it's not easy I can tell you for -CHA RMAN There's another factor involved in this and people actually seem to be missing it, just as God knows I could be here for another two or three years if I didn't try and keep this thing on the rails. I am not interested in stuff that doesn't help me.
MR G LLANE: No, I appreciate that completely.
CHAN RMAN That is not going to help me, her answer wasn't going to help me and I am not going to press this issue, if I ever have to press this issue, in relation to stuff that is just yet more nonsense that I am listening to, I am not interested in it. I am here to report on specific things.
MR. G LLANE: oh, yes, and I hope, I sincerely hope, Chairman, I am not contributing to the nonsense, and I should point out to you, Mr. Kenny, my clients in fact have come forward to attempt to assist the Tribunal. But I am just simply trying to contextualise.
CHA RMAN I don't know about that now.
MR GLLANE: wel1, sorry, Chairman, I think that -CHA RMAN I mean I have a term of reference which
requires me to look into whether, for instance, the relevant broadcasts on 9th May 2016 were from Commissioner o'sullivan or not and privilege has been claimed in relation to that.

MR. GLLANE: well --
CHA RMAN So I mean I don't know why you say these things as if it's a kind of a general encomium that I am expected to take at face value. Because I don't, I look at specific factors, Mr. Gillane. And I am not saying your client is being unhelpful, can I just add
that before you get upset at what I'm saying and perhaps legitimately upset at what I'm saying. And I'm not saying that RTE hasn't co-operated, I'm not saying that at a11. I'm saying that there is such a thing as journalistic privilege and there are circumstances wherein it may be claimed and if RTE are making a legitimate claim in relation to journalistic privilege well then I'm going to do my best to look at the circumstances and try and make the right ruling. That's it.

But I am just not prepared to have a general statement out there to the effect that RTE have told me absolutely everything because they haven't. But they may have a very good reason for not doing so.
MR. G LLANE: And, Chairman, that wasn't what I suggested at a11.

CHA RMAN We11 I took it up that way and maybe that's my fault. Maybe I grew up speaking a different
language, Mr. Gillane.
MR. G LLANE: what I was trying to establish, particularly with this witness, is that there are different views. And one extreme that this Tribunal has heard --
CHA RMAN No, Mr. Gillane, I am absolutely happy, you can continue. That's just --
MR. G LLANE: I mean at one extreme this Tribunal has had some journalists, for example, refuse to confirm their phone number and said, you know, that's covered by privilege and at another level people are doing their best to say what they can.
CHA RMAN How do you know that?
MR. G LLANE: Because I have seen some of the material where people have said I am not confirming my phone
number. In any event --
CHA RMAN You could add to those the people who don't answer letters or spend months answering letters. That could be journalistic privilege too for all I know, Mr. Gillane.

MR. GLLANE: I think my clients have answered every letter that has been sent, whether satisfactorily or not is an issue that you may have views on in due course.

CHAN RMAN No, I don't.
MR. G LLANE: But certainly we have answered, I think, every letter sent to us by the Tribunal.

CHAI RMAN I am not in the business of conferring medals on RTE or anybody else.

MR. G LLANE: I haven't asked for one.
CHAN RMAN We11 I can't give you one, so.
356 Q. MR. G LLANE: Well, we are on common ground, Chairman. Mr. Kenny, moving on from that then just, I suppose slightly within the same area. You also gave evidence and in your statement you cover the question of motivation of sources?
A. Mm hmm .

And I think you do accept that a source could in fact be full of malice, but that the story generated by the source may still be of public interest?
A. It's possible.
Q.

I mean, to move away from this sphere, in the political sphere a Minister may leak that the Minister for Finance next week is going to put a tax on children's shoes, that Minister may simply want the Minister for Finance's job, that might be his motivation but it wouldn't make the story any less newsworthy or in the public interest?
A. If it can be stood up as factual it may be useful to a journalist, of course.
Q. Now can I also --
A. But if there is no basis for it or if there is no possibility that the information will ever be published then it's more problematic.

360 Q. Can I ask you again also about another area you've covered in your evidence which, as Ms. Leader has said, isn't in the terms of reference but you've linked it in a sense to the terms of reference, and that's the Garda

Inspectorate report you've referred to?
A. (Witness Nods).

361 Q. And RTE's coverage of it.
A. Mm hmm .

362 Q. Now, in terms of trying to sum up what the Inspectorate report said in a single sentence, which $I$ know is difficult, but would it be fair to say that the Inspectorate report was a vindication of the whistleblower?
A. A vindication of?

363 Q. of the whistleblowers.
A. I think it was nuanced, there was different things that it said. It certainly contained some good news for the whistleblowers in that it was clear that some senior members of the Gardaí felt that they had preformed a valuable function. There was also, I think you'11 see from looking at the RTE report to which I referred, some criticism as well. And I think there was, it was -- to write a balanced report you would have to say that overall the whistleblowers welcomed it because until then I think they had felt under greater pressure than they did after it appeared. But it wasn't, nothing is ever, no source, no party to a story is, or seldom are they ever completely faultless, it's never black and white, is it?
I understand, that's very fair. But I'm just trying to deal with it in the context of your criticism. Because the story broadcast at six o'clock on 11th March pushed it further than you in terms of being in favour of the
whistleblowers. The actual story finishes with Mr. Reynolds saying that the whistleblowers have been vindicated by the report?
A. I think if we want to look at the report I would be happy to talk about it because I think you need to see it in the whole. But certainly the impression I formed looking at the report was that it was incomplete. I think when you look, when you compare it to the coverage in other media, I think you'11 see a different emphasis. And of course RTE is perfectly, RTE News is perfectly entitled to take its own interpretation. All I asked of RTE was had they seen the whole report? And they couldn't give me an answer apparently in order to protect their source. They were not prepared to say having seen, having said that they saw the report they were not prepared to confirm that they had seen the whole report. And there was a very significant difference in that. I understand that. RTE wouldn't answer your question, as is their entitlement. But, in terms of the report itself, it contained material from Richard Dobson and Paul Reynolds, it starts as a story by saying that the report is highly critical of An Garda Síochána. Mr. Reynolds suggests that it may indeed be evidence of corruption post o'mahony and it ends indicating that the whistleblowers are vindicated. And the follow up story on the same night, and I think you suggested that there wasn't an interview with an opposition TD, contains an interview with Fianna Fail TD Niall

Collins, who also repeats in the course of the same broadcast that the whistleblowers have been vindicated. Do you remember that?
A. I think Mr. -- I remember RTE covering this story that night. I remember, if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Collins complained about the report to which I refer. I am not here to bash RTE, RTE did some very good coverage of this story, Prime Time, some on radio, some in the news. It's an organisation that $I$ have a lot of respect for, I am not here to weaken it in any way. But that particular report seemed to me to be based on a partial reading of the Garda Inspectorate report which was only available to four people I think in the country officially from the Garda Inspectorate, it hadn't gone to Cabinet even. I felt that the way that RTE presented it was inaccurate. I have made that clear here. I don't feel that it was the report that would have been presented objectively had the whole report been available to RTE. I may be mistaken, maybe they did see the whole report, I couldn't understand why they couldn't simply say they had if that was the case or how they were protecting sources by not confirming it to me. I tried a number of times writing for the Sunday Independent to get confirmation, I cannot see why they wouldn't have given it to me.
366 Q. All right.
A. I say no more than that. I am not making, you know I am not condemning RTE's entire coverage and I am not condemning, I am not analysing. If the Tribunal wants
me, I will took today, any other day here with you all at that report in full and we can discuss it, we can discuss the aspects of it that I found. But I don't think really that's going to change anything or add a whit to what I have already said about it.
All right. And, just to be clear because I don't want to try the Chairman's patience and I'm going to move on from this.
CHA RMAN I think I am really, really patient, do you know that?
MR. G LLANE: No, I know that.
CHA RMAN No, honestly I really do.
MR G LLANE: I know, but even you have limits,
Chairman.
CHAN RMN Well do I?
MR. GLLANE: And I don't want to --
CHA RMAN Like what, the rule in Browne -v- Dunne, that I was banging on about for the last year and a half for instance? Yes, I certainly do have limits on that.

MR. GLLANE: Yes, and what I don't want is the witness to leave and then you to hear a submission from me about a report that I haven't put to the witness.
CHA RMAN No, no. I think people should forget about my patience and just get on with things. I am a bit
tired of people referring to trying my patience.
I have been very patient and I am saying that.
MR. GLLANE: Indeed.
CHA RMAN And that is a ruling of the Tribunal.
Q. MR. G LLANE: And I am bound by it. Mr. Kenny, I'm going to move on from it, except to say this: That there were four reports over the two days, all of them contained phraseology highly critical of An Garda síochána, all of them indicating that the whistleblowers had been vindicated. It contained an interview with Mr. Collins and also in fact contained on the 12th an interview with Mr. Bob Olsen who himself indicated that none of this could have been come about were it not for the whistleblowers' legitimate complaint.
A. What is the question, $I$ am sorry?
A. Well there is a methodology to content analysis in media. You will forgive me engaging in a little bit of academia but this is not how you do it by picking out a few sentences and saying 'you know, isn't that so?' You would look at the whole thing. I'd be quite happy to do it. You take a range of days or times and you analyse what's there and you look at the -- you might compare it with what's elsewhere. And then you can -and in the same way, if you got a complaint when I was on the broadcasting compliance committee you would look at the overall context and the total package. I can't make any meaningful statement on a few sentences selectively chosen. I have made it clear that I felt
that the Garda Inspectorate report, the report about the Garda Inspectorate report on RTE was not based on the document, on the full document that RTE said it had seen.

CHA RMAN Could we perhaps leave it like this: You have a point of view on that and Mr. Gillane's instructions are to the contrary. He was simply trying to put to you what his instructions are to say that there may be another point of view and it seems you are not going to change your mind, and the other thing that's not going to happen is I am not going to report on either side of that.

MR. G LLANE: Thank you, Chairman, I have no further questions
CHA RMAN Thank you. Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, you have no questions.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. WFELAN AS FOLLOVS:

370 Q. MR. WFLAN Mr. Kenny, Noel whelan, I have some questions on behalf of former Commissioners Callinan and O'Sullivan. I am conscious that at this point the Tribunal, as it were, is moving into a journalistic module, over the next couple of weeks is calling a capacities, as it were, one on questions of fact which, as the Chairman has just said, seem most or all of which lay outside the terms of reference of the

Tribunal, notwithstanding your best efforts. But on the question of, as it were, your expertise on journalism, you have for many decades been a practitioner of journalism, more recently as you said not full time, but you are a practitioner of journalism, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.

371 Q. You were at, as it were, the cutting edge of creating the education in journalism out in DCU as a kind of an academia in journalism emerged in this country, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You also have had, to complete the 360 degree perspective, an involvement in the regulation in terms of the Broadcasting Authority and other entities?
A. (Witness Nods).

373 Q. In those contexts and with that expertise can I ask you to see if you would agree with me on a number of things which are not purely academic debates and if need be I will apply them to particular issues that are in front of this Tribunal. Can we have a conversation first about sources, and I know you have, Ms. Leader has led you on some of those. There was a presumption from the date of woodward and Bernstein in watergate that journalists needed two sources for anything.
That's not strictly true, is it, there are circumstances in which a journalist can rely on one source only, isn't that correct?
A. We11 in theory, yeah. I suppose you could certainly
have a situation where you had one source and you felt it was sufficient to go with it.

374 Q. okay.
A. Depending on the story.

375 Q. And looking at any source beyond the primary source, doesn't the journalist have to be careful that the second source is not merely repeating something they have heard from the first source, isn't that correct?
A. Absolutely.
okay. And again, quite practically for this case, there is no issue with the fact that David Taylor made a protected disclosure which makes allegations of a smear campaign in which it is said Martin Callinan directed, that Nóirín O'Sullivan knew and/or indulged or permitted. Maurice McCabe accepts that his protected disclosure is no more than an account of what was given to him by David Taylor. So amn't I correct in seeing that as a primary source and as a secondary source informed by what the primary source told him; isn't that correct?
A. Well based on what you are saying it would appear to be the case, yes.
377 Q. Okay. And any journalist getting those, getting word of those two accounts, shall we say, or getting those two accounts, would of course have to have regard at the second of those accounts, in this case the McCabe one, is no more than a hearsay or repetition of the first account, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. They don't corroborate each other to an extent?
A. Correct. They conflict each other. Can I ask you then about another recent trend, I don't know to what extent you are familiar with the protected disclosure legislation. 14:31 But in the general journalistic discourse there have been a number of protected disclosures made by persons, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

382 Q. As an expert in journalism does the fact that somebody puts an allegation in an envelope addressed to a protected disclosure manager give that allegation any greater weight in journalistic sense?
A. Not per se. of course it depends on whether it's true or not.
Is there a risk in the consumption of media coverage that the fact that somebody has become an official protected disclosee or made a protected disclosure might be perceived as, well, there must be something to
it if they put it in a protected disclosure?
A. I don't think any serious journalist would assume that.
okay. I should emphasise there have been two incidences within the realms of this Tribunal, and I emphasise this is not directed to Mr. McCabe, that's why I am naming the two incidences, namely Garda Harrison and Superintendent Taylor where stuff has been put into protected disclosures, which the court has. Already found in respect of one, Mr. Harrison, the Tribunal has already found in respect of Garda Harrison was largely inaccurate and in respect of superintendent Taylor, much of what he has said in his original protected disclosure, it seems, has been withdrawn. So you see the point I am making, that the risk of elevating something to having greater veracity because it's in a protected disclosure is something journalism needs to be live to, is that correct?
A. Absolutely. And I think it's a risk to Sergeant McCabe. If I may say, I've always found from the very outset, he was very reticent, subdued about what he said, very careful to proceed in a proper fashion, not to give a document in one case that was to go before the Dáil before the Dáil had seen it. He has been through so much and I think it's cruel if at this stage late in the day any activities by other people which overstate a case rebounds against him. So it's difficult for him as well as for journalists.

385 Q. I have to say, I don't disagree at all with anything you have said, and again to emphasise that Sergeant

McCabe was always careful to say that what was in his protected disclosure was stuff he had been told by Superintendent Taylor. Can I ask you then, and I read your, the materials you offered to the Tribunal firstly and then the statement you were invited to make with a personal interest but also in a sense with professional interest in this context. You seemed to be anxious to emphasise that before running with any story maligning or taking any view maligning or bad mouthing Sergeant McCabe journalists need to be careful to check the facts, isn't that correct?
A. Not just running with it, before --
Q. Accepting it?
A. Before entertaining it even as a chilling factor in your own mind. I mean if I was told, you know, you were a bank robber and I was about to write about you, I would not ignore that, I would want to check out, you know, even if I was not going to write about it, if it was relevant to my coverage of something in which you were involved.

387 Q. I am going to take your word "entertain" which is very useful in this context. Before somebody would entertain a notion of somebody being maligned or bad mouthed to them, the journalist is obliged to look beyond that one source who is doing that, isn't that correct?
A. Well that is my opinion. I have been surprised by a couple of senior journalists disagreeing with me saying that well if $I$ wasn't going to write a story about it,

I wasn't going to use it, I didn't need to check it. I don't agree with that point of view.

And to suggest in particular that that person, that it force generally under the instruction or direction or tolerance of the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner, wouldn't that be particularly defamatory of both the force and the individuals if it was established it was correct?
A. I think you would need an anthropologist rather than communications academic to categorise an Irish whispering campaign as to whether or not it is
systematic. We all know what a whispering campaign is in Ireland. I am not sure what the right word for it is.

Well that again, and I don't want to misuse the Tribunal's time, I won't say indulge, impose on the court's patience, I don't want to misuse the Tribunal's time by engaging in -- but I mean there have been patterns in history where rumours campaigns have gone, surrounded like wildfire?
A. Hmm.

393 Q. I think in particular you will remember one relating to the Gorta charity many years ago and even one touching on the $x$ case which concerned a named individual, it became a rumour campaign, which somebody may have lit the fire for, but sometimes they take an oxygen all of their own and become wildfire rumours, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.

394 Q. okay. But in this case the court, the Tribunal was being asked to investigate, this Disclosure Tribunal, a 14:37 disclosure that alleged a systematic, coordinated and directed campaign out of An Garda Síochána to undermine the journalistic and political view of Sergeant McCabe in the vilest way. That's what the Tribunal is inquiring into. That allegation is defamatory, isn't 14:37 that correct, if established?
A. It certainly is, yeah.

395 Q. So the high, of course it's not the high end we discussed earlier, but it's at the high end. So when
journalism or anybody else receives such an allegation then, as you said earlier, it has to look at the motivation: what's the anger of the person who is making the allegation, isn't that correct?
A. Mm hmm .

396 Q. That is the phrase you used, the first thing you say is where is this person coming from?
A. Yeah.
Q. what is their anger?
A. Yeah.

398 Q. What might their bitterness be?
CHA RMAN I think angle.
A. Angle.

399 Q. MR. WFELAN Angle, sorry, what is their angle, sorry, okay. But whether they might be bitter, whether they might be motivated against an employer, whether they might be motivated for other reasons against the person they are making the allegations about, isn't that correct?
A. Absolutely, naturally.

400 Q. And in this incidence we now know that Superintendent Taylor was motivated, his angle was, and this is ultimately a matter for the Tribunal to establish, but his motivation or his angle was that he had a bitterness directed towards Nóirín o'sullivan. And if journalism was aware of that fact, that he was unhappy about being investigated and had a sense that investigation was being driven by Ms. O'Sullivan and her husband, shouldn't there have been particular
concern about propagating that allegation?
A. Yes. Journalists should have made it their business to generate a story about the fact that smears were being circulated and whispering campaign of a defamatory nature about Maurice McCabe and should have tried to get to the bottom of the source of those whispers, which were being circulated at a time when he also had extraordinary disciplinary proceedings hanging over his head for some 13 months, I think, that were ultimately dropped. The journalists had a very serious obligation who heard those rumours to not just treat them with caution, but to air them and to address them in my opinion.
401 Q. And a similar obligation acquires in respect of rumours made against any other police officer, including the Garda Commissioner?
A. (Witness Nods)

The same obligation to test the motive, to examine the angle?
A. In any story you should always ask where is the person coming from, of course, yeah.
Q. Can I ask you, and if you are not in a position to, then please don't, but can I ask you as a journalistic expert then to offer a view on the manner in which the stories of Nóirín o'sullivan have been reported in the last two or three years?
A. Well, to be honest --

405 Q. In light of what we now know, what you now know?
A. It's very hard to find in my heart sympathy, if that's what you are asking given the mess that has been made of this by the Department of Justice, from the Gardaí from the outset and the various subsequent shambles over drunken driving and other affairs. I think the government deserves a police service fit for purpose, and Maurice McCabe in my view was doing nothing more than as local sergeant would do properly in trying to bring attention to systematic flaws in the system that should have been corrected long, long ago.

So I don't have a great deal of interest to be honest, I haven't analysed carefully the coverage of Nóirín o'Sullivan, but she is entitled to due process as much as Sergeant McCabe is.
MR. WELAN In journalism as much as elsewhere. CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Whelan, you will be entitled to make a submission to me to that effect at the end if you want.
MR. WFELAN Thank you, Judge.
CHA RMAN I am not sure.
MR. WFELAN I am nearly finished, Chairman.
CHA RMAN No, no.
MR. WFELAN Sorry.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. WFELAN what I am saying is, all I am doing is laying the expert evidence basis for what would form the basis of submissions in circumstances --

CHA RMAN well, look, you can take it as hopefully a reasonable person sitting in this chair, that if people don't ask where people are coming from, what's their angle? or if they ask the question, let's say the matter is concealed, then they may have an excuse. But 14:41 if they don't ask is there any truth in this or is it verified elsewhere, for which I think there is no excuse for not looking into those things, then I don't think that's very good kind of journalism. I am not going to be reporting on journalism. I'd kind of rather avoid it, but if you want to make a submission to me at the end that Nóirín o'Sullivan was very badly treated and that there was a rush to judgment or anything like that, I will certainly listen to it and then see what I am going to do with it.
MR. WFELAN Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am just conscious this is the only independent evidence from a practicing journalist in the various organisations you are going to hear from in the next couple of weeks and that's the capacity in which he has been called.
CHA RMAN Yes. But it may be that the principle, Mr. Whelan, is more important than the actual case that you are referring to. So that if, I thought it was the washington post or wherever that didn't publish anything, unless there was two sources. There may be other papers as well. I did not think that applied in Ireland, but.
MR. WFELAN Thank you, Chairman. Can I touch on --
A. By the way there are excellent academics at DIT and DCU
who are happy to undertake content analysis, particularly if the Garda Commissioner has a budget for that kind of work they can do it scientifically and I am sure they will form a view as to whether or not Nóirín O'Sullivan was treated fairly. But I have no view on the matter.

MR. WFELAN Can I ask you then a couple of other questions which you may have a view on. In January 2013 you say you were told by a couple of journalists in some, outside the committee room, lobby perhaps, was 14:42 it, in Leinster House about this story of a sexual allegation against Sergeant Maurice McCabe, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

407 Q. You were, as the judge said, in the helpful position that you could get a source who could confirm very quickly that that wasn't true and that was Sergeant McCabe, is that correct?
A. Yes.

408 Q. And he was able to show you the letter from the DPP that made it clear not only was it not being prosecuted for any lack of evidence, it didn't amount to an offence, isn't that correct?
A. I was able to satisfy myself on the basis of seeing that letter what the circumstances were and on the basis of other information.

409 Q. Can I take it then that you regard it, because you referenced your conversations with Sergeant McCabe on a number of occasions in your evidence, that you regarded
your conversations with Sergeant McCabe as off the record?
A. I had a limited number of discussions with Sergeant McCabe, who said he is quite happy to have me talk about them. I was conscious as he was at all stages of 14:43 the sensitivity of those discussions and I didn't want to put him into a position of doing anything which might have caused a problem for him and he didn't, in my view, do anything that was inappropriate. In fact he was frustratingly restrained at times. I remember one particular document $I$ wanted to see that was before the Dáil or was due to be brought before the Dáil by a TD and I would very much like to have seen it and
I couldn't get my hands on it and in that respect, yes, there was a certain amount of contact, but I think, you 14:44 know, what was striking to me was how restrained he was.

410 Q. Again I'm not taking issue with any of that. Can we then, can I just then raise with you two final matters. Journalists, you and I may have a conversation and I may say to you 'that's off the record'; if a moment arises sometime, because of the passage of time or the circumstances or public controversy, is there circumstances where the journalist could or should go back to their source and say 'can you relieve me of that privilege now'?
A. We11, of course you can always ask.

411 Q. You could always ask?
A. (Witness Nods)
Q. And are there times when, let's say, if this Tribunal, in order to have the fullest possible picture of a situation, it has waivers $I$ emphasised from Superintendent Taylor and from both of our clients, former Commissioner Callinan and former Commissioner O'Sullivan, but if it would assist the Tribunal in establishing facts, particularly where things concern on7y two persons having a conversation and Mr. Taylor, say, for example, was one of them and the other source is unidentified; are those the kind of circumstances where journalists should or in your view, could or in your view should go back to the source and say will you relieve me now of the privilege?
A. I think the journalist needs to be very careful that they are not putting the source under some kind of pressure that's unfair. So again it depends on the circumstances. I wouldn't be in a hurry particularly in response to investigations by the State to put pressure on a source to relieve me. But if the source voluntarily does it of their own accord that's a very different set of circumstances, I think, assuming that there's no reason to believe that the source, her or himself isn't coming under some kind of unfair inducement.
413 Q. But given that patriotic obligation which the Chairman 14:45 spoke this morning, you'd at least go back to the source and give them the opportunity?
A. That's theoretically possible.

414 Q. Yes, okay. Can I ask you then one last question. You
said in January 2013 that you heard this story from a journalist about sexual assault allegation, if a police officer or a senior police officer had told you that in January 2013, that Maurice McCabe --
CHA RMAN I think it's January 2014, it has to be
January 14
MR. WFELAN Sorry, excuse me.
CHA RMAN Because it's in or around the time --
MR. WFELAN It's the PAC meeting
CHA RMAN I have on7y focused on one PAC meeting and I didn't know, but I understand this morning now there were other ones. They could have gone into 2013 for all I know.

MR. WFELAN No, no, it's '14, it is January '14.
A. It is early January 2014. I have lost track of all the 14:46 meetings.

415 Q. MR. WFELAN I should have corrected that myself. If a police officer had told you what you say a security correspondent told you in January '14, what would your response have been? If a police officer said to you 'you have to be careful with Maurice McCabe, he can't be trusted, he has psychiatric problems or he is a trouble maker or whatever', what would your response to that have been?
A. Well I would have wanted to check it out also.

But would you have taken steps about the fact that a senior police officer told you that, quite apart from checking out what they said, wouldn't you have been horrified that they said it to you as a journalist?
A. Well the first thing I would have probably assumed is that there was possibly some truth in it.

417 Q. Yes.
A. When I found out that it was misleading and that perhaps there was some historic truth to an incident rather than to instances or it being continuing, I might have considered writing a story about, depending on the situation - this is very hypothetical, Judge - depending on the circumstances that the Gardaí, that there was rumours, a whispering campaign from Garda sources. I mean I did hear of someone else who was told by a senior guard who is now deceased about the abuse allegation actually. Like I'm not at liberty to talk about that. But it doesn't really matter where it came from to be quite honest in the sense for me journalistically. Well it does matter, obviously if it comes from a police source it's more serious. But it's a very significant thing. It's the fact that is crucial: Is this true or is it false? If it's true it may be relevant, it may not be relevant. Even if it were true it wouldn't necessarily change a thing, the truth of what somebody, a whistleblower was saying, but it would certainly be a factor you would have to bear in mind when dealing with their statements.
418 Q. We11 if it was untrue and it became apparent to you then that this senior police officer was maligning in serious and significant terms either the mental health or otherwise of the whistleblower, then that of itself would be a story for you, wouldn't it?
A. Absolutely. You would be speaking to an editor immediately, but the problem was to get corroboration of course.

No, and I think Ms. McCarthy, Justine McCarthy this morning made the point that it wouldn't be the easiest story to do. But your point is you would go and have a conversation with an editor immediately?
A. (Witness Nods).

MR. WFELAN Thank you very much, Doctor Kenny.
MR. KELLY: Chairman, sorry, Kieran Kelly for INM. CHA RMAN Oh, you are there, Mr. Kelly, yes.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. KELLY AS FOLOVG:

MR. KELLY: Just a few questions. Mr. Kenny, hello. Good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I just have a few questions for you, Mr. Kenny. You have referred to the chilling effect a smear might have on a journalist.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hmm}$.

421 Q. Before you submitted your statement, did you do any research on the number of articles that were written concerning Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. No, I haven't got a count of them.

422 Q. You haven't taken a count of them. Because you see Mr. Thuillier was here one day for Mr. Michael o'Toole of the Star and asked questions of Superintendent David Taylor on that subject, were you here that day?
A. No.
Q. No. Did you read his transcript?
A. I haven't read the transcripts.

424 Q. You didn't read the transcript. We11 on page 199 of the transcript of Day 75 the Chairman actually made an intervention, and I will quote the Chairman, if he doesn't mind: "Just on that point put by Mr. Thuillier there, obvi ously the Tri bunal has searched through news papers --"
A. Sorry, am I looking at this here, sorry?

CHA RMAN No, if you just listen to the question there.

MR. KELLY: It is a very short quote.
CHAN RMAN It is, yes.
425 Q. MR. KELLY: "As well as everything el se and it is very hard to come across anything negative to Ser geant MLCabe, never mind anything about hi mbei ng embittered in consequence of an investigation whi ch took place all of 14 years previ ousl $y$ or there or ther eabouts?"

That was what the Chairman said to Superintendent Taylor. So the situation is that there was no chilling effect, Mr. Kenny, do you understand?
A. We11 I don't know. I hear what you are saying.

426 Q. Yes, thank you. And just, if you don't mind, on your, some of the papers you submitted to the Tribunal, you, and they are at 3910 , if Mr. Kavanagh might like to get that up.
A. 3910?

427 Q. Yes.
A. I have it, yes.

428 Q. To 3912. You are citing a number of articles that you wrote in the Sunday Independent newspaper?
A. Yes.

14:50
429 Q. And they go from Apri1 2013 to June 2014, I think.
A. Yeah.
Q. And then you have a number of others for other publications, but it is INM I am interested in, is that okay?
A. Yes, there's a number of publications.

431 Q. And you have 24 articles in that period of time, Mr. Kenny, on Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. Right.

432 Q. That is what you list there, would you accept that?
A. Yes.

433 Q. In that period of time 24 articles, a11 of which were very positive to Sergeant McCabe and the whistleblowers in general, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

434 Q. Yes. So there was no chilling effect on your journalism there or on the INM journalism presented there, was there?
A. You're asking a question that's almost impossible to answer. It does per se have a chilling effect to be
other people covering the story, and in particular the security correspondents seemed to me to be particularly slow to cover what would be a rather obvious story that presented admittedly difficulties to them. I really don't -- I think there is a non sequitur in what you are saying. I mean if somebody is maligning an individual and you are writing about them, there is a danger there will be a chilling effect.
I'm asking you whether 24 articles written by you in the Sunday Independent in that period of time all supportive of sergeant McCabe?
CHA RNAN Yes. I think the question really is were you chilled yourself?
A. Well, first of all, I had found out straightaway after I heard this that there was no basis. And, secondly, I have to say, and I want -- I'm glad to have this opportunity to say actually, in relation to Anne Harris, the editor, and willie Kealy, the deputy editor, they never retailed to me the gossip that was apparently being sent around elsewhere. I think that was a very appropriate and proper editorial response. So the only place I had heard it at this level was from the people I have mentioned and I immediately discovered there was no basis for it. Had there been a basis, had I discovered that a whistleblower was still under investigation for alleged abuses of a child, I am afraid it probably would have affected my perspective on that person in some way. I think we are all human. You would step back a little and say 'hang on a minute,
what's going on here, is there some kind of walter Mitty character, is this some kind of a guy with an axe to grind?' And it didn't seem to me that that applied at all. So why would it have had a chilling effect on me? I don't understand, you know, the deduction from the fact that I wrote about the story and especially in the situation where $I$ was writing partly to encourage, I had hoped - and there were other journalists by the way, I am not suggesting I was the only one, Mick Clifford was writing quite a lot and there were other people. I am not sitting here saying I was the only person who saw this story, but I am saying that I felt that the seriousness of this story was such that I would have wished at a period that more interest had been taken in it by a number of security -- and there were security correspondents writing about it too. So I am not making any sweeping generalisations about RTE, about the Independent or about security correspondents. This is a real scenario, a real, you know, real set of circumstances. And they are the facts as far as I am concerned.

436 Q. MR. KELLY: Mr. Philip Ryan, are you familiar with him as a journalist, Philip Ryan, you are familiar with Philip Ryan as a journalist?
A. Yes.

437 Q. Did you see any of his articles about Maurice McCabe and the whistleblowers?
A. Yes, of course.

438 Q. You did. Were they positive?
A. I wouldn't categorise them as positive or negative. 439 Q. No? Do you remember the article from February 2014 that was put to Ms. Harris the other day?
A. I think I have mentioned one of his articles here, haven't I?

440 Q. About the confidential recipient?
A. Well, it's in the documentation.

441 Q. Yes.
A. The one I mentioned.

442 Q. There is no chilling effect on Mr. Ryan either, was there?
A. I really I have to say I don't know.

MR. KELLY: No. Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Yes, I think it's fair to say, Mr. Kelly, and we've looked into this as best we can, but when it comes to scrutinising newspapers, there are a lot of them, there's a lot of -- we're talking about responsible sources on websites such as the journal.ie. etc. and we couldn't find anything where someone was writing and saying Sergeant McCabe even was a person driven by agendas, never mind -- and it is certainly the case no one ever wrote that he had abused a child and been investigated and as a consequence of that he was a demented bitter person who was making up a whole load of nonsense. So it just doesn't seem to be out there. I don't think it is and you possibly would be more familiar with the media than $I$ would be. I can't find it. Can you?
MR. KELLY: No, I am not aware of it, Chairman

CHA RMAN A11 right, fair enough. And that is the point you are making?
MR. KELLY: Precisely, Chairman
CHA RMAN That whatever the chiliing effect, it didn't seem to go very deep, is that it?

MR. KELLY: That's correct, Chairman.
CHA RMAN A11 right.
A. May I say, Chairman, just one thing. Philip Ryan is mentioned. I mention in my statement to the Tribunal an article by Philip Ryan and Jim Cusack, Garda quashed 14:56 points, Sunday Independent, 30th December 2012. I'm not claiming that there weren't other journalists writing, of course there were.

CHA RMAN Oh, no, of course, I imagine so. Did you have any further questions.

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

443 Q. MR. LEHANE: Sorry, Chairman, I have one question on behalf of Ms. Harris just arising out of Mr. Keeley's cross-examination. Good afternoon, Mr. Kenny, my name is Darren Lehane and I am counsel here on behalf of Anne Harris and I just have one question for you.

Would you agree with me that not every bit of gossip that would be floating around a newspaper headquarters would necessarily make it into articles written by the purveyors of that gossip necessarily?
A. No, of course not.

MR. LEHANE: Thank you.

## THE WTNESS WAS RE- EXAM NED BY ME. LEADER AS FOLOVG:

MS. LEADER: I just want to confirm with you, Mr. Kenny, that you are happy to meet with our investigators so as to identify those two particular journalists?
A. Yes, and I'm sorry if it's going to put them to any inconvenience.
CHA RMAN No, it's not.
A. But, as I say, I don't have anything -- I am not making any judgment about them.
CHA RMAN The normal procedure in any event, rather than making a big public fuss, is that we take a statement, we send it to them, ask them what they have got to say about it and then consider whether they need to be called in evidence or not. That's the usual
thing. But I just wanted to ask you a few things, I am 14:57 sorry. Ms. Leader went very, very thoroughly -- oh, yes.
MR. MEDONELL: Chairman?
CHA RMAN Oh, yes, I beg your pardon.
MR. MEDONELL: Chairman, before you ask the question
one more question.
CHA RMAN A11 right.
MR. MEDONELL: Mr. Whelan put it to Professor Kenny that Sergeant McCabe had shown him the DPP's direction.

CHA RMAN Yes, I was wondering, I was actually wondering about that.
MR. MEDONELL: I just want to clarify that. Sergeant McCabe knew what was in it for the reasons that the Tribunal knows, but certainly has never seen it until this Tribunal started.

MR. WFELAN I suppose told him what was in it. CHA RMAN Yes. He didn't produce the actual letter, 'Director of Public Prosecutions, here it is'. Or can you remember?
A. I saw a document, so I can't say which specific document it is, at one point, yes.
CHA RMAN But, whatever it was, it said it doesn't even amount to a --
A. It gave a full account of what had been decided by the DPP and appeared to come --

CHA RMAN From somewhere.
A. I can clarify that too, it's no problem.

CHA RMAN No, it's not actually. Again it's one of these details that's not going to assist me one way or the other. There is so many of them along the way.
A. There no difficulty about that by the way, I mean I am absolutely clear.

CHA RMAN No, no. Again it's, you can say I'm not interested, it sounds as if I am sitting here bored out 14:58 of my tree, I'm not. But I just don't think that it's anything that's going to help me one way or the other.
A. The document was furnished to the lawyer for the Independent Newspapers, not this Independent Newspaper
lawyer, at the time when I was writing about the affair. So it was part of a legalled and assessed process.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, un1ess people say that I should look into this, I don't really want to look into it to tell you the truth. A11 right, we11, there it is, there may be a different of opinion. Look, just a couple of things, if you don't mind.

## THE WTNESS WAS THEN QUESTI ONED BY THE CHA RMAN, AS FOLLOVS:

445 Q. Even among journalists, I suppose this is why the child sex abuse thing is so significant, I take it there are people who are taking an ideological viewpoint: Look, anyone who makes an allegation of sex abuse is always telling the truth, in other words there's no smoke without fire type of thing?
A. One is always afraid that people do that.

446 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, but I mean journalists aren't immune
A. Thinking there's no smoke without fire?

CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. Of course they're not, just as human as lawyers or anybody else.
A. Pardon me, Judge?
Q. CHAN RMAN The amount of deceit, the amount of lies that are promulgated. People are talking about now at the present time this being a post truth age, which seems to me to be nonsensical. But the question that I wanted to ask you is, certainly there's a public interest in the truth, but is there any public interest in the promulgation of lies in the media so that people get hysterical about them, engage in witch-hunts or even start to just believe them about people?
A. Certainly not.

449 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. So even if it were on the basis that things didn't reach the newspapers but that people were talking about people in a negative way and it was untrue, could that ever possibly be in the public interest?
A. I cannot see it, unless it was a very constrained set of circumstances where a journalist was bringing to their line manager an account of information being circulated in order to discuss how they should react to the fact that that was being circulated. Apart from that, such gossip couldn't be in the public interest I don't think. And it's own only in the public interest in those circumstances insofar as you form a methodology of response to the vile rumour that's

450 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. We11, in the sphere of law certain1y we, in terms of writing about the Constitution etc., there's an awful lot of words spilled over the concept
of justice, but I'm not sure there can be any justice without a search for the truth. And, similarly, can there be journalistic privilege in the promulgation of complete and utter lies?
A. No, absolutely not. I mean the truth is the central, should be the central aim of journalism, you tell the truth and shame the devil. If you're not religious you tell the truth and try to ascertain some kind of a context in which the best possible decisions can be made by society on the basis of the known facts.
451 Q. CHA RMN Yeah. One of the things that perhaps might worry a journalist is, in the same way as a person asked to defend someone, let us say, on a murder charge is obliged to get that person's instructions and then to put those instructions to whatever witnesses are relevant to those instructions; if, say, a defence counse1 were to say to themselves 'well I'm going to decide whether they are guilty or not', that would be a breach of professional duty, I presume that journalists are sometimes operating in a similar constraint where they are saying to themselves 'I can't act as judge and jury and say this was malicious or deceitful by so and so and therefore reveal them as a source, I'd need to have perhaps the clearest possible indication in that regard before reaching any decision on that basis', would that be fair?
A. very fair.

452 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. Now, you mentioned, I think, to Ms. Leader, one of the things you said was, look, was
there constraints in terms of the waiver of privilege if privilege is waived. I just want to give you an example maybe just to help me clarify that in my own mind. Let's suppose there is a board of directors of 12 people and let's suppose that they are contemplating, $I$ don't know what, a takeover of a cement company or something like that and it's important that that would not get out into the public domain because the consequence of that would be, I suppose, negative to shareholders or negative to people's interests in either of the companies; in the event that that did get out and was clearly a leak from the board of directors and let us say the managing interest in the company, the person with the biggest shareholding passed around a waiver saying 'I hereby waive any journalistic privilege that $I$ have as a member of this board of directors in relation to any information published on this company's bid to take over Smedley \& Co cement producers, that's the kind of thing you are talking about, is it? where if you don't 15:03 signed you're clearly the source; if you do sign, then you've got a problem, because it's coerced out of you?
A. You could be identifying other people.

453 Q. CHA RMN Well, no. I mean you're signing a waiver, but if you don't sign a waiver, you're in trouble?
A. Oh, yes. Well that is the kind of complexity there is, exactly.
454 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. And if that isn't present or something like that isn't present, a waiver may indeed be a
genuine and voluntary waiver?
A. It may indeed be genuine and voluntary and I cannot see why in some circumstances having been waived a journalist would need to persist in ostensibly protecting a source that in fact doesn't want to be protected and may even be damaged in some respects by being protected in that sense.

CHA RMAN And what if there's a side agreement? In other words, what if the source says 'well, I know this has become a matter of public controversy now and
I know that there's going to be whatever kind of a, let's say a court case or something like this about it' but you and I will agree that you'11 only go so far and won't tell the full truth in relation to what I said, even though I'm publicly waiving privilege', would a journalist be bound by such a side agreement?
A. I'm sorry I don't...

456 Q. CHA RMAN Do you get the point? Well, let's suppose -- again to try and get a concrete example of it.
Let's suppose somebody is murdered and let's suppose the journalist gets information to the effect that the person who committed the murder was A, Mr. A, and let us suppose that Mr. A comes under pressure just publicly generally whereby, forget about the pressure now, he feels he has to in some way make a public show of somehow waiving any privilege that may attach to the communication with the journalist, all right?
A. Mm hmm .

457 Q. CHA RMAN Forget that situation.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN It sounds outlandish, but in the event that the waiver is for public consumption only, just to make the person look good, but at the same time there's an agreement with the journalist that, notwithstanding the apparent waiver, that the protection of the source will be maintained, is that a valid exercise in journalistic privilege?
A. It doesn't sound to me like it conforms to the rubric of sedulously fostering sources in the public good, it sounds like something undesirable.
CHA RMAN Well it is certainly undesirable, but is it possible under journalistic privilege?
A. I cannot see.

461 Q. CHA RMAN Do you understand what I am saying? You make a public show of making a waiver, but at the same time you have a side agreement with a journalist that it is only a public show, it means nothing but you are stil1 bound?
A. That would be entirely improper if it happened,

I think.
CHA RMAN Would the journalist though not be bound by it, if they are told 'look I was your source, all right, but I am going to make a public show now of issuing a waiver but you and I know that it means absolutely nothing, you are still bound as far as I am concerned'?
A. I can't -- I'm afraid it's, I am trying to be helpful judge, but to me I'd prefer to comment on a specific example or a specific case because it's very difficult. 15:07 I don't fully -- it seems to me what you are suggesting would be completely wrong for the journalist to enter into just on the hypothetical level that you are putting it. I don't see there would be a set of circumstances in which that would be valid if the journalist was party to the deception of the public in any way.
CHA RMAN Yes. But, you know, you can, in the ordinary and normal circumstances, if Mr. A is the source of, let's say, some very important stories or whatever, they may turn out to be true, they may turn out to be false, but if Mr. A publicly comes out and says, without any pressure: 'Well, in the particular circumstances, because there's public controversy about this, I am waiving any privilege $I$ may have as a source'?
A. Yes.

464 Q. CHA RMAN But if at the same time he is saying to the journalist 'look, that waiver doesn't apply to you'?
A. Yeah.
Q. CHA RMAN Is the journalist bound by that? In other words, is the journalist bound by the public declaration, even a declaration on oath, or are they bound by whatever original agreement they had to protect the source, which has now ostensibly been waived but not waived vis-à-vis that journalist?
A. I think the agreement on sources has to be in good faith and I think that good faith doesn't exist in the circumstances you are outlining there and therefore the journalist cannot seriously consider this to be, in the circumstances you've outlined, an exercise of journalistic privilege. It's something else and something not very appropriate to be quite honest. It could put the journalist in a very difficult position.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes, all right.
A. But I think that, $I$ don't think that the journalist is bound in those circumstances. If the person is publicly saying that they waive privilege then I think the journalist has to act in the public good and if it's being said to the public that privilege is waived then the journalist should act as if privilege is waived. It could not be in the public good for the journalist to connive in some way out of deceit.
467 Q. CHA RMAN We11 as you say, you go back to the idea that the public never have an interest in the promulgation of deceit and lies?
A. Exactly.

468 Q. CHA RMAN

Just the last thing, and Ms. Leader did go
into this and it's called negative information. So several people have said, I mean I have made a list here on the side, and I'm not going to go through it, saying, well, David Taylor is saying that you briefed him negatively and a number of people have said well, no, sorry, I wasn't. Is there any breach of journalistic privilege in saying, apart from circumstances where the class is so small that by saying, no, I wasn't briefed, you are identifying somebody else or narrowing it down to two or three or maybe a dozen or two dozen, is there any difficulty in terms of journalistic privilege in saying 'no, that never actually happened, no, I was never briefed'?
A. I understand the point that's been made by counsel for RTE that there are different opinions on this, and my opinion is that if it's so broad, for example in this case to say I heard from Gardaí this vicious rumour, that's never going to identify particular Gardaí, or even to say I heard from senior Gardaí above the rank of sergeant this particular rumour, they are never going to be identified.

Now, I understand it may make life uncomfortable for some security correspondents who deal on a daily basis with the guards, but to jump to the conclusion that the 15:10 guards are going to cut them off for saying that raises more questions in my mind about the relationship that they have with their sources in the Gardaí than it does about the doctrine of journalistic privilege.

CHAI RMAN Yes. We11, thanks very much for your help.
A. Thank you.

MR. MARRI NAN The next witness is Philip Boucher-Hayes, please.

## MR. PH LI P BOUCHER-HAYES, HAV NG BEEN SUORN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR MARRI NAN AS FOLLOWE:

469 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Mr. Boucher-Hayes' statement is to be found at page 5317 of the material, which is in volume 20, and also a supplemental statement at page 5319. Now, I think that you're a journalist and well known broadcaster, isn't that right?
A. I have been a journalist for 30 years now, yes.

470 Q. Would you mind, even though you are well respected and well known, would you mind just giving a brief outline of your career to the Chairman, please?
A. I started writing for regional papers this month 30 years ago as it happens. I moved from there to RTE, where I was a radio producer for a number of years, producing programmes like the Gay Byrne show. I subsequently moved into reporting for programmes like Five Seven Live. I've covered for over a decade or so war zones for RTE, the political beat. I am a generalist though and currently I make documentaries for television and report on the, mainly on the Drive Time programme on radio and fill in for Joe Duffy on occasions on Liveline.

471 Q. And I think on December 17th of 2013 were you
presenting, or a presenter on Crimeline?
A. I was a co-presenter on Crimecall with Gráinne Seoige. Crimecal1, sorry. And I think that a disagreement you say arose at a production meeting between members of an Garda Síochána and yourself and your co-presenter, Gráinne Seoige, is that right?
A. Yes, Andrew McLindon, the Director of Communications for An Garda Síochána, arrived at that December 17th production meeting ahead of what was to be a prerecorded interview with then Commissioner Martin Callinan, which was an annual feature in the programme. Mr. McLindon presented myself and Gráinne, though it was to be Gráinne who was to conduct the interview, presented us with a list of questions, which was, frankly, completely unheard of before. I had never experienced anything of the kind before. I had certainly experienced people try to influence the direction of an interview, but to so baldly hand a list of questions, some of which were, quite frankly, so far removed from public interest that it was almost
comica1. It might not have been the first question, but certainly high up on the list was that he wanted to talk about the changed Garda roster. Both myself and Gráinne suggested to them at the time that (a) these were not items that were of interest to the public, (b)
this was a bit of a presumption giving us questions to can ask him, and (c), most importantly, when there were issues like penalty points, closure of rural Garda stations and his own response to the findings of the
report of the Smithwick Tribunal that perhaps these were issues that he would also like to address.
Q. You refer to Mr. McLindon there; was Superintendent David Taylor also party to the conversation?
A. I really wanted to help the Tribunal on this, I have wracked my brains on it. I cannot say for certainty that David Taylor was there for the entirety of that meeting that day. If he was there for the part at which the row arose, because it became quite febrile, quite heated in the room with a number of Gardaí shouting at myself and Gráinne, he wasn't one of them. He was silent. He only said to me sometime after that meeting, which I do have a clear recollection, 'you can forget about trying to get the boss to answer questions on penalty points, it's just not going to happen'.
474 Q. Yes. I think that in particular you argued that the allegations about the penalty points that had been raised by Sergeant Maurice McCabe was something that was of enormous public interest and concern and should be addressed by the Commissioner, is that right?
A. I placed equal emphasis at the time on the closure of rural Garda stations and the penalty points as being the two things that in the public mind, when they thought of An Garda Síochána, that December 2013, those were the things that they would want to hear answers on.
475 Q. And I think that the Garda Press office personne 1 indicated that there weren't any circumstances under which the Commissioner would address the topic of
penalty points, is that right?
A. I can't remember if it was specifically John Ferris, I know that Karl Heller was also there, Dermot Nolan and, as I said, David Taylor for at least part of the meeting. which individual said that this wasn't going to happen, I can't remember, but it was a pretty much united face. The message coming back from Phoenix Park to the production meeting was: He11 will freeze over before Commissioner Callinan answers any questions on Crimecall about penalty points.

476 Q. And that's the way the matter rested. But the show wasn't called off, was it?
A. We11, the matter didn't rest quite there. After the meeting, because my colleague, Gráinne Seoige, was a freelancer, she was in a considerably more vulnerable position than $I$ was as an RTE staff member. She was quite happy for me to take the lead, as it were, in negotiations on this, but we were both ad idem throughout. Our position was if An Garda Síochána's requirement or prerequisite of the Commissioner coming to give this interview is that we ask the questions that have been scripted for us, we won't be going on air this evening, we will not be presenting the programme. And that was where matters rested at the conclusion of that meeting.
477 Q. What time was that meeting at, do you recall?
A. It used to start at nine o'clock in the morning and I think it probably would have concluded 11, 11:30, something like that. statement and what's been suggested by former Commissioner Callinan. But as far as the Commissioner would have been concerned, arriving in RTE the same day, what hour of the evening would he arrive there at?
A. To my slightly uncertain recollection, it was a prerecorded item definitely, but it would have been around about six o'clock, let's say tea time, with the 15:19 programme due to go on air at 10:30.
480 Q. As far as he would have been concerned at that point in time, he would have thought the matter had been ironed out, is that right?
A. We11, my answer is informed by having read the transcripts of his evidence to the Tribunal. Certainly on the day and at the time he knew that I wanted to talk to him and he knew that I was uncomfortable to say the least with the state of affairs that had been presented to us.

Al1 right. So did you speak to him?
A. I did. I was, as Mr. Callinan has said in his own evidence, I was talking to somebody in the corridor outside the studios, who was actually not the make-up artist that he identified but was actually my boss, the commissioning editor of factual programmes, Niamh
o'Connor. And when I saw the Commissioner there I made a beeline for him. A number of Gardaí, some uniformed, actually moved to prevent me from talking to him, but Niamh O'Connor placed herself between me and them and reminded them gently that $I$ could talk to whoever I wanted to.

I took the Commissioner aside, I wished him happy
Christmas and a good evening, thanked him for coming out and said that he knew that there was some controversy and I wondered would he give me a few minutes to address it. I set out -- sorry.
482 Q. Just before you go on to describe what happened, and just trying to get a mood and atmosphere of what your expectation was at the time. I mean you have described a meeting in the morning where there are raised voices
and members of An Garda Síochána and the team shouting at yourself and your co-presenter. That's a very hostile environment for you to be in?
A. It was very hostile. It was very, very pressurised.

I should put on record perhaps that the people who shouted at me subsequently apologised and realised that they were out of order. But on that evening, it was perhaps a measure of Martin Callinan's reluctance to talk about the penalty points issue that was reflected in the stone wall that myself and Gráinne were greeted with in trying to make what I thought were very reasonable arguments about the credibility of the interview, the Commissioner's own credibility in coming to RTE, in giving RTE an interview in which he was going to talk about the changes to the Garda roster and not something like the penalty points.

483 Q. Yeah, no, I understand. But again you've given a fairly descriptive account of going to try to talk to the Commissioner and almost being physically prevented from doing so. I mean, was it as bad as that?
A. It was febrile, yes, it was certainly very tense. Because it had just come to everybody's attention again that myself and Gráinne had not made the agreement that was being said that we had made. We had absolutely not promised to knuckle down, as had been suggested, and just ask the questions that we had been supplied with. We said I'm sorry, we're both journalists, we should be drummed out of our profession if we were to do this.

484 Q. So you talk privately with the Commissioner and out of
earshot of everybody else?
A. Yeah, I moved a little bit further down the corridor. There was certainly quite a number of people present, but none of them would have been able to hear the conversation, because I was deliberately discreet about 15:23 it. I figured that I had a job of work to do to persuade the Commissioner, I didn't want to embarrass him publicly, $I$ figured that a discreet chat might be the best way of doing that.
485 Q. Would you just take up the narrative from there?
A. Certainly. I set out my stall in the terms I already have. I said if the interview and indeed the Commissioner was to have any credibility then these were issues that really needed to be addressed and that the proposed talking points were of absolutely no interest and would do neither him nor the programme nor RTE any service. He, his response was to immediately suggest that we were off record, which I neither assented to nor disagreed with. And in spite of the fact that I had not mentioned the names John wilson or Maurice McCabe, that was his starting point in responding to these issues.

He said -- he didn't say very much about John wilson, I can't remember his exact words but he more or less dismissed John wilson with kind of a shake of the hand and then concentrated on Maurice McCabe and said 'this man has issues, he has some well known grievances, well known within An Garda Síochána and there's all kinds of
issues there, Philip, that I can't talk to you about; there are psychological, psychiatric issues with this man and there's more that $I$ could tell you, but I won't, there's an awful lot worse that I could tell you, the worst possible kind of things, but we'11 just leave it there'.

Obviously one doesn't expect you to remember the conversation verbatim, but is that a very close recall of what the Commissioner actually said to you?
A. I was so shocked by what I was hearing that, yes, absolutely. And, as I said, I'm a reporter for 30 years, I have been recording, taking notes of conversations and reproducing them.
487 Q. He said that McCabe was a troubled individual and that he had a lot of psychological issues and psychiatric?
A. Psychological slash psychiatric issues.

488 Q. And that he claimed that McCabe was motivated by a set of grievances against Garda management and that he was famous within An Garda Síochána for this.
A. (Witness Nods)

489 Q. And that he warned you that McCabe was not to be trusted and went on to add that there were other things he could tell you about him, horrific things is what you have said in quotation marks in your statement?
A. As far as I remember it was actually the most horrific 15:26 kind of things, which I didn't believe. I did not believe what $I$ was being told right from the very start. I of course can't determine whether Mr. Callinan believed what he was telling me was
actually the truth, but, suffice it to say from my point of view, I didn't believe what I was hearing. I felt that it was a smokescreen that was being erected to deflect attention from the penalty points issue, which he clearly didn't want to answer questions about. 15:27 490 Q. When he said horrific things, the worst kind of thing, as is in your statement in quotation marks, what did you think that that could possibly refer to?
A. Well, I knew that there was no suggestion of either murder or genocide attached to Maurice McCabe, so my imagination went to where I presumed it was being directed to an allegation of child sexual abuse or rape perhaps.
491 Q. Had you heard that in any other quarters or by way of rumour?
A. Never before.
Q. How did you regard what the Commissioner was saying to you at the time?
A. I didn't. I had no time for it. I just -- my estimation of it was that it was a reluctant
interviewee trying to wriggle out of being held to account on an issue that caused him personal discomfort.

493 Q. You go on then to say in your statement: "As our conversation was ending, he added that if there was
anything el se I want ed to know about Maurice McCabe or the penalty points issue that I shoul d ask Superintendent Dave Tayl or fromthe Garda Press Office, who was al so present that eveni ng."
A. For the sake of completeness, Chairman, I should also add that before he said that to me the Commissioner actually agreed with me that presenting the list of questions was a presumption that shouldn't have been made and that he would deal with the issues that I had brought up as being of concern, but that he would only deal with them in his own way. I thought that that was the graceful position, or moment to withdraw and say 'all right, we have agreement, we have some limited form of agreement'. And I thanked him for that, again wished him Merry Christmas and then he said as a parting shot: 'If there's anything else you want to know about this or any of the other stuff we've been talking about, you can talk to David Taylor over there', who was standing a few feet away in the corridor.

494 Q. And then almost immediately afterwards you say that Superintendent Taylor, you use the expression "button-holed" you?
A. Yes.

495 Q. What do you mean by that?
A. Everybody was moving behind the Commissioner down towards studio four where the pre-recorded interview was to be conducted. I didn't really have that much interest in watching it, I was going in the other physically button-hole me, but stopped me and said 'Now do you understand the issues related to Maurice McCabe and the penalty points' -- sorry, 'Do you understand
the issue with Maurice McCabe and the penalty points?'
496 Q. Are you sure that he made reference to Maurice McCabe and the penalty points?
A. Yes. No, I'm absolutely sure of this. And I know that it has become a matter that the Tribunal has had to give considerable deliberation to. To be clear, it did not mean, in my mind, that he knew the content of myself and the then Commissioner's conversation, only that he knew that the penalty points was the issue that I had been pressing him, David Taylor, the hardest on during the course of our earlier conversations. So -and he had been telling me that there was no way that Martin Callinan was going to answer questions about penalty points. So insofar as -- the explanation perhaps for what he said lies in that myself and David Taylor had been talking about penalty points, not about Maurice McCabe beforehand.
497 Q. Well, I don't really understand that.
A. Sorry.

498 Q. Because I know the explanation that you're giving in relation to it and having considered it, but in those circumstances perhaps one might've expected Superintendent Taylor merely to say 'Now you know what the issue in relation to penalty points is'.
A. Perhaps.

499 Q. Or alternatively, that 'Now you know what the position is in relation to John wilson, Maurice McCabe and penalty points', or alternatively 'Now you know what the position is in respect of the whistleblowers and
penalty points'. But your recollection seems quite firm in this regard that he referred to 'Now you know what the position in relation to Maurice McCabe and penalty points is'?
A. Yes, I concede your point absolutely. But I did not feel at that time that that question -- sorry, that statement from him betrayed any intimate knowledge of myself and the Commissioner's conversation, only that he knew in broad brush strokes that myself and the Commissioner would've been talking about penalty points, and indeed Maurice McCabe as it turns out.

500 Q. We11, is it possible, looking back at this in hindsight, that he didn't in fact mention Maurice McCabe at all?
A. No, absolutely not.
A. No. Well, he might have very, very good hearing, but I doubt it, because myself and the former Commissioner were stooped very low and in a, I suppose what you might cal1 hugger mugger type conversation.

502 Q. Or is it possible that he knew in advance that the Commissioner was going to say what he said about Maurice McCabe?
A. I can't exclude that possibility, but I can't be of any 15:32 help to the Tribunal on it.

503 Q. But in any event, did you take any action on foot of what had been said to you?
A. There and then at that time, no, I didn't. Subsequent
to that, I discussed what I had heard with my editors. And we knew that it was a story that was never going to go to air, because even if I managed to establish beyond any doubt whatsoever that the allegations against Maurice McCabe weren't true, I would then never do a report on them, because to even utter the allegations and to disprove them we would've decided would've had a devastating impact on Maurice McCabe and his family.

But knowing that it was a zero sum game, I still made contact with Maurice McCabe, I went, I met him, I reluctantly put the allegations to him. He wasn't as shocked as I thought that he might be, because he had obviously heard them before. We talked at some length about where they might've come from. And although Maurice McCabe wasn't and didn't provide me with any documentary evidence to acquit himself of this allegation, $I$ believed him. I, following just pure gut instinct, nothing else, decided that his rebuttal of what Martin Callinan was saying was so sincere $I$ would have found it very hard to doubt. But I never, as I said, broadcast anything on it, because it would have been devastating to his family, to his wife to have even issued his denial of it.
504 Q. okay. So after the conversation, the issue of the allegation, or the suggestions that were being made to you about Maurice McCabe, it was a live issue in your mind and you'd discussed it with your producers, is
that right?
A. Well, on the day it wasn't as live, frankly, as getting the programme on the air. That was the thing that most concerned me, that was really the only thing that concerned me.

We11, when did you discuss what had been said to you with your producers?
A. This is where $I$ have to make the distinction between my job in radio and my job in television. I didn't discuss the allegations with the producers of Crimecal1, I brought them to the attention of my producer in charge in radio in the subsequent days and weeks.

506 Q. Who is that?
A. Mr. Tom Donnelly at the time.

507 Q. And did you discuss with your co presenter, Gráinne Seoige what had been said to you by the Commissioner?
A. Only insofar as I said to her before she went to do her interview 'You can ask him the questions now'.
Subsequently I said to her 'You're not going to believe what he said to me'. And I laid it out and she was as shocked and appalled by what she heard as I was.

508 Q. And was that after the show had been aired?
A. No, it actually wasn't. Because the day had been so stressful to her in particular, I decided not to add to the burden before we went and did a live show at 10:30. I kept the information to myself until a day or two 1ater.

509 Q. okay. So a couple of days later you share what had
been said to you by Commissioner Callinan in relation to Maurice McCabe with Gráinne Seoige and also with Mr. O'Donnell, is that right?
A. Donnelly.

510 Q. Donnelly, sorry.
A. Tom Donnelly, yes.

511 Q. And other than those two, did you share it with anybody else?
A. I shared it - I'm afraid I can't help the Tribunal by putting a date on it - I shared it with my commissioning editor for Crimecall, Niamh o'Connor.

512 Q. And sort of in what year would that have been? Was it that year or was it the following year, 2014 or 2015?
A. It had probably, time had probably passed on into January 2014. Because not that long after the
programme on 17th December, I took leave around Christmas and I wouldn't have been back in until January.
513 Q. All right. And there matters rested until you made a statement to this Tribunal on 13th March of last year, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

514 Q. why did you decide to come forward in relation to this?
A. Quite simply, the Tribunal asked. And I knew that I was in possession of what appeared to be a particularly 15:37 germane piece of information or evidence to the terms of reference of the Tribunal. I wrestled briefly with whether there was actually an issue of journalistic privilege or confidentiality that I should observe
here, but ultimately I decided that Martin Callinan, on the night of December 17th, had not been a source, a journalistic source of information, he had been a reluctant interviewee who did not want to be held to account, and under those circumstances, journalistic privilege didn't apply in my mind.

You're aware of the fact that former Commissioner Callinan has given evidence and also provided a statement to the Tribunal. And if we could just have that up on the screen, it's page 695, please. The introduction doesn't appear to be all that relevant to the meeting, you don't seem to be at odds in relation to it. He says:
"I met with Philip Boucher-Hayes" - this is in the fourth paragraph down - "in a corridor at RTÉ on the ni ght of my schedul ed appeared on Crimeall. He appeared to me to be upset and di sappointed that । woul d not engage on the two topics mentioned, but particularly the Smithwick report."

We11, do you recal1, was there any discussion in relation to the Smithwick report?
A. In fact it was, of the three things that I raised, closure of rural Garda stations, penalty points and the 15:39 Smithwick report, it was the one that I was least concerned with holding him to account on in the space of a what was going to be five and a half minute long interview.


516
Q. And was your demeanour one of being upset?
A. I don't do upset.

517 Q. Right. He then goes on to say:
"He stated" - and this is you - "that he was an
experienced journal ist and he felt it was important that l address these issues in the interview. I replied that there would be ample opportunities when I was in publ ic el sewhere to address these matters."

```
Do you reca11 --
```

A. That was a point that was made on his behalf to me earlier on at our production meeting and by David Taylor. It wasn't made by him to me in the course of that conversation, but yes, it had been made.
Q. He goes on in the next paragraph:
"He asked me if l would be willing to answer questions about the penalty points issue and the two whi stlebl owers, Ser geant MECabe and John WI son."
A. I asked him would he be willing to answer questions about the penalty points. I never raised John Wilson or Maurice McCabe's names, he was the first person to do that.
519 Q. We11, you see, he's suggesting that you were the first person to introduce the names of Sergeant McCabe and John wilson.
A. I stand by my evidence.
Q. He then goes on to say:
"I i ndi cated that John Wil son had made a compl ai nt agai nst an inspector who had allegedly wrongf ully cancelled around 20 fixed charge penalty notices."

He then goes on to say that this matter was investigated by a chief superintendent, who in turn submitted a file to the Director of Public Prosecutions on his investigation. No prosecution arose in the matter. Do you recall him saying that to you about John wilson?
A. As I said to you, I think, already, I'm somewhat unclear what he said about John wilson, but I know that it was very brief, it certainly wasn't as detailed as that. I was more struck by the non-verbal gesture, the 15:41 flicking of his hand (IND CATI NG when talking about John wilson and he moved on to Maurice McCabe.

521 Q. It then continues:
"I further indi cated that Sergeant McCabe had submitted a list of allegations around the wrongf ul cancellation of fixed charge notices agai nst several officers and these allegations were investigated by Assi stant Commi ssi oner John O' Mahony, as he was commonl y known."

Do you recall John O'Mahony's name being mentioned?
A. No.

522 Q. "I di d not speak" - to quote your statement - "at some I ength on Ser geant McCabe's char acter as indi cated."
A. I stand by my evidence.

523 Q. He then goes on to say:
"I did not state that Sergeant McCabe had a lot of psychol ogical issues and psychi atric issues and was motivated by a set of grievances agai nst Garda management and that he was famous within An Garda Sí ochána for this. I did not indi cate to Philip Boucher-Hayes that Sergeant McCabe was not to be trusted, nor did I state that there was ot her things that I could tell himabout, namel y horrific things, the worst kind of things. I do not know what Philip Boucher-Hayes is referring to."
when I was asking him questions when he was here at the Tribunal, I put it to him that there was no possibility that perhaps people were misinterpreting the conversation. You're at total odds with each other in relation to this conversation, isn't that right?
A. I'm afraid so, yes. But my evidence remains unchanged. 15:43

524 Q. I think he goes on in the last paragraph to say that the first he heard of this was on 30th May 2017 when he read an article in a newspaper.
A. Well, I actually attempted to contact the Garda Commissioner on foot of having talked to Maurice McCabe, I made strenuous efforts to re-open the conversation about Maurice McCabe with him, including writing to the Chief State Solicitor's Office in the hope that they would pass on the correspondence, but it
was never replied to.
525 Q. When did you have your conversation with Sergeant McCabe?
A. I can't put a date on it, but I would imagine it was in the summer of 2014. Now, sorry, we had a number of telephone conversations where I initially contacted him to try and clarify details. Very often, because he was stil1 a serving Sergeant, he wasn't in a position to help me, but he was very friendly, he was very open to talking in general terms. But I travelled to meet him first, $I$ think, in the summer of 2014 , $I$ can't put a date on it I'm afraid.
Q. And you say you asked him about these allegations, is that right?
A. I felt that I owed it to him, to myself, to establish where this could have come from, was there any truth to it, yes.
527 Q. Were you familiar at all with an article that was written by Paul williams on 12th April 2014 ?
A. No, I actually wasn't, only subsequently. But at the time that I had met Maurice McCabe, I wasn't, no.

528 Q. And the conversation with Maurice McCabe, just give us again the content of that?
A. I put it to him what I had heard --

529 Q. Exactly what you've told us here today?
A. Well, no, initially I didn't tell him that the allegation had been made by the Garda Commissioner. I thought that that would be quite shocking. I wanted to get his general reaction to the allegation first before

I told him that it was coming from the most senior guard in the country. And he rebutted it. He told me the details of -- he didn't have any documents to support any of this, but I remember he told me insofar as he was able to the fact that he had gotten essentially a clean bill of health from the DPP and that the matter was one that hadn't been pursued, even by his colleagues who were, he felt, aggrieved towards him, it hadn't been pursued any further.
530 Q. Okay. And did you in fact report on the Maurice McCabe 15:46 story --
A. No.

531 Q. -- thereafter?
A. No, as I said to you already, I didn't report on any of this. To be honest, the sexual abuse allegations were really very much secondary to what my main interest was, was the ten allegations of malpractice or corruption that were being considered by the o'Higgins Commission, that had been considered by Sean Guerin and penalty points. If you like, the allegation of sexual abuse informed my judgment on Maurice McCabe's credibility, $I$ wanted to see how he dealt with it, but I had never really much intention, frankly, of reporting it.
MR. MARRI NAN Okay, would you answer any questions?
A. Thank you.

MR. MEDOVELL: I've no questions, Chairman.

THE WTNESS, WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MG. BURNS AS

FOLLO/G:

532 Q.
MS. BURNS: Mr. Boucher-Hayes, my name is Tara Burns and I appear on behalf of Superintendent Taylor. Just in relation to your evidence, it's clear that there wee 15:47 two meetings that day, it was an early morning meeting which, as you've indicated, was at about nine o'clock in the morning?
A. Well, there was actually about five or six. But if you mean full meetings, yes, the first meeting was at nine a.m. Sorry, maybe then I've misunderstood. There were two visits by members of An Garda Síochána to RTÉ that day and within that there were five to six meetings, or were there several visits throughout the day?
A. Various members of An Garda Síochána would have been floating around RTÉ during the course of the day - I've already told you Superintendent Kar1 Heller, John Ferris from the Press Office, David Taylor, Dermot Nolan - and I would have had, maybe "encounters" is a better term rather than "meetings" with them throughout the course of that day, yes.
534 Q. I see. And I think you also referred to Mr. McLindon having been there in the morning time as well --
A. Yes.

535 Q. -- is that correct?
A. Yes.

536 Q. I see. Now, in terms of Superintendent Taylor, his instructions to us are that he didn't attend until
later in the day, he wasn't present for the time when the list of questions was provided to you by Mr. McLindon.
A. Well, that would explain my uncertain recollection of him being there. Because I certainly don't remember him contributing to the conversation. I see. Now, in relation to the interactions that you have had with the various members from An Garda Síochána that you've referred to, did anybody, in the course of your early interactions during the day, say anything to you along the lines of what you say Mr. Callinan said to you later in the day?
A. Not at all. McCabe having psychological or psychiatric issues?
A. I'm open to correction on this, but I don't remember anybody mentioning either Maurice McCabe or John wilson by name until I met the Commissioner.
539 Q. I see. And in terms of any references to psychiatric problems or psychological issues that Sergeant McCabe had, did anybody mention those to you earlier in the day?
A. None at all.

540 Q. Did David Taylor mention those to you when you spoke to him in the course of the day?
A. None at all. My only interaction prior to the Commissioner arriving with David Taylor was him saying to me 'There is no way the boss is going to answer any questions on penalty points, you may as well give up
now'.
541 Q. I see. Now, in terms of Superintendent Taylor's arrival at RTE, his instructions are that he arrived that evening, but he arrived approximately 30 minutes before the Commissioner. Are you aware of that?
A. We11, I had to have met him at some point.

542 Q. Yes, yes. No, and he agrees that he spoke with you in relation to the penalty points issue, I've no dispute in relation to what you've said about that. But his instructions are that he arrived himself and that Martin Callinan then arrived approximately 30 minutes later, and the reason for that was that he would arrange the protocol in terms of somebody from RTE coming to welcome Martin Callinan. Does that make any sense?
A. If that's his evidence. I have absolutely no -- I can't be of any assistance to the Tribunal on that I'm afraid.

543 Q. I see. So then in terms of you meeting Mr. Callinan you've obviously given your evidence in relation to
that - it seems that you're quite clear that this meeting with Mr. Callinan was held away from other people?
A. Correct.

544 Q. And you seem to place two reasons for that; firstly, 15:51 that you wanted to speak to him in relation to the issue that arose, but you've also stated in your evidence you didn't want to embarrass him in relation to raising this issue?
A. I wanted a resolution to the matter and I didn't think that that was going to be achieved by conducting our diplomacy down a loudhailer.
545 Q.
I see. Now, you have indicated that Superintendent Taylor was somewhere around that vicinity, is that right?
A. Yes, I would say he was within 20 feet of us.
Q. I see. But your view is that he'd have to have very good hearing to hear what the conversation was?
A. It was a noisy corridor, there was a lot of people coming and going. The entire production staff and Gardaí involved in Crimecall is 40 or 50 people, they were all chatting, it was Christmas, it was, notwithstanding the hostility and the rows from earlier on in the day, the atmosphere was convivial. He would've had a very hard job making out what we were talking about.

547 Q. I see. When you finished your conversation with Mr. Callinan, did you notice whether he spoke to Superintendent Taylor?
A. At any point or straightaway?
Q. No, immediately afterwards.
A. No, my evidence was, you'11 remember, that having concluded his conversation with me, Martin Callinan turned and went with the producers and other Gardaí into the studio and David Taylor was behind him. And that was the point at which Mr. Taylor button-holed me. 549 Q. I see. So you think that from what you saw, it's impossible that spoke to Superintendent Taylor before

Superintendent Taylor spoke to you?
A. It's impossible did you say?
Q. Impossible from what your recollection of events are.
A. For Mr. Taylor to have spoken to Mr. Callinan after our conversation? Yes, it would've been impossible.
A. Yes.

552 Q. I see. Superintendent Taylor's recollection of this is that most certainly he referred to mentioning the penalty point issue with you, however he doesn't recollect speaking about Sergeant McCabe in that discussion.
A. 'Do you see the whole problem with McCabe and the penalty points' was what he said to me.
553 Q. He accepts that he may have mentioned it, but if he did, he did it in the context of discussing the penalty points issue with you.
A. If that's his evidence, that's his evidence.

554 Q. And in terms of what you said, and correct me if I'm wrong, in terms of your recollection of that conversation between yourself and Superintendent Taylor --
A. It wasn't a conversation.

555 Q. A comment by Superintendent Taylor to you. Your view of it seems to be that he was referring to the penalty points issue and the problem with Sergeant McCabe; is that a fair assessment of what you've said?
A. He was referring to what had been contentious throughout the course of the day, yes.
556 Q. Yes.
A. The penalty points issue.

557 Q. Yes.
A. But he did mention Maurice McCabe by name.

558 Q. I see.
A. Did he know specifically at that time that I had been given all of this poisonous toxic information about Maurice McCabe? I don't know.

559 Q. Well, he certainly couldn't have found out there, because as you've indicated, he didn't speak to Martin Callinan after Martin Callinan spoke to you.
A. Which doesn't exclude the possibility that Martin Callinan and he had discussed it long before that. 560 Q. Of course. But in terms of what in fact happened on the day, certainly it would've been impossible for David Taylor to have heard that from Martin Callinan, in light of how quickly he speaks to you?
A. In that window --

562 Q. Yes. Now, in terms of Superintendent Taylor saying
anything further to you, he didn't make any further comment in relation to Sergeant McCabe, is that correct?
A. Ever?

563 Q. No, at that time when he spoke to you.
A. No.

564 Q. He didn't make any reference to any sexual
allegation --
A. No.

565 Q. -- occurring previous7y?
A. He never did actually.

566 Q. And in relation to any discussion that you had with Superintendent Taylor at any stage during the day, did he at any stage refer to the fact that Sergeant McCabe had psychological or psychiatric problems?
A. No, he didn't.

567 Q. Or that they were the most horrific things that he could tell you about him?
A. No he didn't.

MS. BURNS: I see. Thank you very much, Mr. Boucher-Hayes.
CHA RMAN You wanted to go last, I presume?
MR. G LLANE: Yes, if I'm going at a11.
CHA RMAN If there's anything to be asked, yes.
CHAN RMAN Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh?

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR Ó MU RCHEARTAI GH AS FOLLOVS:

568 Q. MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA GH Just one or two questions about the dates. This interview -- sorry, I'm Fíonán ó Muircheartaigh and I represent Alison O'Reilly, a journalist with the Irish Mail. The interview was for the Christmas programme, so it was in December 2013?
A. 17th December.

569 Q. Sorry?
A. 17th December.

570 Q. 17th December. And then you followed it up later with Maurice McCabe. Was that -- the question I really wanted to ask, was that before or after the end of February or the beginning of march 2014?
A. oh, after. It was summer time.

MR. Ó MI RCHEARTA GH Thank you very much.

THE WTNESS, MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. WFELAN AS FOLLOWE:

571 Q. MR. WFELAN Mr. Boucher-Hayes, Noel Whelan. I have some questions on behalf of former Commissioner Martin Callinan. Can I ask you first to clarify, did you tell Maurice McCabe that the Garda Commissioner had said these things to you?
A. Yes.

572 Q. When did you do that?
A. Summer of 2014.

573 Q. Have you any explanation why you haven't told the Tribunal that before now?
A. It's not germane to the terms of reference.

574 Q. It's not germane to the terms of reference?
A. No.

575 Q. You take a view --
A. Well, in terms of my evidence anyway. I mean, my
evidence --
576 Q. Well, no, you take a view, is it, that the fact that you had told Maurice McCabe that the Garda Commissioner himself had badmouthed him to you in these terms was not relevant to the terms of reference?
A. Yes.

577 Q. You put in your statement in response to the general call from the Chairman when he opened the Tribunal, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.

578 Q. In that statement you said nothing of having discussed the matter with either, Tom Donnelly is it?
A. Correct.

579 Q. Gráinne Seoige?
A. Correct.

580 Q. And you said nothing in that statement of having discussed the matter with Niamh O'Connor.
A. There are many other details that I provided to the Tribunal today here which I didn't put in a statement for, frankly, the sake of brevity, Mr. Whelan.
581 Q. We11, I can assure you - and you'11 have covered many such tribunals in your extended career, particularly in the news and current affairs realm - that tribunals receive thousands of statements and we find ourselves, thankfully now with the help of technology, but having to deal with thousands and thousands of documents. Accuracy and thoroughness is the concern of the Tribunal, not brevity.

Did you discuss with Tom Donnelly whether he would make a statement to this Tribunal?
A. No.

582 Q. Did you discuss with Gráinne Seoige whether she would make a statement to the Tribunal?
A. No, I didn't.

583 Q. Did you discuss with Niamh O'Connor whether she would make a statement to this Tribunal?
A. Yes, in brief. But her evidence would have been so tangential. She was in the corridor on the occasion of ${ }_{15: 59}$ the chat with former Commissioner Callinan. She would have had nothing to add.
584 Q. Oh, so you didn't tell her what the conversation with Martin Callinan had been?
A. Subsequent, yes.

585 Q. We11, when did you tell her?
A. I can't put a date on it. But I subsequently told her maybe within a couple of weeks.
586 Q. Within a couple of weeks? So therefore, she had evidence of direct relevance to the terms of the Tribunal?
A. I would've considered it hearsay evidence, frankly.

587 Q. We11, this Tribunal has heard a lot of hearsay. This Tribunal has heard a lot of evidence from journalists who say other journalists said things to them that wasn't something they had direct evidence of. Did you discuss with Niamh O'Connor whether she would make a statement to this Tribunal?
A. Insofar as I understood the terms of reference of the

Tribunal, Chairman, it was that you were looking for evidence of a possible smear campaign or malignant comment coming from members of An Garda Síochána about Maurice McCabe. My list of people that I have subsequently related my conversation with Martin
Callinan to, I didn't think was going to be of any help to the Tribunal. If you would have liked me to have included my wife in there, well, then maybe I should have as well, Mr. Whelan, but it didn't seem to me to be relevant.
588 Q. Well, if we could stay away from the melodramatic and just focus on answering the questions please. Can I ask you why you thought it wasn't relevant to tell the Tribunal that you had told Maurice McCabe?
A. Because again it's hearsay. So what?

589 Q. Okay. So you told Maurice McCabe in the summer of 2014 --
A. It's not evidence of a smear campaign, it is only evidence that I related it.

590 Q. You told Maurice McCabe you say now in 2014?
A. Mm hmm .

591 Q. So any concern you had about publishing the story, was that abated when you had this conversation with Maurice McCabe?
A. As I have already described, yes.

592 Q. And why didn't you --
A. No, sorry, hang on a second. Sorry, is your question any concern about pub1ishing the story was abated?

593 Q. Yes.
A. As I have said to you, from the moment that former Commissioner Callinan started passing on this information to me, I knew that it was something that was never going to be broadcast or published. It was -- it smelled to me, my intuition was that it was a 16:01 smokescreen, a deflection. Even if that wasn't the case, it was the kind of allegation that, frankly, you will never be able to prove outside of a court of law. I wasn't going to be able to do that.
594 Q. That's the story that Maurice McCabe had been involved in any sex sexual assault, which everybody knows is completely untrue. That could never --
A. So my instinct was right.

595 Q. But the dramatic, significant story that a senior guard was telling journalists that Maurice McCabe had psychiatric or psychological problems and that he had been involved in some horrendous things, that was a significant story in its own right, isn't that correct?
A. Well, perhaps you could explain to me where in the terms of reference that appears --
596 Q. No, no, that's not the question.
A. -- because --

597 Q. No --
A. No, no, because you're asking me why I didn't relate it and I'm telling you I didn't relate it because --

CHA RMAN I think, Mr. Boucher-Hayes, it may help if I explain. I suppose it's a question of somebody says something to you and how do you react? And here the question - and indeed it was canvassed with Prof. Kenny

- was if a journalist hears something, sometimes what they are told in itself is a story. That's, I think, the point that's being made by Mr. Whelan.
MR. WFELAK Yes. It's not why you didn't tell the Tribunal. If the top cop in the land had told you some 16:02 horrendous things or that there were some horrendous things about a serving member of An Garda Síochána, arguably one of the most prominent members of an Garda síochána, that of itself is a significant story.
A. I didn't think it was, in terms of the evidence that I 16:03 was going to offer the Tribunal.
599 Q. No, in terms of news value. In terms of news value, wasn't it a newsworthy story?
A. No, it was not a newsworthy story. Because it wasn't a story, it was an unsubstantiated and, as it turns out, malicious allegation.
600 Q. No, the fact that a malicious and unsubstantiated allegation had been made to your very own ears by the Garda Commissioner himself, that of itself was a newsworthy story.
A. Chairman, day in, day out in what I do $I$ hear malicious and unsubstantiatable allegations in the course of reporting stories, sometimes it's idle tittle tattle or gossip, sometimes it's actively meant to deflect your attention from a story. I don't report those, I don't 16:04 pass on that information. I didn't deem it relevant on this occasion to do so.

601 Q. So why did you discuss it with your editor?
A. I did.
Q. Why did you discuss it with your editor?
A. Because it was one of those facts that you stick in your back pocket and you say 'Look at what Martin Callinan is doing to Maurice McCabe; this may yet prove to be relevant at some later point in this developing dynamic story'.
Q. Okay. Well, let's look at the developing dynamic story, let's look at the developing dynamic story. Apart, as you have set out, from television presentation work that you now do on the documentary or 16:04 factual programmes, the meat and veg is the shift you do for Drive Time, either as a reporter or occasional presenter, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.

604 Q. And that requires you to, as it were, walk the politics 16:04 and news of the day brief, isn't that correct?
A. I'm a generalist, yes.

605 Q. A generalist, yes. But more often than not, it's politics and the related stories that ae the news of the day, particularly when the house is in session?
A. No, actually I would disagree with you.

606 Q. okay. Did you, for PrimeTime, in the day itself or subsequent days when you came back from leave, cover Martin Callinan's appearance at the Public Accounts Committee? It was the occasion when the "disgusting"
A. I did, yes.

607 Q. You covered that as a reporter?
A. Yes.

608
Q. And on that day he had said something which was generally interpreted and commented, perhaps by media including yourself, as maligning Maurice McCabe --
A. Sorry, I have to offer a correction here, Mr. Whelan; I'm not sure that $I$ reported on the day, but I certainly did other journalism related to Mr. Callinan's appearance subsequently.
Q. Yes, that is the way I framed the question. There was an occasion when the general view was taken that the Commissioner had said something maligning or derogatory of Sergeant McCabe. Do you take this thing you have in your back pocket out then and discuss whether you would publish it?
A. Absolutely not. It was an unsubstantiated allegation.

610 Q. Did you cover the events of May 2016 when the O'Higgins 16:06 Commission report was published and then extracts or selective extracts from the transcript of the o'Higgins Commission were published and then counter-extracts, if we call it that, were published? Do you remember that furore in May 2016 ?
A. Yes, I did a report - I had a leaked copy of the O'Higgins Commission report - I did a report on May 9th and I did one, I think, two weeks earlier in March, at the end of March on Drive Time.
611 Q. And you're very much aware that part of the narrative 16:06 in that coverage was that efforts had been made to malign, if $I$ could use that in the broadest sense, Maurice McCabe at the O'Higgins Commission private hearings?
A. Yes.

612 Q. Did you take this thing you had in your back pocket where somebody, the Commissioner himself, you say, had maligned Maurice McCabe to you, did you take it out and consider whether you would publish it then?
A. It was an active consideration, but again it was an unsubstantiated allegation. It was poisonous.
613 Q. With whom did you actively consider it or discuss it then in May of 2016?
A. Myself.
A. Myself.

615 Q. You talked to yourself about it? Okay. The next thing -- so you discussed it -- you brought it no further than your own mind, the consideration of whether 'Actually, look, there's a suggestion now that they were out to get him, I myself, believe it or not, have direct evidence of the top Garda doing this kind of thing, we have a great story here'?
A. Yes. No less than you do, Mr. Whelan, in arriving at what angle of attack you're going to take in cross-examination, you consult with yourself, you consider what your options are. In drafting or drawing up any report as a radio reporter, it's pretty much a solitary activity. So yes, I considered the evidence,

I can do with any of this', because even to utter a denial from Maurice McCabe is going to be so reputationally ruining of his children and of his wife
that I just did not feel comfortable going there at all.

616 Q. I can assure you I have the benefit of better minds than mine in the form of Mr. O'Higgins and Mr. Dignam and others so that when issues come that are important we have others we can discuss them with.
A. You're better resourced in the law library than we are in RTÉ.
617 Q. Well, let me make this point; Ms. McCarthy made the point this morning that of itself the suggestion that the Garda Commissioner had badmouthed Maurice McCabe to a journalist would be a difficult story to write, but it seems you took a view it shouldn't be written or published at all, and yet you were keeping it in your back pocket for some purpose, the nature of which is not clear. Were you keeping it in your back pocket on the offside chance that a Tribunal of inquiry might be set up some day or what?
A. Journalists are collectors of information that they keep in their back pockets and publish when the time is right. Frankly, I didn't want to be here giving my evidence and participating in this story as a witness, I find it rather frustrating that $I$ haven't actually been able to follow through in reporting this story for quite some time now, because as soon as I made a statement I thought that it would be inappropriate for me to cover it, to cover this Tribunal's proceedings any further and I withdrew from them.

But if your implication here, Mr. Whelan, where you seem to be going with your line of questioning, is that this allegation is one that $I$ have kept, withheld in my back pocket because it is illusory or because it is not real and I have fabricated it, I reject that absolutely. I sat on this information because it was of such a highly sensitive and damaging nature that there was nothing that I could do with it. And in October 2016 when protected disclosures were made by Mr. Taylor, by Superintendent Taylor and by Sergeant McCabe and it again became a massive story, did you consider with anybody else deploying the story then?
A. I hadn't read Superintendent Taylor's disclosure or Maurice McCabe's. But again, the considerations were exactly the same; it's a 'Taoiseach, when did you stop beating your wife' kind of scenario, that even if I was able to present the most comprehensive and robust denial of the allegations by Maurice McCabe, there would still be a whiff of smoke or cordite attaching to it and he could, he could quite easily have sued for defamation.
619 Q. Okay. On 8th February Deputy Brendan Howlin walked in the Dáil chamber - and I don't know if you've had a chance to see his evidence yesterday - but he put into the public domain --
A. Under privilege.

620 Q. -- and RTÉ and everybody reported it, that the Garda Commissioner, then Nóirín O'Sullivan, had spread this
word about Maurice McCabe and that she had made phone calls, in fact similar -- that she had made phone calls to suggest, to journalists to suggest that Maurice McCabe had been involved in serious sexual offences. With whom in RTÉ did you discuss publishing your story of which you had direct evidence on 8th or 9th February 2017?
A. As I have never heard any evidence linking Nóirín o'sullivan to this whole affair or these set of allegations, I didn't consider it.
621 Q. But the fact that the Garda Commissioner might've been involved in - either Garda Commissioner Callinan firstly and then Garda Commissioner o'Sullivan might've been involved in smearing sergeant McCabe became big, a massive news story on both occasions.
A. I had evidence, first hand evidence which I have given to the Tribunal of Martin Callinan being linked to attempts to impugn Maurice McCabe's reputation. I had no evidence linking David Taylor or Nóirín O'Sullivan.
622 Q. Can we ask to look at your one-page statement at page 5317 of the materials? It'11 be on the screen in front of you. You'll be familiar with it. If you look at the fourth paragraph of it, you say:
"When the Cormi ssioner arrived at RTÉ, I asked to speak 16:12 to himal one without any of his advisors present in an attempt to resol ve what had become a row that was by that stage at risk of knocking the programme of $f$ air."

Now, when you say you wanted to speak to him without advisors present, why was that?
A. I think what I'm doing is putting into more formal language what I said was I'd like to speak to him man to man.

623 Q. And who produced Crimecal1?
A. COCO Productions.

624 Q. And who was the executive producer of the programme?
A. Stuart Switzer.

625 Q. And who was the producer of the programme?
A. Nuala Carr.

626 Q. And were you a producer in any way of the programme?
A. No.

627 Q. And had any, had -- I'm sorry, there was also a commissioning editor presumably, because it was an independent production for RTÉ; is that Niamh O'Connor?
A. Correct.

628 Q. Okay. Did any of those three people seek to engage with the Commissioner on an issue that you say was about to knock the programme off the air?
A. Yes, Niamh O'Connor had and Stuart Switzer and Nuala Carr had been shuttling backwards and forwards, maybe not literally but on the phone, between Phoenix Park and RTÉ all afternoon long.
629 Q. But none of them sought to meet with the Commissioner? 16:14
A. They did actually, yes.

630 Q. Did they meet with the Commissioner?
A. I don't know --

631 Q. On a one-to-one?
A. I don't know if they did.

But did they know you were going to have this individual one-on-one conversation with the Commissioner?
A. Yes, I had said to them that I thought that if the Commissioner arrived here and had our position explained to him, not through the prism of Andrew McLindon or David Taylor, that he might be persuaded and, and indeed he was.
634 Q. We11, we'11 come back to whether he was or not in a minute. This was minutes before the programme was broadcast, or that recording was to be made, the interview, is that correct? Was it minutes before the interview was recorded?
A. Yeah.
Q. He was on his way into the studio?
A. No, he was in the corridor meeting with the members of An Garda Síochána who worked on the programme.

636 Q. Okay. But he was shortly thereafter going in to do the interview?
A. Correct.

637 Q. With Ms. Seoige?
A. Correct.

638 Q. Can I put it to you that you again are being melodramatic in the suggestion that there was a risk
the programme was about to come off air?
A. Absolutely no melodrama to it at all. It was one of the more dramatic contretemps that I've been involved in in RTÉ. Because there was absolutely no way I was going to stand in front of a television camera with a colleague who was being asked to be a puppet for An Garda Síochána.

639 Q. Were you affronted by the way that An Garda Síochána staff had approached that that day?
A. I think "affronted" is the wrong word.

640 Q. Were you annoyed?
A. Yes.

641 Q. So were you agitated?
A. I don't do agitation.

642 Q. You don't do agitation. Okay. This programme is produced not by the news and current affairs section in RTÉ, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.

643 Q. It's under the umbrella, is it factual programming?
A. Correct.

644 Q. It's broadcast, is it the third Tuesday of the month -Monday of the month?
A. I no longer present the programme, I'm not sure when its transmission date is.
645 Q. Yes. But at the time? 16:16
A. It was the first Tuesday of every month, yes.
Q. 9:30 -- it was 17th December, so for some reason it had been into the second o third Tuesday --
A. It moved around the schedules between 9:30 and 10:30,
but --
647 Q. Okay. A monthly programme broadcast in prime time at 9:30 p.m.?
A. (Witness Nods).

648 Q. I put it to you there was no way RTÉ was going to leave 16:16 a hole in that hour of the schedule on a Monday night, whether because a particular presenter took an issue or not.
A. What are you putting to me? I don't understand.

649 Q. I'm putting to you that it is melodramatic to suggest
the programme was about to be pulled because you or Gráinne Seoige, together or individually, were not going to present it unless certain questions were asked of Martin Callinan.
A. Niamh O'Connor, who was the commissioning editor for RTÉ, the person who would ultimately have been responsible for whether a broadcast went ahead or not, had myself and Ms. Seoige's back on this issue and I had assured her 'Don't worry, it won't come to it, Niamh, I am absolutely convinced that we' -- 'I'm sure that we can convince the Commissioner to deal with this and we'11 also convince An Garda Síochána that we are not asking a series of pre-scripted questions'.
650 Q. So what kind of questions were you insisting would be asked of the Commissioner?
A. I've already detailed that $I$ felt that it was important for the credibility of the Commissioner, RTÉ and the programme that he answer questions in relation to and reassure the public on penalty points, on the closure
of rural Garda stations and perhaps, time allowing, the Smithwick Tribunal as well.

651 Q.
But you didn't get your way on that kind of questioning, isn't that correct?
A. What happened was, as you will recall from my earlier evidence, Mr. Whelan, Mr. Callinan agreed, he said 'Do you know what, $I$ will answer this, but I will answer it in my own way'. What he did when he went on air was to rely on a frankly rather trite acronym, HARP, which stands for honesty, something, something, something, I can't remember. But --

652 Q. Again can we deal with the facts rather than comment?
A. Well, I'm giving you the facts. This is what he said in his interview.
653 Q. No, no, the word "trite" is comment. Let's deal with
facts. Can I put to you -- let's look at what Ms. Seoige did when she went into the interview. She asked four questions. She asked him, one: "How would you describe the year for An Garda Sí ochána?" She asked secondly: "What are the bi ggest challenges facing An Garda Sí ochána?" She asked thirdly, she said "It's been a bad year for fatalities on the road" and she asked a question along the lines 'what are you going to do about it?' And her fourth question was: "What's your final message for people watching at home toni ght over the Christmas period?"

Those were the four questions that she agreed, notwithstanding your discussion with Martin Callinan,
to ask him in the studio, isn't that correct?
A. I'm not Gráinne Seoige, I didn't ask the questions. Had I been doing the interview, I would've asked different questions. No, no, that's not the question. The question is you were about to walk off the programme that night you said un1ess tough questions could be asked. Those were the four questions that were asked?
A. No, I never said "tough questions", Mr. Whelan, I said unless issues of public interest were addressed. And he assured me that he was going to address those issues. He didn't.
Q. Indeed.
A. -- in his answers.
Q. Indeed. So you must still have been affronted, agitated and unhappy after the programme happened?
A. As I said already, I don't do agitation. I was annoyed at him though.
CHA RMAN But I thought you'd indicated you didn't watch the programme? I may have got that wrong.
A. No, sorry, I didn't watch the interview being pre-recorded, $I$ watched it live in transmission.

CHA RMAN Ah, okay. So was it a number of years -sorry, hours later?
A. Hours, yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
658 Q.
MR. WFELAN Was this your first year doing Crimecall?
A. I had started the previous year, September the previous year.
659 Q. And had you done the interview with, was it Fachtna Murphy the year before, or had Gráinne done it?
A. No, it should've been me. And I can't recall actually doing it.
Q.

Because I don't know whether you looked at this programme back in the archives, I know you had the opportunity to look at it today, but did you look at the programme back in the archives before you made your 16:21 statement?
A. No.

661 Q. And before you took up the post did you look at any of the previous programmes of Crimecall, before you took up the presenting post?
A. One or two.

662 Q. A Christmas one, any of the Christmas ones?
A. I can't recall which ones I watched.

663 Q. Because I'm putting it to you that that was the nature and type of the interview that was conducted with every 16:21 previous Commissioner on every single Christmas occasion of Crimecal1.
A. That might've been the nature or the type of interview that other people did. It wasn't the one that I was
going to do.

664 Q.
Keelin Shanley, for example, had presented the programme previously, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, she did. But hang on a second, Keelin Shanley presented it for a very short period of time and I'm not sure that she would've been there for one of the Christmas programmes, if indeed they might actually have dropped the Commissioner's interview because it had become, since 2013, such a contentious interview. The point I'm making is that you weren't the first person from the news and current -- who otherwise worked in news and current affairs to present this programme for the independent production company under the factual banner.
A. Correct.
Q. And that's an important distinction, I put to you. It wasn't a news and current affairs interview, it was to be the seasonal interview, as it were, at the end of the December programme of Crimecall on the public service factual side --
A. I see what you're saying, Mr. whelan. But I am a news and current affairs journalist. I can't change what I am just because I'm presenting a programme that comes from a different department.
667 Q. Exactly. And that must've been a concern for you when you took up the position of presenting Crimecall, whether or not it would leave you in any way compromised from your news and current affairs instincts?
A. No actually, I was quite satisfied, having discussed this with the producers of the programme, what the limitations of the job were. At the production meeting for this programme we would agree what the operational concerns of An Garda Síochána were and the areas that they weren't happy about being asked questions about for operational reasons. And for operational reasons, I was happy to abide by their better judgment, if you like. Those were the only editorial limitations that were ever placed on me in presenting that programme, until 17th December 2013.

668 Q. In the second last paragraph, or the seventh paragraph of your statement at page 5317, if we scroll down just from the bottom, you say:
"He told me that McCabe was a troubled indi vi dual."

It begins with that. You say that he told you he had a lot of psychological issues and psychiatric issues. He claimed, you say, that McCabe was motivated by a set of grievances. You went on to say:
"He warned that MECabe was not to be trusted and went on to add that there were other things he could tell me about him horrific things, the worst ki nd of things, but he did not el aborate further."

You didn't say in that statement, or in the second statement in which you say you set out additional
information - and we can look at that in a second - you didn't say in that statement what you interpreted that phrase to mean.
A. I have here.

669 Q. Exactly. And why didn't you say it before now?
A. Because I didn't think that in my written statement the Tribunal would necessarily be interested in me opining, Chairman, but that you would be interested in the facts as I recalled them.
670 Q. We11, the Tribunal may be interested in the fact, and Martin callinan indeed made the comment in his evidence, which presumably you had an opportunity to read, that it was strange you left it hanging there and didn't ask any further questions about what he meant by the words.
A. Because I took it as a deflection, a smokescreen. I wasn't going to engage with it. The reason that Martin Callinan might've been surprised that I didn't pursue it was because throughout all of this he wasn't looking at me, he didn't make eye contact at any point, he was looking down at the ground. Had he, he would have seen the look of disbelief etched across my face. But I wasn't interested in pursuing the fact with him that I didn't believe him, I was only interested in securing agreement on him answering questions about penalty

671 Q. Were you interested in asking him what he meant? Isn't the first basic rule of journalists the follow-up question?
A. I think I've just answered that question. As far as I was concerned, this was all rubbish. It was a deflection, it was designed to get me to stop trying to hold him to account on penalty points.
672 Q. You've described yourself as a journalist of over 30 years who was good at recal1; are you good at recall?
A. You're about to try and catch me out.

673 Q. Well, no, because you went on to say that you also took good notes.
A. No, I didn't say that.

674 Q. Well, we can scroll it back, but you said that you were in the habit of taking notes as a journalist.
A. No, I didn't. I absolutely didn't say that. what I said was my job as a journalist means that $I$ have to recal1 conversations and reproduce them on air. I don't think that I said --

675 Q. No, I think you --
A. But anyway, sorry, it was a private conversation that was not an exercise in journalism. I wasn't interested in what he had to say, I was interested in getting agreement out of him.
676 Q. We11, let's explore that. Because you, for the first time today, said that he suggested to you it should be off the record.
A. Yes.

677 Q. You didn't say that in your statement either.
A. No, I omitted that.

678 Q. And you rejected the suggestion it be off the record?
A. No, I said - and you can scroll back on this - that I
neither assented nor demurred.
679 Q. Which means the rules of placing it off the record weren't met; in your view it was on the record?
A. I was waiting to see what he had to say.

680 Q. okay. We11, journalists don't usually wait to see what 16:26 somebody says before they decide whether to put it on or off the record.
A. How do you know what journalists do?
Q. Well, answer the question. This whole Tribunal is debating extensively on what journalists do or don't do. In the normal course, are you telling me you let somebody talk after they ask you that something should be on the record before you answer the question, whether it should or should not be on the record?
A. Yes, usually I'd say 'Give me a sniff of what it is that you have to say and we'11 decide on what basis we move forward here'.
682 Q. So do you accept it was off the record?
A. I accept that he said it. I did not treat it as being off-record, because it was not a journalistic --
683 Q. Sorry, put it the other way around; do you accept it was on the record, he's never accepted it was off the record?
A. No, it was a private conversation aimed exclusively at trying to overcome a disagreement.

684 Q. So it was on the record?
A. It was neither, Mr. Whelan, on or off-record as far as I was concerned. I accept that he said 'This is all off-record'. I did not agree to that. I saw him as a
reluctant interviewee trying to weasel out of answering questions.
Q. Was it on or off the record?
A. I've just told you. It's not a binary, Mr. Whelan, it's not binary issue. It was neither.
Q. Well, even Mr. McDowell hasn't come up with a fourth version. It's either on the record or off the record, which was it?
A. Okay, if it was to be on the record, it was a conversation that could be broadcast. Obviously, Mr. Whelan, it was never going to be broadcast. If it was off-record, I would have agreed that with him. I didn't agree it.
687 Q. So there was no reason, I'm putting it to you, why you couldn't have broadcast it. You didn't broadcast --
have always remained agitated and disappointed about and saw it in a way that wasn't, that it wasn't -- that it didn't -- in a way that wasn't the case at the time.
A. Mr. Whelan appears to be trying to suggest, Chairman, that I am motivated by some long held grievance since 17th December 2013 to come here and give my evidence and make this statement today. Let me assure you that is absolutely not the case. I have no earthly reason for either making any of this up or withholding anything until now. In fact it has been to my detriment offering this information to the Tribunal and it would've been made for a much easier, a much simpler life, I could be sitting down there with my colleagues right now actually observing the proceedings of the Tribunal rather than sitting here.

690 Q. But later events, I'm putting to you, could've infused your view, recollection -- and recollection of that conversation. Because --
A. My account as given to the Tribunal of what happened on December 17th is accurate.

691 Q. Because had it been as dramatic in its content then as you now say it is, you would've set about putting it into the journalistic system with a view to publishing it.
A. I did. I contacted Maurice McCabe, I met him, I put the allegations to him. I, before doing so, had an instinct that it was going to be a zero sum game, I was never going to be broadcasting anything in relation to this, but I still pursued it to the nth degree or

Q. Just lastly, sorry - and the Chairman will appreciate that I have to reserve my position as to whether we may have further questions to put to Mr. Boucher-Hayes on another occasion in relation to it - when did you talk to Tom Donnelly exactly again?
A. In the days and weeks after the Crimecall broadcast.
Q. So if you went on holidays for Christmas --
A. January perhaps, yeah.
Q. So after you came back?
A. Don't ask me to put a date on it, but yes.

697 Q. Well, we're in the business of chronologies here in the Tribunal, so do your best please.
A. Ask me to put a date on it, I can't give you an accurate one.

698 Q. When did you talk to Gráinne Seoige about it? That night?
A. No. As I said, I didn't want to upset her any more. I might've said 'We'11 have a chat tomorrow ' and it was either the tomorrow -- sorry, it was either the day after or the day after that.

699 Q. Is that one conversation only?
A. Do you mean have we never discussed it since then?

700 Q. Yes.
A. No, we would have discussed it on a few occasions.

701 Q. And Niamh O'Connor?
A. One or two occasions.

702 Q. The first of which was when, roughly?
A. Early 2014.

703 Q. And the further ones, roughly?
A. Much more recently when I decided to make a statement to the Tribunal.

MR. WFELAN Thank you Mr. Boucher-Hayes. As I say to the court, it may not arise, but depending on what any of those other persons have to say - and there's some suggestion about a letter written as well - it may be that this witness will have to answer further questions at some stage.
CHA RMAN Yes, well, we'11 talk about that when he's
finished.
MR. WFELAN Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Was there anything further, Mr. Marrinan?
MR. MARRINAN Yes, just two -- oh, sorry,
MR. G LLANE: Sorry, I didn't realise I was next.
CHA RMAN Oh, I beg your pardon. No, you are, you're last, which is the position if --

## THE WTNESS MAS RE-EXAM NED BY MR. G LLANE AS FOLLOVG:

MR. G LLANE: Very briefly, Mr. Boucher-Hayes. Just in relation to the last implicit criticism from

Mr. Whelan, which seems to rest on this assumption, it's been suggested to you that if there was any truth to what you were saying about the conversation, as a journalist you might have run this as an actual published story. And do I understand your evidence to be that the only value to the public that could be placed on a story such as this would necessarily involve identifying Mr. Callinan and identifying Sergeant McCabe in a context of poisonous toxic wrong allegations?
A. Absolutely. And casting a shadow over Maurice McCabe's children and his wife for the rest of their lives.

705 Q. And do I understand it then that your assessment in relation to that at the time involved perhaps concluding that had you run such a story, on a good day you might've bought yourself the biggest defamation case in history and on a bad day you might've destroyed
someone in respect of allegations that everyone agrees are untrue?
A. I think you can assume that both would've happened, yes.
And in relation to the broadcast itself, while you are cut off, you did mention Mr. Callinan's reference to HARP, which he did make on the programme, and in fact he gave evidence of that acronym here; honesty, accountability and various other factors.
A. On this occasion your recall it is better than mine, Mr. Gillane. Thank you.
MR. G LLANE: Thanks very much.
CHA RMAN Honestly, accountability, respect, professionalism. Just so as we all remember it. Thanks.

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

707 Q. MR. MARR NAN Just two matters. In the normal course of events, you can't corroborate yourself; in other words, you can't rely on what you've said to other people as supporting your version of events. It only, in a legal sense, becomes admissible in circumstances where it's suggested to you - it's one of the circumstances - where it's suggested to you that this is a recent fabrication, in other words you've recently made this up and that the event never happened.

Now, in those circumstances, it would appear that what
you've said to your co-presenter, to your producers is relevant. You've no objection to the Tribunal getting statements from them --
A. of course not.

708 Q. -- in relation to the private conversations that you had?
A. I can't speak for them, but I've no objection to you asking them.
Q. Yeah. No, but I mean there's no issue in relation to journalistic privilege or otherwise in relation to the conversations that you had with other, producers in the first instance and a fellow journalist?
A. No, I'm sure they would be happy to support my statement here today.
710 Q. The second thing is that in relation to the letter that ${ }_{16: 36}$ you sent to the Chief State Solicitor's office, when was that sent?
A. Can I come back to the Tribunal with --

711 Q. We11, yes, I was just wondering whether you still have a copy of it?
A. I will on my computer --

712 Q. Very wel1.
A. -- in work.

713 Q. Well, if you wouldn't mind looking into that and sending it in to the Tribunal?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN what was that about, Mr. Marrinan? I'm sorry, I don't understand that at all.

MR. MARRI NAN We11, in answer to a question that I
asked --
A. I endeavoured to get in contact with the former Garda Commissioner after I had spoken to Maurice McCabe to put Maurice McCabe's rebuttal or denials to him. The letter itself will be of very little interest to the Tribunal, because it was just a 'Please contact me'. I didn't put any of the allegations in writing. CHA RMAN So it's a bland letter, if you like?
A. It's a matter of urgent --

714 Q. MR. MARR NAN We11, of course at that point in time Commissioner Callinan had retired.
A. Yes. Yes.

715 Q. So the letter was sent to the Chief State Solicitor's office, is that right?
A. I contacted Garda Press Office, I contacted Garda Headquarters, I contacted the Chief State Solicitor's office in an attempt to have the communication passed on, yes.
MR. MARRI NAN Right. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

CHAN RMAN Thanks for being here, Mr. Boucher-Hayes.
A. Thank you.

# THE HEARI NG WAS THEN AD OURNED UNTI L TUESDAY, 5TH J UNE <br> 2018 AT 10: 00 
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