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## THE HEAR NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVB, ON TUESDAY, 5TH J UNE 2018:

CHA RMAN Just a couple of things I need to say. First of a11, I am sorry I was a few minutes late. One 10:06 of the reasons is that apparently $I$ was to sit in the Court of Appeal -- I was to sit in the Court of Appeal tomorrow, and on Wednesday, but the sittings have been cancelled due to a lack of judicial resources so I am now free to sit here. So it's possible to rejig witnesses, we will have a look during the day and see what can be done, but $I$ would prefer to get through as much of this as I possibly can given that I don't have to be elsewhere because I can't be elsewhere because unfortunately there is no judge to sit with me in the Court of Appeal. So, that is the situation this morning.

There we go.
MR. MARRI NAN The first witness this morning, sir, is Michael Clifford, please.

MR. M CHAEL CLI FFORD, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN

1 Q. MR. MARR NAN Now, you are a journalist by profession and would you just give an outline of your career to date, please.
A. Yes. I studied engineering in UCC and then a few years
later $I$ went back and did a course in DCU, journalism. I began as a sub-editor in The Star newspaper, I worked for Independent Newspapers and Ireland on Sunday, now a defunct newspaper, as a business reporter and a general reporter. From 2000 to 2011 I worked in the Sunday Tribune, until it closed, as a reporter/columnist. Since then, $I$ have worked for the Irish Examiner. I wrote a column for the Sunday Times for a couple of years, but mainly I work for the Irish Examiner and I was appointed special correspondent to the Irish Examiner $I$ think in 2013. And it's a general brief; I cover, a lot of stuff, a generalist you could call me basically in terms of any type of a lack of speciality.

2 Q. I think you also do a certain amount of broadcasting work as a panelist on radio and television, is that right?
A. Yes, I have done a bit of that. And for a period I stepped in as the replacement for vincent Browne in his -- the late night show he did have on TV3 and a sma11 bit of presenting, that kind of stuff.
3 Q. I am not sure there is a replacement for vincent Browne.
A. That's a very good point.

4 Q. But in any event, I think you are also the author of a book, The Maurice MECabe Story, A Force for Justice, is 10:09 that right?
A. Yes, that is true. It's published last year.

5 Q. So you have taken a great deal of interest in relation to all matters touching on Maurice McCabe and his
plight as a whistleblower. when did you start getting interested in the story?
A. I think it was about May 2013, just after the publication of the o'mahony report into the penalty
points issue.

6 Q. And it's something you have pursued as an investigative journalist ever since, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. Investigative journalist is a very big term, but I certainly pursued it and I think it's fair to say I have broken some stories in relation to it and I have commented a fair bit on it.

7 Q. Now, you had an interview with the Tribuna1 investigators on the 18th December, the first interview you had with them, it starts at page 4099 of the material, and you were asked at page 4102 in relation to whether or not you had been negatively briefed by anybody in relation to Maurice McCabe, and I suppose the expression being negatively briefed is an unfortunate one, but had you heard any rumours in relation to Maurice McCabe --
A. Yes, Chairman.

8 Q. -- in association with any sexual offence or offences in the past?
A. Yes. There were three particular incidents I remember from 2014. I believe the first one was early in Mr. Marrinan?

9 Q. Yes, if you would please.
A. Yeah. The first one was in early 2014, I was in a
conversation with an individual whom I would classify as a source, on the basis of previous interaction with him, and we spoke about the Gardaí and then I mentioned something to the effect about Maurice McCabe, there's a lot to that story, a lot more than has come out, and he 10:11 said words to the effect that there is an issue there, and I asked him what the issue was and he said there had been an allegation of child sexual abuse. He got this, he told me, locally in Cavan. He said the general feeling was that he wasn't guilty or
responsible for the allegation, that there wasn't any foundation to it, but, the way he put it is, that is still there, it's still hanging over him. And that was the first time that I had heard anything of that nature.

10 Q. I think this wasn't a member of An Garda Síochána?
A. No, it wasn't a member of An Garda Síochána, no.

11 Q. So it's not of any great interest to the Tribunal, other than being the first occasion when you heard something negative about Sergeant McCabe. What was the 10:12 second occasion?
A. Yeah, the second occasion was an individual whom is a source. What I can say about him is he is somebody who is very familiar with politics and on the basis of my own conversations with him he has a friendship at the very least with a senior garda. And I would emphasise that the individual is not any of the senior Gardaí who are the focus of the Tribunal's work.
12 Q. That is helpful, thank you.
A. Yeah. Now, I don't know for a fact that this came from -- sorry, just to put it in context. By then I had checked out, after the initial conversation about this issue I satisfied myself completely that it was without foundation and there was also a suspicion that it was being used to attack Sergeant McCabe on the basis of what he was bringing forward. So that was my state of knowledge when the second interaction occurred with this gentleman. He came on the phone, I was talking about other issues and -- well actually, I am not 100 percent positive whether he rang me specifically to convey this or whether it occurred in broader conversation, but he said words to the effect, you know your man McCabe is a kiddie fiddler.
13 Q. Yes.
A. I explained to him that I had heard that, I had checked it out, there was no truth to it. He sounded sceptical in my response. The only connection there, and as I say I don't know this but this would just be a suspicion on a previous occasion, that particular individual had relayed to me about a friend of his, a senior garda who had described myself in disparaging terms and on that basis I assumed, rightly or wrongly, that this is where it was coming from when he mentioned it to me about Sergeant McCabe.
14 Q. Well, you say you believed this conversation took place in the first part of, early in 2015, is that right?
A. 2014, I think.
Q. All right. Just to be clear in relation to this, if
you'd just look -- could we have page 4103 up on the screen? If you go four lines down there:
"The second occasi on I heard it froman indi vi dual, somebody who would be familiar with politics and to a certai $n$ extent seni or personnel in the Gardaí. In the course of this conversation, and fromrecollection, the conversation was not specifically to do with Sergeant McCabe. He said something to the effect 'you know your nan McCabe is supposed to be a ki ddi e fiddl er'. That conversation was to the best of my recollection in the first half of 2015."
A. I see it there. Now, I can't be sure about that. what I can say to you is that I know the third occasion chronologically was after that with Tim Vaughan and I may have got my dates wrong there, I think it may have been earlier than 2015.
16 Q. Okay, all right. You know what the terms of reference are of the Tribunal and you know what we are examining now in relation to the protected disclosures that were made by Sergeant Maurice McCabe and Superintendent Taylor in relation to a smear campaign. You are aware of some of the difficulties that the Tribunal is experiencing in getting journalists to answer questions?
A. I am, yes.

17 Q. You are aware of that. These are obviously two individuals that you have classified as being sources. The Tribunal isn't interested in looking at information
that isn't of assistance to it in its ultimate task, but are you satisfied to advise the Tribunal that neither of these two persons that you classify as sources, that the -- to reveal their identity, are you satisfied that it wouldn't assist the Tribunal in any way whatsoever in its task?
A. I am.

18 Q. Yes.
A. To the extent that neither were Gardaí and whereas in one case I may suspect but that that's, you know -- I am satisfied -- yes. the information in that form, as long as it doesn't touch on the core of the issue that the Tribunal is examining in relation to whether or not Superintendent Taylor was briefing journalists negatively about Sergeant McCabe.

Then the third occasion was with your editor at the time, Mr. Tim Vaughan, is that right?
A. That's right, Tim Vaughan rang me. Again, I think I may have -- my recollection may not -- may have put it later than what it actually was, $I$ think it may have been 2014. He rang me and he said -- he sounded slightly, not alarmed but slightly urgent and he said that had it come to him, somebody had suggested to him that Maurice McCabe was involved in these issues and I reassured him, I said Tim, I have come across it, there's no truth to it, $I$ think it's actually being
used against the man, and that was it. And to the best of my knowledge he accepted my explanation entirely and certainly didn't affect work that the Irish Examiner did thereafter on this story.
20 Q
And when do you believe this conversation took place?
A. I had initially put it at 2015, it may well be earlier. My recollection of dates aren't great and I think it may well have been in 2014. Probably the second half of 2014, perhaps.
And were they the on7y three occasions on which you heard anything negative?
A. They were the only three occasions until the whole issue became widespread, which, February '17 I suppose. Largely, yes, they were the only three occasions any --
22 Q. You didn't hear a whisper from other journalists?
A. There might have been something. I can't specify a journalist who said anything, but there is no doubt about it, it was in the ether with journalists who were associated with the story. I can't tell you of any instance where anybody said anything. I didn't have that many conversations with journalists; I work from home in that regard, I didn't have that many conversations with journalists about it. Those are the on1y three specific occasions that stand out for me in terms of somebody specifically saying anything in that line to me.
23 Q. And other than that, you merely had a sense that it was out there in the ether, is that right?
A. At perhaps -- not at that time but perhaps in 2016, for
instance, I would definitely have had a sense it was out there.

24 Q. And having heard this from three different sources, did you confront Sergeant McCabe with it?
A. Well, I'11 put it this way to you: on the first occasion after I heard it, I was floored, because I had been following the story, it didn't seem to be getting much traction in the media in general and then out of the blue this thing comes along. I then made inquiries about it, I made inquiries in Cavan. I made -- I satisfied myself as to the veracity of what the story was. I also became aware that Sergeant McCabe's legal team were aware of this issue and to be honest with you I found that very reassuring, to the extent that Mr. McDowell, for instance, is a public figure and the idea that he would have been involved or allowed himself to be used in any way to run an agenda by somebody who had these kind of issues in their background, was beyond any sort of belief as far as I could see. But I also satisfied myself as to what actually happened; I did not know the detail that has emerged here in the Tribunal but the general gist of that to a large extent, I satisfied myself that that was the case.
okay. And the Tribunal discovered that there was an interaction between Gerald Kean, solicitor, and Commissioner Callinan in January and into early February of 2014. Were you aware of that?
A. I wasn't aware of the interaction. I have a
recollection of hearing Gerald kean on that programme but I wasn't aware of any interaction between him and the Commissioner.
And also an anonymous letter that it was believed may not be accurate, but it was believed had been sent to the Independent newspapers; were you aware of the existence of the anonymous letter?
A. No, no.

I think that you were able to assist the Tribunal in that regard by pointing the Tribunal to a broadcast by Katie Hannon on RTÉ that indicated that perhaps RTÉ had been sent the anonymous letter?
A. That was my recollection.

28 Q. Yes. And that was very helpful and was pursued by the Tribunal and shown to be correct. I think you also had 10:22 some interaction with Mr. McGuinness, the TD, but that conversation that you had with him was in the early part of last year, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yeah. It was in relation to the book.
Q. And there was no information there that could be of assistance to the Tribunal?
A. No. Anything that passed between us there, I think he stated all publicly, it was basically an interview for this book I was doing and anything that happened there would either be in that or I think the whole gist of it $10: 22$ he has given in evidence here.
30 Q. And you subsequently, in 2016, met Superintendent Taylor?
A. That's correct.

31 Q. Will you tell us the circumstances in which you came to meet Superintendent Taylor in 2016?
CHA RMAN Mr. Marrinan, the date of publication of the book is what?
A. Chairman, September last year, 13th September '17 -- or $10: 23$ 15th September.

CHAI RMAN All right. So you met Superintendent Taylor first, I just wanted to --
MR. MARRI NAN Yes, 2016.
A. It was literally 12 months before that, that $I$ met Superintendent Taylor, yes.
Q. When was the first occasion you met him?
A. Well, I got a phone call out of the blue from David Taylor, I would place it at late May/early June at the latest. I had mentioned him in comments or an analysis piece I had written about the issues that were arising in the Gardaí. This was in the aftermath of the publication of the O'Higgins Report and the story that the Examiner broke in relation to that and everything that flowed from it, I had written a piece in relation to the Gardaí and what was going on. In the body of that piece, I made some mention, and it was just on the basis of talking to people, that it appeared that whatever way the Commissioner was handling this was in sharp contrast to how the issue around Superintendent
Taylor and the leaking of the names of his children had been handled and that he had been suspended, something to that effect. I had never met Dave Taylor prior to that, my only interaction with the Garda Press officer
was officially through the Press Office rather than through him. I had no interest in meeting him, to be honest with you, or anything, but that was just using a device as a comparison for instance within the piece I was writing. I got a phone call, I remember it because ${ }^{10: 24}$ I was in my mother's house in Cork, and it must have been a Saturday evening. He said 'Dave Taylor here', for a couple of seconds I couldn't place him, then he said 'thanks for the mention in the piece' and then I realised who I was talking to. And we had a bit of a conversation, he made some comments about Nóirín o'Sullivan and the difficulties she was having at the time and how, in his opinion, she wasn't very good for the Gardaí or whatever. And he also made comments about Sergeant McCabe, and he said what Maurice was going through, and he referenced him twice I think as Maurice, which I found -- I thought it was amusing or ironic, the right words, because as far as I was concerned he had been Garda $H Q$, which had, I believed, a very hostile attitude towards Maurice McCabe and now he was speaking about him in these terms, but that was the nature of it. And anyway, that phone call didn't last too long and he suggested going for a cup of coffee sometime and I said grand, and I left it at that. And to be honest with you I wasn't at that point 10:25 that interested in meeting him for a cup of coffee and I just left it at that on a cordial basis.
33 Q. And then the next time that you met him?
A. The next time, I initially told the Tribunal I thought
it may have been June, July or August, September, on the basis of superintendent's recollection and I think other stuff that has come out, I'm pretty convinced now it was late August/early September. I have a number of reasons for believing that, most principally because the second time I met him I know was three or four weeks after that and that was definitely the first weekend of october '16. So I would put it at late August at the earliest or possibly early September.
34 Q. All right. And what were the circumstances in which you came to meet him?
A. I can't definitively say to you whether I rang him or he rang me. I remember parts of the conversation but I can't say who initiated the call. I became aware in that late summer that he had met -- that michelle Taylor had met Maurice McCabe and that may have piqued interest and I may have said well, I wonder what is going on here and rang him, I am not sure. He suggested here, I think, that it was in relation to the book I was writing, I doubt that very much because I don't think I would have cold-called somebody like Dave Taylor, despite having one conversation with him, and asked him to give me background for my book, I'd find that -- or he may have rang me. I can't definitively say who initiated that contact.
A. Yeah, out of that, I do remember -- he doesn't live too far from me, I do remember suggesting a well-known coffee shop or another venue, and he said no, the way
things were with him he'd prefer to meet privately and he suggested I come to his home. And I did, and however many days later I met him and his wife in his home.
All right. And at that point in time he was suspended and there was an inquiry into him, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

37 Q. Were you aware of that?
A. I was. I was aware of that. And he made me very quickly aware of the circumstances he was then in. well, as best you can, can you recount to us what conversation that you had with him in his home?
A. Well, Chairman, there was really two prongs to it. One was the scenario he had found himself in, it had a massive impact on his family, on himself, on his career. They were obviously in reduced circumstances both financially and emotionally, I would suggest, or certainly that is the way it was portrayed to me and I have no reason to question how genuine that portrayal was. He spoke about having worked all his life and then finding himself looking at the four walls and the impact it was having on him. And on a human level, you walk into somebody's house and you are confronted with this, your immediate instinct I think is one of sympathy, irrespective of how he may have arrived at that position. But that was the initial phase of the conversation. And then he got into how he had arrived there. And the central character in that was Nóirín o'Sullivan. He spoke of -- he spoke of his time in the

Press Office. One thing he said was when he arrived in the Press office or certainly soon after, they were obsessed in H -- I'm not sure whether he said they in HQ or the Commissioner of the day was obsessed with Maurice McCabe and what Maurice McCabe was doing in terms of the issues he was highlighting. He suggested that he didn't have a great working relationship with Nóirín O'Sullivan. He said that at one point himself and Martin Callinan suspected she was leaking to the media, you know, in the form that I think is more familiar to political or business world of one person briefing against another. I have absolutely no basis to believe any of this is true, I'm only relating what he told me. And that was the nature of their relationship until the day Martin Callinan resigned in March 2014. And he put huge emphasis on what happened that day; Mr. Callinan was gone in the morning and later that evening a letter was passed, I believe, to Mr. Reynolds in RTÉ which effectively vindicated Mr. Callinan, former Commissioner Callinan in terms of this issue that had arisen about the taping in Garda stations. He placed -- he says he was asked to do that by Martin Callinan, even though Martin Callinan had just resigned that morning, he placed huge emphasis on Nóirín O'Sullivan's reaction to him doing that. He said that -- he said she was very annoyed, to put it at its mildest, but his big thing that was her position was that he was now working for her as she was Commissioner and he shouldn't have been doing something
for Martin Callinan. That is the way he framed whatever happened there but he certainly gave the emphasis that that signalled a rapid deterioration in any relationship he had with Nóirín o'Sullivan, by his account.

39 Q. Okay. And did he move on to talk or discuss with you the campaign against Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, to tell you the truth, he didn't dwell on that and I nearly got the impression that he preferred not to speak about that because he preferred to concentrate 10:31 on what he saw himself as being a victim in, which was after that, his arrest, his suspension, he went into some detail in that, his belief that those who showed any sympathy or liking towards him were ostracised, etcetera, all of that, and he went into some detail
about his arrest. In terms of the campaign against Maurice McCabe, the only things -- he spoke in a general way about it, but the general gist of it was that Martin Callinan would send him a text or a message and that -- which would be derogatory towards sergeant McCabe in one form or another, and he passed this on, I believe he said to other senior officers and to the media. I cannot tell you 100 percent that he said he texted the media or spoke to them verbally. I understand that he said he told me he only spoke
verbally, I have no recollection of that. But I can't be 100 percent of that. But what I am absolutely sure of, in terms of that conversation, is the centrality of these text messages, because his thesis, if you want to
call it that, was that the whole investigation, suspension of him from his job was associated with the fact that then Commissioner o'Sullivan wanted to get her hands on his phone because that was what you might call the smoking gun in terms of anything to link her to the type of attitudes there was to Maurice McCabe back in '13 and '14, and he effectively blamed his demise as such on that issue, and he put forward the case that it was all 1inked to the Commissioner, through her husband, who was on the investigation team, 10:32 he described it at the time as heading it up, getting her hands on that phone to effectively destroy any evidence linking her to this campaign that he says was going on.
40 Q. Now, I will come back to that in a moment. Did he also 10:33 mention the creation of an intelligence file?
A. I don't think he said that to me on that occasion. I okayed that with him the second time I went up to him. I went to check that with him. From my recollection, I'm not 100 percent sure whether he went into the intelligence file at that point.

41 Q. okay.
A. I okayed that with him on the second occasion I met him, definitely.
42 Q. And when was the next occasion that you met him face-to-face?
A. The next occasion was about -- well, it was the first weekend in October 2016.

43 Q. Yes.
A. I had got word that a protected disclosure had gone in. To be honest with you, I was taken aback. Because when I left him on the first occasion, the idea that a protected disclosure emanating from him -- it never even crossed my mind, principally because it would involve incriminating himself, but I never thought for a second -- not for the first time I was taken aback when I had heard this disclosure had been made. I definitely rang him on this occasion and said there was a couple of things I wanted to checked with him. And I 10:34 called up to the house again and he was there again with his wife and I asked him, I said just a couple of things I wanted to check. One, were the text messages part of this campaign? не said, yes. Had an intelligence file been created on Maurice McCabe in HQ ? He said, yes. And had somebody been appointed to monitor Maurice McCabe's activity on Pulse? And he confirmed that as well.
44 Q. And as best you can, obviously the issue of text messages was a matter that you were going to seek clarification on, to what extent did he clarify the issue of the text messages? well, first of all, what issue did you need clarification on in respect of the text messages?
A. The fact that text messages were used in this campaign ${ }^{10: 35}$ and that by extension, I thought, would -- if that were the case, there would be evidence there as in text messages from phones. That is why I thought that was important.

45 Q. And you have told us that you believed that the phone that had been seized from him during the course of the investigation, you got the impression that he was indicating to you that that might reveal some evidence that would support --
A. Oh, he was very clear about that.

46 Q. -- his case?
A. That was, in his mind the purpose of seizing the phones. That the phones -- I mean, obviously the Tribunal has learned since that, as I understand it, it 10:35 wasn't the phones from that period that were seized but he certainly told me they were the phones that were seized. The text messages, it was just confirmation on the basis that that was the case because there would be presumably some evidence of that then. But as I say, that had been a central theme of his when I met him first on the basis that effectively these phones were the key to everything.
47 Q. okay. And in terms of when you finished your meeting with him, what was the clear impression that you were left with in respect of the text messages and who the text messages were sent to and what they concerned?
A. Are you talking about the first meeting or the second meeting?
48 Q. The second meeting.
A. Well, the impression $I$ got was that these text messages were sent, as I understood it, to senior officers or senior management rather than one individual. I wasn't 100 percent sure on that. Neither was I 100 percent
sure that they were sent to journalists. But the emphasis that was put on them was that these text messages contain effectively statements, language, whatever, that shows that this campaign he was claiming was run was being run and, therefore, people who would have been informed had knowledge of it. That was the general gist of where I interpreted him as coming from with the whole issue around text messages. As I say, I can't say definitively that he said he sent texts to journalists but he most definitely said that he sent texts of this nature to Nóirín O'Sullivan and, my recollection, to senior management in the Gardaí. well, you see, you probably will be aware of the fact that Superintendent Taylor denies that he was indicating that he was sending or had told you that he was sending text messages in relation to this issue, but what he is saying is that he was sending text messages to Nóirín o'sullivan, the Deputy Commissioner, and to the Commissioner Martin Callinan at the time, merely updating them in relation to issues concerning Maurice McCabe; in other words, that his name might be mentioned in a radio programme or might have appear in a newspaper article and that he would immediately update them by sending fairly innocuous texts just advising them of the up-to-date position in relation to $10: 38$ Maurice McCabe, and, therefore, Maurice McCabe was a focus of attention, and that's what he has now told the Tribunal. You are aware of that?
A. I am aware of that.

50 Q. Was that the -- did you get a flavour of that being the case, that he was making to you at the time?
A. I got a flavour of that being one element of it, to the extent that he even said to me something along the lines of, that I was mentioned in some of these, Clifford is on the radio, or whatever, would be that kind of update you are talking about, but I most certainly got the impression that that was only one element of it, that it wasn't that alone. And again, back to the central tenet, as I saw it, of what he was saying, which was this business that the evidence, the smoking gun or whatever you want to call it was on these phones and it certainly wouldn't make sense to me that the character of that kind of thing, updating the McCabe stories on the radio or being written about or whatever of that nature, that certain7y wouldn't indicate a smoking gun, so $I$ was most certainly under the impression that it was far broader than that. CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Marrinan, the expression smoking gun, obviously it's a thing that sticks in my mind but I am wondering was that used in your conversation --
A. Chairman --

CHA RMAN -- or is that your interpretation of it?
A. -- sorry, I have no recollection of him using that phrase. He may well have, but that is my
definitely the case, as in, these phones had the evidence of what had gone on previously.
51 Q. MR. MARR NAN So, I mean, you wrote a book in relation
to the Maurice McCabe story, and this formed part of it and there was a focus at page 323 of your book, but I think that before the book was published you had cause to contact Superintendent Taylor in relation to a chapter that you had written on this, covering this issue, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I mean, specifically in the course of that book there are a number of instances where there are private meetings and I endeavoured in every case to get as much an account or a view of those meetings and one of those was the meeting between Maurice McCabe and Superintendent Taylor, and I -- that formed one of the chapters. I also, just because Mr. Taylor appeared to enter the story at that stage, I had some biographical detail of him in that chapter and $I$, in that chapter there is, it's related a version of the meeting between Superintendent Taylor and Maurice McCabe and there is a reference in that to the texts.
52 Q. So when was it that you had your conversation with him about this?
A. I told the investigators, because I initially thought and this again goes back to dates, I appear to be atrocious with dates, but I told them initially it was February ' 17 and when I went and got the email it was actually May '17. I rang him, I said, you know, I am doing this book, there's one part I want to check with you and could I bang this on to you. He gave me an email address and he told me to send it on there and I did and he got back to me within days, at the very most
a week.
53 Q. And your understanding was that he was going to check the accuracy of what you had sent to him, is that right?
A. I specifically said in the email could you check this particularly for factual accuracy. If we could just have page 6617 up on the screen, please. This is from you to David Taylor:
" Dave
Thi s is the chapter I was telling you about, where you enter the McCabe story. See what you thi nk, particularly in terns of factual accuracy.
Thanks, tal k soon."

And then an attachment there, if we scroll to page 6618, we see the interaction:
"McCabe rang the door bell. Within seconds M chelle Tayl or appeared. They had al ready met twi ce and now greet ed each ot her with smiles."

And it goes on then to talk about the encounter between Maurice McCabe, Michelle Taylor and her husband David Taylor for the first time, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

55 Q. And then you go on in the next paragraph:

[^0]down as a man destined for big things."

You then point out that he is a native of Tipperary. And then it goes on to deal with some personal details in relation to his background, isn't that right?
A. Correct, yeah.

56 Q. And if we then scroll down to the following page, 6619. And then we will see there in the second paragraph, if you just scroll down please:
"On the eveni ng Callinan retired, Tayl or passed to an RTÉ reporter a letter which has become a focus of controversy. It showed that, contrary to medi a speculation, the Commissioner had informed the Department of Justice about the recordings in Garda station, the item whi ch had prompted Callinan's retirement."

That was a matter you discussed with Taylor, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that was -- as I said, the narrative he set out, that was a big thing in it.
57 Q. Yes. You then go on down:
"Wthin weeks, Tayl or was moved out of the Press
Office. He wasn't totally surprised but he was di sappointed that the move wasn't accompani ed with what he had regarded as the requi site pronotion, instead he was shifted to traffic managenent."

Again, did that reflect the conversation that you had had with Superintendent Taylor?
A. It did, Mr. Marrinan. He made a point of telling me that every other super who had been in the Press Office 10:44 on leaving it had been promoted to chief super.
58 Q. Yes. And then if we scroll down, there is a quotation there:
"Sensitive information regarding child T entered the medi a i nappropriately on the morning of October 23 rd (2013). On the bal ance of probabilities the inf ormation in question came from someone with the Gar daí . "

And that is a quote from the Children's Ombudsman, isn't that right? And then if we just go over the next page, 6620, second line:
"Tayl or was suspended from duty in April 2015 when chi ef super came to himand confiscated his phones and laptop. Thi s move ensured that any inf ormation retai ned on the devi ces was now in possessi on of Headquarters."

Again, that is on the basis of your conversation with him, is it?
A. That's correct. And there is a name missing there and that is because this is the draft, it's chief super --

59 Q. Yes. Well, it is only obviously a draft. And then, if we scroll down just 6620, the paragraph:
"However, context is requi red. Tayl or has al ways deni ed being the source of the leak, but on the assumption that he was the prime suspect there are mitigating factors. The culture at the Gardaí / medi a i nterface, devel oped over decades, ensured that i nf ormal contacts between the Press Office and certain crime correspondents were routine."

And then you go on at page 6621, paragraph starting:
"By J une 2016 Tayl or's I ife had been compl et el y transformed. He was on reduced pay and his family's standard of living suffered as a result at a time when hi s two daughters were goi ng through second and thi rd-I evel education."

Again, that seems to reflect the discussion or part of the discussion that you had with him in relation to the impact that his suspension was having on his life, isn't that right?
A. Absolutely, yes.

60 Q. And then if we then go over the page to 6622 , and the 10:47 last paragraph down:

[^1]conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands, of text messages to media and Garda personnel, casting MECabe in a dark light. Journalists were briefed that MECabe was a person who had a record of sexually abusing children. Excuses were invented as to why there was no 10:47 official record of these crimes or allegations. Tayl or was prepared to believe anything that was passed to him in rel ation to MECabe. He di dn't question its origins or veracity. Many within his circle believed the worst of this Cavan- based cop, who would not leave him al one. "

So if we just go back to the beginning - "There were a number of strands to the campaign, he tol d the incredul ous McCabe. The nost basic was the conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands, of text messages to media and Garda personnel casting MECabe in a dark light." - that would tend to suggest that you got that information either from Sergeant McCabe, is there a possibility you got that from Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, what I can say to you, Mr. Marrinan, is, I got that information certainly between -- I established that was said between them at the meeting.
61 Q. All right. But in any event, this is what was given to Superintendent Taylor to correct if he so wished, isn't 10:49 that right?
A. Correct.

62 Q. Just, obviously there is a line there:
"Journalists were briefed that McCabe was a person who had a record of sexually abusing children. "

It's in the plural. Was that your understanding at the time?
A. That was my understanding.

63 Q. Right. And then if we go over to page 6623 --
A. Sorry, just beyond that, it wasn't just for him -- it was literally, I was hoping that if I had got anything wrong factually, particularly in relation to anything that was attributed to Superintendent Taylor, I was relying on him to point it out to me, whether I was --
64 Q. Absolutely. If you just go over to page 6623 then. The top:
"He told McCabe that an intelligence file had been created on MECabe in Garda HQ. The file was kept under a Christian name which coi nci ded with the name of the offspring of a seni or officer."

And then if we go to page 6624, the top there we see:
"They met at Tayl or's home the day after that. McCabe asked himagain about some of the detail rel ated to the text messages. Then he informed Tayl or that he was obliged to make a protected disclosure on the matter."

And then if we go over to page 6625, and there is the end of the portion. Was that the entire chapter that
you sent him, do you recall?
A. I don't recal1, to be honest with you. It was certainly --
Q. It's the portion that concerns Superintendent Taylor?
A. Absolutely. If there is another piece to that chapter it would have nothing to do with Superintendent Taylor.

66 Q. And all of that, with the exception of one portion, made its way into your book, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. When I passed it to Superintendent Taylor, I asked him to have a look at it, when he came back to me he said there was just one issue and that was that in relation to the investigation into leaking of the names of the children, that he was not interviewed by the Children's Ombudsman. I went and checked that out as best I could and I was able to confirm that that was the case, so I had no problem inserting that in terms of the only change that he requested me to make.
67 Q. So that was the only correction and it was done at his behest in relation to the draft that is set out between 6618 and 6625, is that right?
A. Correct.

68 Q. Did he ever, even after publication of the book, ever at any time contact you with a view to correcting the text of the book?
A. No, absolutely not.

69 Q. Now, obvious7y the Tribunal investigators went through a number of other matters with you, in particular the terms of reference of the Tribuna1, and you are
familiar with them. Have you any other information that you have to offer the Tribunal from a fairly unique stance where you have written a book on Sergeant McCabe, you have done a lot of investigative work as well as the work that we have done at the Tribunal, is there any other information that you think might be of assistance to the workings of the Tribunal that you haven't alluded to in your interviews with the investigators or your evidence here today?
A. There is nothing comes to mind, Mr. Marrinan, to the extent that I have first-hand information of anything in relation to any campaign or alleged campaign against Sergeant McCabe. In that regard, no. As you say I have written a lot about it, I have -- I have, analysed might be too sophisticated a term but I have certainly commented on it, but I don't recall that there is anything of first-hand knowledge that I could give you to assist you in that regard.
MR. MARRI NAN okay. Would you answer any questions, please.

MR. GORDON No questions, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M CHAEL

## O H GG NS:

70 Q.
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Mr. Clifford, Michael
O'Higgins, I am counsel on behalf of Superintendent Taylor, and I have some questions to put to you. I am not going to be very long, and if you don't mind, I am
going to use your statements to the Tribunal just as a bit of a roadmap in terms of those questions. Really, the purpose and effect of the questions is to put my client's case to you.

You made your first statement on the 18th December, isn't that so?
A. That's correct.
A. 2017.

72 Q. And would it help you if I ask for your statement to go on screen or if you wanted to just follow --
A. If you don't mind.

73 Q. or perhaps if the hard copy is available to you there, it's page 4102, volume -- I will just give you the volume number in a moment now. Yes, it's on screen there. And if I could ask you to go to page 4104.
A. Yes, Mr. O'Higgins.

74 Q. And just there are three points of contact: There is a telephone call and two face-to-face meetings, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And if I could just direct your attention to line 81, which deals with the telephone call, you say:
"He di d not say anything negative about Sergeant McCabe, nor did he gi ve any credence to the allegations agai nst him"

Isn't that so?
A. Correct.

76 Q. And that is an agreed position between my client and yourself?
A. Yes.

77 Q. And if I could ask you to go on then to page 4108.
A. Yes.

78 Q. And line 150:
"Q. I have been asked to detail any information in my know edge rel ating to any campai gn to smear Ser geant Maurice McCabe rel ated to any ot her person, body or office hol der referred to in terms of reference [h]."

Isn't that so?
A. Yeah.

79 Q. And you replied:
"The onl y thing in my know edge --"

And I presume "my know edge" refers to the campaign.
"The only thing in my know edge is what l became aware of in late September 2016 in respect to what was contai ned in Superintendent Tayl or's protected di scl osure. "

```
Isn't that so?
```

A. Correct.



80 Q. Now, I read that to mean that when you're giving your answer to this question, in your initial statement, you are saying that the first time you learned of a campaign was post protected disclosure?
A. Well, if that's the case then, Mr. O'Higgins, maybe I didn't phrase it very we11. Because that is true to the extent that it's the first time it's on paper, so to speak.
81
A. But that is -- and certainly it's not the impression I wanted to convey, because $I$ believe elsewhere in that statement, I think I did say that there was a reference to it --
82 Q. There is --
A. -- in the initial meeting.
. Wil, if

Yes.

Bunt
Q. -- and I hope that what is on the face of it an inconsistency can be reconciled, and perhaps it can. But for the present, in any event, when asked about your knowledge relating to the campaign, your initial response, and I won't try and describe it as anything other than that, was that your knowledge emerged at the time or after the protected disclosure --
A. Yeah, sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, just in terms of the way -and I'm not nitpicking with you but the first time I became aware was in late September in respect to what was contained in Superintendent Taylor's disclosure.
84 Q. Yes.
A. I certainly didn't intend it, and I think an interpretation could be taken from it, that that wasn't
necessarily saying what was actually in the disclosure, it was around that time I became aware of it and all of these events did occur in September 2016.
85 Q. If I could ask you to go over to the next page, which is 40010 [sic]:
"I have been asked if l have any information or evi dence about an orchestrated campai gn di rected by seni or officers of the Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Sergeant McCabe by spreadi ng ruñurs about his professional and personal life other than what I have detailed above.
A. No.

I have been advi sed that Sergeant MkCabe stated in his statement to the Disclosures Tribunal that I met with Superintendent Tayl or in Septenber 2016, the following is what Sergeant McCabe stated:
Then in Septenber got --"
A. I am a bit lost as to where you are, Mr. o'Higgins.

86 Q. Sorry, 4110. I am on line 8, just at the bottom of the page. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do, yes.

87 Q. The following is what Sergeant McCabe stated:
"Then in Septentber 2016 I got another call off Mck Clifford. He stated he was after having an interview with Dave Taylor, David Taylor, for an hour. He said to me that he, Superintendent Tayl or, isn't suspended
in rel ation to the Rom children, he is suspended for inf ormati on he knows about you, meani ng re. "

Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

And although the document is undated, my impression was that related to the first meeting, is that right?
A. I'm nearly sure it would have related to the first meeting, yeah.
Al1 right. And I think just to be clear, you had Taylor asked that you did not keep notes because it wasn't for publication?
A. Correct.

93 Q. "I got the impressi on that he attributed his plight in respect of his arrest and suspensi on to his know edge of the campai gn, whi ch he said was conducted $t$ hrough hi magai nst Sergeant McCabe and specifically the all egati on that Nói rín Ơ Sulli van was at least aware of it. That was the gist of the conversation with him And I did mention it when l subsequently spoke to Sergeant MkCabe. "

I infer from that, that is simply your impression of what was said; you were extrapolating from things said that is what he was meaning, is that so?
A. Yeah, I mean, perhaps it was more direct than that because specific things he did say -- maybe in stating that was my impression maybe I was understating it perhaps, because he specifically did make mention of this importance of the centrality of the phones.
94 Q. I mean, he did feel hard done by, there is no question?
A. Oh, absolutely, yes.

95 Q. And he was, I think you have given us a description, he 11:01 was very low, he was on the floor, and he was, for want of a better description, in a vulnerable description?
A. Excuse me?
Q. He was in a vulnerable position?
A. I think you could say that, yes.

97 Q. But in any event, you relayed that impression and you went on to say:
"The onl $y$ know edge I had of that campai gn was what was
i n David Tayl or's protected di scl osure. There was nothing more than that. It was quite a general conversation I had with Superintendent Tayl or."
A. Correct.

98 Q. And I think you said today when Mr. Marrinan was asking you about it, that your impression was he didn't really want to talk about that, he wanted to talk about his own circumstances?
A. Exactly. In that vein, the general conversation was in relation to the smear campaign.

99 Q. Now, I will put my client's version of events of that a little later, but just to -- because $I$ think the proper place to put it it is when his version that he gave to the Tribunal investigators is being put to you and your response, but could I just say in general terms, because I don't want to appear to be simply cross-examining you without cross-referencing where Superintendent Taylor fits in, in all of this. He says that he would -- he would have discussed -- he unquestionably discussed Sergeant McCabe with you and he accepts he would have said things about Sergeant McCabe in general terms, but not in specifics.
A. And excuse me, Mr. O'Higgins, are you suggesting that within that the specifics, being any alleged smear campaign, he is saying that that wasn't discussed?
100 Q. Yes. That there weren't specifics. In other words, as you say it, the knowledge of the campaign was gained later and you were engaged in a general conversation?
A. Yeah. My distinct recollection of that is that he did
tell me about his plight but he connected his plight to the fact that there had been a smear campaign against Maurice McCabe. The details of such a campaign was a general conversation where he mentioned the texts and, as I said, he appeared to be uncomfortable going into too much detail, because let's face it what he was talking about was being involved in something pretty unsavoury, to put it at its mildest. If I was to put it this way: He might not have given you specifics but he left you with a clear impression in your mind that sergeant McCabe had been spoken $i 11$ of with regard to his previous 2006 investigation?
A. Yes. When he was in the Garda Press office. Well, more than spoken ill about, as I say, and it's my words, this analogy of the smoking gun being the phones.
102 Q. And just going overleaf then to the next page, at 4112, line 213:
"I have been asked if I was informed by Superintendent David Tayl or that he was instructed, directed by the former Garda Martin Callinan and/ or then Deputy Commi ssi oner Nói rín O Sullivan to contact the media to brief the media negatively against Sergeant McCabe. If so, I have been asked to provi de details.

In general terns, and as described in my answer above, he did confirmthis."

So, may I take it then a specifics were not adverted to?
A. Specifics that $I$ can remember in terms of any intelligence file, the content -- yes, specifics were not adverted to other than this business of the texts. And the reason that specific was adverted to was because, again, back to this thesis about the phones.
103 Q. If I could ask you to go overleaf to the next page, 4113, line 230:
"Q. I have been referred to my book, A Force for Justice, the Maurice MECabe St ory mand in particular to the last paragraph on page 323:
' There were a number of strands to the campaign, he told the incredul ous McCabe. The most basic was the conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands, of text messages to medi a and Garda personnel casting McCabe in a bad Iight.'

In respect of this section l have been asked what my source for this inf ormation was and whet her Superintendent Davi d Tayl or ever confirmed thi s inf ormation to me. If so, I have been asked to provide details and all attendant circunstances.

A source told me about the conversation bet ween Maurice MkCabe and Superintendent Tayl or."

So I take it that my client is not the source of the
conversation?
A. Certainly, but on the basis that $I$ sent it to him for verification, you can take that, yeah.
104 Q. Well, subject to that.
A. Yeah.

105 Q. But I am talking about really at the first meeting.
A. Yeah.
Q. "I established what had occurred in that conversation through sources. I was able to confirmthe content of the conversation. I don't recall specifically if
Superintendent Tayl or said to me about hundreds and thousands of text ressages being sent. However, the character of what he said to me would be very much al ong those lines. This was al so subsequently reflected in the protected disclosures."

So again, the texts come up in more detail in your second statement, but again, in your first statement it's in fairly non-specific terms?
A. Correct. And the reason for that being that I was contacted by the investigators prior to the second statement here and asked specifically about the texts, and as far as they were concerned the texts had taken on a major significance.
107 Q. okay. And if I could go to your second statement now, and I'm sorry, this will take a little bit of time, but there is a long chunk that was put to you and if I could just run through it with you. It commences at page 4879, volume 18.
A. Sorry, 4879?
Q. 4879 .
A. Sorry, yes.

109 Q. And just before I take you through the extended passage or passages, you, when you are making your statements to the investigators you are basing your answers almost exclusively on your recollection, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. The note that you referred to, that the investigators asked me to check -- I think actually it was for a note related to the email he sent me, but in doing that, $I$ discovered this other note that $I$ immediately sent on to the investigators.
110 Q. Which I think you described as accurate but in no way comprehensive?
A. I would say that is fair enough, yeah, yeah.

111 Q. And in fairness to you, and there is no criticism implied or otherwise, you had actually forgotten making the note?
A. I had forgotten completely. As I say, I only discovered it when asked they asked me.
112 Q. And as part of your work you talked to a lot of people, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

113 Q. And you frequently might talk to people on a rolling basis?
A. Correct.

114 Q. As a story unfolds. And sometimes, looking back on it, it can be hard to know what was said in which particular conversation?
A. That's fair enough, yes, that is reasonable.

115 Q. And that is just human memory particularly?
A. Yeah.

116 Q. But in any event, the quotation begins with the same quotation from the book about:
"...the most basic was the conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands, of text messages to the medi a and Garda personnel casting McCabe in a bad light.'

In respect of this section, $I$ have been asked what my source for this inf ormation was and whether Superintendent David Tayl or ever confirmed the inf ormation to me. If so, I have been asked to provide details and all attendant circunstances."

And just to orientate you, you are being recounted what was being put to Superintendent Taylor in his Tribunal investigators' interview.
A. Correct.

117 Q. "A. A source tol d me about the conversation." That is just what I read previous7y. And it goes on: "In respect of the above 1 --"

That is Superintendent Taylor.
"-- have been asked whet her the content of the above
extract, as attributed to me by Mr. Clifford, is accurate and if not I have been asked to detail what is i naccur ate. "

And Superintendent Taylor replied:
"I had a conversation with M chael Clifford, before I net Maurice McCabe. This was late summer. I told $M$ chael Clifford about the campai gn to negatively brief journalists about Maurice MkCabe. I told himl was to 11:11 brief journalists negatively agai nst Sergeant Mcabe in respect of the Ms. D allegation on the instructions of Martin Callinan and that this was al ways done verbally. "

I am just going to pause there for a moment before we go on to the texts. In the course of his evidence before the Tribunal, Superintendent Taylor said he hadn't discussed specifics with regard to any smear campaign and hadn't confirmed that there was a smear campaign in his first discussion with you, do you follow me?
A. I do.

118 Q. But I should say, just by reference to the note that has surfaced -- and if you could just give me one second, just to find it. The top line on your note, which is a typed note -- you had made handwritten notes, I think?
A. It's pretty -- the spell check I think was on strike
that day, Mr. O'Higgins.
119 Q. We won't worry about that. We are all guilty of that. Sometimes when the spe11 check comes up, one wonders why. But in any event, that is the typed version of an original handwritten note, is that right?
A. No.

120 Q. You just typed --
A. I just typed this into my --

121 Q. So, Dave Taylor, a few interesting things -- sorry, this is page 6628:
"Dave Tayl or, a few interesting thi ngs - DT definitely spread rumours - onl y following orders."

That's your near same day record, in any event?
A. Of what Superintendent Taylor said to me?
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

123 Q. And having put that to him, mindful of the fact that that is not a contemporaneous but a record made very closely after the conversation, he is not in a position to dispute it, is his instruction. So I'm not disputing that if you are saying that's correct.
A. oh, yeah, yeah.

124 Q. Coming on then to read on:
"In rel ation to the reference to texts in the above extract, I would have told hi mthere would have been texts in respect to updates or briefings as per my
protected di scl osure. I never di scussed my meetings --"

Sorry, first of a11, do you understand what he is saying there?
A. Yes. He is distinguishing between texts updating personne1, senior personne1 about the story and the media, whatever, as opposed to texts disparaging or whatever towards Maurice McCabe.
125 Q.
The primary difference would be one is after the event internal and up ward; the other one is prior to the event, and is an attempt to, by text we are talking, to influence how something is reported, that is the primary distinction, practical distinction, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. Whether it's prior to the event or not I am not sure, but certainly there is -- the distinction to my mind is one is basically updating in --
126 Q. In terms of what has already happened?
A. -- in terms of what's going on or if something is going to go on TV tonight or whatever, it's just updating the media; the other is the specifics of any campaign.
127 Q. I understand, it couldn't be forward pointing. But it's updates.
A. Yeah, yeah.

128 Q. And we will return to that because the texts are dealt with a little bit more in your statement.
"I never subsequently di scussed my meetings with

Maurice McCabe on the various dates with M. Clifford."

Is he right or wrong about that?
A. He is correct.

129 Q. He is correct, yeah.
"I amnot the source referred to in the above extract."

And I think that is true. And if we go on then:
"In respect of the foregoi ng extract, I have been asked whether I agree with Superintendent Tayl or's account of his di scussion with me and the date he says this occurred, late summer. If not, I have been asked to provide details and all attendant circunstances of what I recall of my meetings with Superintendent Taylor.
A. I had a notion it was earlier but I do not have an i ssue saying it was around the time late summer. My first contact was in May. Certainlylater in the
summer when I met him In relation to the meeting, my recollection is that Superintendent Tayl or placed a lot of emphasis on text messages being part of the issues around Sergeant MECabe, particularly in rel ation to communication with the seni or management of Gardaí and in contacting journalists. "

Now, I want to make clear that up to the line "within the seni or member of Gardaí ", and again, just to be
clear, we are talking about text message communication, not communication, generally I mean, with regard to text messages there was emphasis on text messages but it was only with regard to internally and upward. In other words, he did not say to you, and I think you said this morning earlier you weren't sure about this, but he did not say to you that he had put anything in a text to a journalist about Maurice McCabe and briefing negatively and the 2006 allegation.
A. Yes, I'm not --

130 Q. First of all, do you understand the distinction I am making?
A. I do, and I am -- I can't say definitively that he said he texted journalists. But also, I have no recollection of saying that he only exclusively verbally briefed journalists. The other thing there, Mr. O'Higgins, is, in terms of the communication within senior management, I mean, as I understand it, there is a conflict there between me and Superintendent Taylor to the extent that he is saying these were updates as we spoke about, whereas the impression I had is they were incriminating to the effect that they referenced Maurice McCabe.
131 Q. I don't doubt that, and I will return to that in due course. But just so that you are clear what I am putting: Yes, there was emphasis on text messages but the emphasis lat internally and upward and not outward to journalists, but I will develop that in a moment I hope.
"One i ssue I certai nly recall at one point is he certai nl y mentioned to me (Reilly) that l featured myself in a number of texts. And el aborating he said, for instance, if I was tal king about the McCabe story on the radio he would have circul ated that amongst seni or Gar da management with comment."

Now, insofar as that is any significance, it's consistent with the internal texting.
"I don't recall specifically what he said but he was paying a lot of emphasis on text messages. That was the i mpressi on that I got. I have a recollection of Superintendent Tayl or saying that he would reference the sexual abuse allegations and communi cations by text with journalists."

Now, a couple of things. First of a11, on my instructions that did not occur. Secondly, you are saying there in your statement you have a recollection, but this morning you are saying you are not sure.
A. Yeah, I can't be definitive about it. I mean, as I say, al1 I can be definitive about is that I have no recollection of him saying that it was always exclusively verbally he briefed journalists. And the emphasis on the text messages and, as I understood it, the incriminating element to the text messages, whereas those were sent to senior management by his account,

I'm not 100 percent sure that they were sent to journalists but there was such an emphasis on it and there was an emphasis on the briefing of journalists that perhaps it is quite possible that I am not 100 percent sure on that.
Could I put it like this: I know logic isn't the answer to everything, but the purpose of briefing a journalist about bad things, alleged bad things, even alleged bad things that are actually untrue to journalists, is for the purposes of hoping to influence 11:19 how the journalist will approach the story?
A. Yeah.

And it's done on an unattributed or off-the-record basis. And in that way, there is let accountability.
A. Absolutely. You would be handing up a very, very significant hostage to fortune?
A. Certainly if you did not have a very close relationship with that particular journalist.
"I have no specific recollection of Superintendent Tayl or saying that former Commissi oner Callinan scripted specific texts and that he passed them on, but I do recall himsaying that often former Commissioner

Martin Callinan would contact himand then he would contact journalists to brief negatively about Sergeant MECabe in rel ation to the allegation made by --"

Sorry.
"-- in rel ation to the allegation made himby ME. D."

I think there is a word missing there. Just to be clear, on my client's instructions there is not, and never was, any question of him saying to you or anybody else that Commissioner Callinan composed a text and sent it on to him simply as a conduit.
A. I think my only reason for referencing that, Mr. O'Higgins, was it arose previously. I mean, the investigators contacted me about this text issue when it arose in hearings there and my recollection is that, I can't remember whether it was Sergeant McCabe, that arose in some capacity and whether prompted by the investigators or not, I don't know, but I am just making the point that I have no recollection of this business of a script being effectively copied and sent on to me.
137 Q. I mean, bearing in mind the issues which have been teased out during the course of this Tribunal, have pages, which have the benefit both prior to the taking of the statement and subsequent to the taking of the statement, to check everything off a variety of
different sources, it's very time-consuming and it's a very valuable exercise. You, on the other hand, were coming in, and $I$ don't mean this in a deprecating way, scratching the surface with regard to an awful lot of things that were simmering below the surface and trying 11:22 to make sense of them, isn't that right?
A. You could interpret it that way, yeah.

138 Q. And not just you, but also the person who was articulating it and the possibility for things being taken up slightly wrong or half right or half wrong, is 11:22 quite significant, isn't that so?
A. Up to a point. I mean, I would suggest that I was fairly across things here but this encounter with Superintendent Taylor was something completely new to me and what he was presenting and, as I say, on his request I didn't take notes, so it's possible that my recollection is not 100 percent. The one thing I can say, with certainty, in general terms, and not in specific terms, is that this issue over the texts was noted on the basis of the phones, phones confiscated, smoking gun, my words, etcetera, that the thesis was central to what he was saying to me.
139 Q. I understand exactly what you are saying.
"I don't recal I whet her Superintendent Tayl or used ME. D's name when speaki ng about this, but I do recal I hi maying that we --"

That is superintendent and his wife
"-- bel i eved the allegation."

That is, that there was something -- what did it mean by "bel i eved the all egation"?
A. Well, at one point in the conversation $I$ have a recollection of Michelle Taylor saying we believed it, when David Taylor was explaining this about the briefing, again whether it was texting or briefing journalists or spreading the word, if you want 11:24 to put it that way, she made some comment to the effect of we believed it, we believed that this was true, that what her husband was engaged in was the allegation that there was substance to it or whatever, that was what she conveyed to me.
140 Q. Thank you for that. Overleaf then, and I don't have very much more to go:
"I met Superintendent Tayl or on a second occasi on in very early October 2016. Agai $n$ he was with his wife.
I met him l do recall asking himabout text messages bei $n g$ part of the campai gn agai nst Sergeant McCabe, who was one of three or four specific things l wanted to ask hi mabout. He confirmed that text messages were part of the campai gn agai nst Sergeant McCabe."

But again that is specified in fairly broad terms, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. particul ar being the crucial one, the superintendent did put the emphasis on text messages and l said, in mentioning me in referencing things that were going on, for example, Clifford's on the radio, et cetera--"

You go on then to add of your own volition:
"-- which is of a different character to briefing, reminding or emphasi sing intexts to journalists about the sexual abuse allegations agai nst Ser geant McCabe."

And you acknowledge that to the investigators.
A. That's correct, it's a different character, yeah.

142 Q. "But I do recall hi mstating that references to the
sexual abuse allegations agai nst Sergeant McCabe were frequently made in texts by him"

Now, you have my client's response to that; that that didn't occur. Could I simply add that whatever about hoping that you might have a particularly strong relationship with one journalist, if you were doing it frequently the chances of a journalist retaining that and making reference to it increases, isn't that right?
A. That is fair enough, yeah. repeating it but under law or under some under obligation would be obliged to disclose it, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

144 Q. "In this regard I di spute what Superintendent Tayl or has stated he stated to me in this context as referenced above and as follows: 'l told himl was to brief journal ists agai nst Sergeant McCabe in respect of the ME. D allegation on the instructions of Martin Callinan. This was al ways done verbally.' Frommy recollection superintendent did not al ways tell me this was done verbally. I amoperating on the basis of my recollection as I did not take notes."

And I am working on the basis that you are giving your evidence here, and from our perspective there is no doubt about this, honestly and to the best of your recollection, but recollection is and can be fallible, isn't that so?
A. That's correct, in terms of detail, yeah.

145 Q. "The second meeting with Superintendent Tayl or I asked about the texts being part of the campai gn agai nst Ser geant MECabe al ong with ot her strands specifically." 11:27

You are giving a list here.
"The creation of an intelligence file."

And it's accepted that my client did make reference to the possible existence of a file. It's what he believed. He accepts now that was incorrect, but he accepts he did have that conversation with you. He
takes issue with the suggestion that he confirmed that there was a deployment of a member to monitor Sergeant McCabe's Pulse activity, but you have a different view on that.
A. I do. And I reference that in the story I wrote because again, it was a specific in terms of any alleged campaign.

147 Q. And he didn't tell you what was in it, he didn't volunteer what was in it?
A. Beyond confirming those details --

148 Q. Those details.
A. -- no.

149 Q. And a couple of things I just want to ask you in generic terms. You would have cause, as a journalist, where people would impart to you their involvement in an event and they would complain to you that they were hard done by, that arises frequently?
A. Oh, absolutely.

150 Q. And I'm talking here incidentally in generic terms and I am talking about circumstances where you would have no doubt that the bona fides of the people voicing the complaint was not at issue, do you follow me?
A. Yes. To the extent that in their belief, in their mind they were hard done by and that they were --
Q. Yes. In other words, there are people who will tell you things that just simply aren't true, you disregard those, or there are people who are telling you things that mightn't check out, but it doesn't necessarily mean that they were lying to you, isn't that so?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can I ask you, in the latter circumstances where people make, for want of a better description, a complaint to you about how they have been -- how they are -- how they have been dealt with badly, is it common that they would frequently say if you go and check out this or that it will validate me, and that you do go and check it out and it doesn't validate them?
A. I'd have to say that there are people who say if you go and check this out it will validate me, proactively without me suggesting it, and in those terms it tends to validate them. doesn't validate them?
A. Oh, there are, absolutely. Someone will say check it out --
Q. And you would be satisfied in those circumstances it's less an attempt to lead you up the garden path and more 11:30 their own subjective assessment of their own circumstances?
A. Yeah, sometimes, Mr. O'Higgins, it's a tough one because, believe me, you get all sorts in that regard,
but there is no hard and fast rule in that regard, I'd suggest.
Q. I suppose what I am getting at is, sometimes when people cite other sources in their own mind they have given them a value far in excess of what they deserve?
A. That is true, yes, yes.
Q. And in terms of showing material prior to publication, that doesn't routinely happen, I imagine, but it can happen?
A. A very -- extremely rarely, if I can't recall, in terms 11:31 of daily newspaper publication.
Q. Because it's happening so quickly, for one thing?
A. Yeah, and as well because, you know, there's an issue over neutrality in terms of what you are reporting and that sort of thing.
Q. Would it be then that it has only been your experience that you would have a small reference sample for people you'd ask to look at stuff?
A. Are you talking about asking -- as an example of me something Superintendent Taylor about the chapter in the book, that kind of thing?
Q. Yes.
A. That would be very, very rare, yeah.
Q. I mean, if it is only -- if you have only a small reference sample you may not be able --
A. Well, I can recall one instance and that was because of sensitivity, because somebody was bereaved and their family came to me and it was an extremely sensitive situation and she wanted to see it before I published
it, and on the basis of all the circumstances I went against my natural professionalism, or whatever you want to call it, and let her have a look at it. That would be extremely rare.

You may not be able to answer this, if it happens so rarely, but I mean, is it the case that some people scrutinise every dot and comma and some people read it quickly and say that is fine?
A. I think anybody who is involved in a story would be far more towards the dot and comma and would be far quicker, not in a negative way but more in a point of information way of pointing out to you where you've got even a small detail, for example, even like the spelling of a surname or something of that nature, wrong.
we11, could I say certainly I respect and understand the logic of your observation, but I mean, as Mr. Marrinan pointed out, the word "children" appeared in the text and that does not seem to have been suggested before.
A. I'm sorry, I am not with you.
Q. Mr. Marrinan pointed up an extract from the text which referred to him briefing negatively against sergeant McCabe on the basis he had sexually abused children?
A. Oh, sorry, the plural, children, yeah.

164 Q. That doesn't seem to have been picked up?
A. No, it doesn't.

165 Q. Just the final thing, you mentioned that someone had first drawn to your attention about stories and --

CHA RMAN Wel1, just to add to that, Mr. O'Higgins, there's journalists who were briefed that Maurice McCabe was a person who had a record of sexually abusing children and then there is a reference to records and Garda files. So, that is a clear plural. 166 Q. MR. MCHAEL OHGGN: The individual whom you had the conversation in which Sergeant McCabe was referred to as a kiddie fiddler, do you know did that person get their information from within An Garda Síochána?
A. No, I -- all I can tell you there is, on the basis of what he previously told me about that individual I assumed it came from there. I also know that the same person, within the last year, speaking to him, I couldn't remember the name of that senior garda because it wasn't significant to me at the time when $I$ ran it by him, and he laughed and said you're not getting that out of me, or something to that effect. But I was not told specifically that it came from that individual, that acquaintance of this person.
MR. MCHAEL OHGGN: Thank you very much, Mr. Clifford.
MR. QU NN Chairman, I am for Mr. Clifford and if I can, if I could just reserve my position until the end. CHA RMAN of course you can, yes.
MR. QUN: I have nothing at the moment, though.
CHA RMAN Mr. Dignam?
MR. DI GNAM Chairman, I have a number of questions for Mr. Clifford.

169 Q. And line 146. I think you can probably read it on the screen, Mr. Clifford. I don't think there is any controversy between us on this.
A. okay.

170 Q. Line 146, you were asked by the investigator in your first interview with them in December 2017, you were asked to detail any contact as may have been had by you directly with Gardaí of whatever rank as to the character, real or supposed, of Sergeant Maurice McCabe, and the detail and provenance thereof, and your answer is "no". Can I take it from that that you had Garda Síochána?
A. Correct.

171 Q. On page 4110 you were asked whether you had any
information in relation to an orchestrated campaign, and again, I think you answer that you have no such information, from your direct know7edge. On page -sorry?
A. Correct, yes.

172 Q. Page 4112, you were specifically asked at the bottom of that page, line 218, the investigators put it to that you for:

"For the avoi dance of doubt, and in the interests of clarity, I have been asked whether former Commi ssi oner Martin Callinan, former Commi ssi oner Nói rín Ơ Sullivan or any ot her Garda member ever spoke to [you] and negativel y brief ed [you] in respect to Sergeant Maurice McCabe. "

And you answer "no".
A. Correct.

173 Q. That remains your position, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

174 Q. Yes. And in fact, you very fairly express some surprise that nothing like this had ever occurred, on page 4118 , at the bottom of that page, you say that:
"Looking back on it, I amvery surprised that I was not 11:37 contacted by David Tayl or or anyone in the media at that time, because in my experience if you are writing anything negative about any organisation people may reach out to try and soften what has been written. in
retrospect, I amsurprised that di d not happen."
A. Yes, Mr. Dignam.
Q. Yes.
A. And I wasn't referring there that I wasn't contacted in order to be briefed negatively about Sergeant McCabe in relation to any of these issues, but merely it was my experience in terms of dealing -- I know, for instance, in one instance in the business world and in the political world, when you are writing, when you make contact with the official Press Office, often you get a 11:38 phone call saying, listen, a cup of coffee, 1 just want to give you a bit of background in relation to that and that is what $I$ was referring.
176 Q. Yes. And that didn't occur?
A. No.

177 Q. No. Now, I think you described yourself in response to some of Mr. Marrinan's questions as a generalist, you cover all sorts of stories and all sorts of topics for the Examiner and indeed for your other publications?
A. That's correct.

178 Q. I think it is fair to say that you have been very involved in stories about Sergeant McCabe and the penalty points issues and indeed the controversies that have given rise to this Tribunal, isn't that fair to say?
A. That's correct. And that came out of a situation over the years whereby I was involved in writing stories about the Gardaí coming from you might call a different angle than the news of the day or the security
correspondents and perhaps that is how I ended up in this.

179 Q. Yes. And indeed you have continued your interest in the story and you have continued to broadcast, etcetera, and contribute to discussions of the Tribunal 11:39 indeed during the course of the Tribunal?
A. Correct, yes.

180 Q. Yes. And I think in that vein, you were in fact the first person -- you in fact broke the story of the protected disclosures having been made, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

181 Q. And you didn't name the protected disclosers but you broke the fact of two protected disclosures having been made?
A. That's correct.

182 Q. And I think you describe them as having been made by senior officers in An Garda Síochána. And that led to, in fact, I think three articles in the Examiner -three items in the Examiner on the 4th October; a front 11:39 page article, an editorial and I think an analysis piece by yourself, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

183 Q. Yes. And can I take it that you had an input into the editorial that was written in the paper on that day?
A. I honestly cannot tell you that. Occasionally the editorial writer contacts me. I can't say definitively whether he did on that occasion. I wouldn't be surprised if he didn't because I would have been very
busy that day. But I can't be definitive on that. 184 Q. Fair enough. In fact, I am not sure the Tribunal has those articles and we had some difficulty in obtaining them but we have eventually found them on-line this morning, but can I ask you, did Superintendent Taylor ever contact you after the publication of those articles to say that anything stated in them was wrong?
A. I was in contact with him but he never stated that anything was wrong in any of them.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Dignam, you have seen the articles, $I$ haven't, but is there something significant in them that I ought to know about?

MR. DI GNMM I was going to ask, just put some smal1 piece toss, Mr. Clifford.
CHAN RMAN That is fine.
MR. DI GNMM I am afraid, Chairman, I haven't got a printed copy because we literally found them as the evidence was being heard. We can arrange to have copies made, or indeed Mr. Clifford's team may have copies.
CHA RMAN It's fine to listen, thanks.
MR. DI GNAM In the analysis piece, Mr. Clifford, you say that:
"Today's revel ations in the Irish Examiner about two protected disclosures alleging the maltreat ment of a whi stlebl ower suggests that little has changed."

And that follows on from a discussion in the preceding
paragraphs of the culture within An Garda Síochána.
A. Yeah --
Q. And you say then:
"The di scl osures allege that there was a concerted campai gn amongst seni or management in the force to destroy the character of a whi stlebl ower. There were different strands to the alleged campai gn, incl uding the di ssemi nation of text messages cont ai ning fal sehoods about the officer in question, briefing of el ements of the media and even the creation of an intelligence file on the officer."

Now, Superintendent Taylor didn't take issue with any of the contents of that paragraph, is that right?
A. No.

187 Q. Yes. And now, you describe the contents of the protected disclosures as revelations elsewhere in the newspaper, and you draw from these revelations that nothing has changed in An Garda Síochána. Now --
A. Sorry, I can't remember specifically but I would imagine that would be the general gist of it, yeah. Can I ask you, had you seen the two protected disclosures when you wrote those articles in the paper on the 4th October?

CHA RMAN Of which year was that?
MR. DI GNAM Sorry, of 2016.
A. Yeah, I might have a difficulty there, Mr. Dignam, in terms of sources and that, in terms of identifying or
potentially identifying sources in terms of answering that specifically.
189 Q. Okay. Well, you have told us that -- I think you have told us that Superintendent Taylor didn't give you the protected disclosure?
A. Correct.

190 Q. Okay. But you don't feel in a position to say whether anybody else gave you those protected disclosures?
A. I don't, no.
A. I don't feel in a position to say that exactly on the basis of identifying people, sources.
Q. Okay. Now, what checks did you do to confirm the truth or otherwise of the contents of what was contained in the protected disclosures, whether you saw them or not?
A. You are saying the allegations effectively that were in the disclosures?

193 Q. Yes.
A. What did I do to check them?

194 Q. Yes.
A. Well, put it this way: I made some phone calls after my first meeting with Superintendent Taylor, and in one of those calls I was able to establish that his narrative about how he had been suspended and all had some sympathy in some sections of An Garda Síochána, and I'd have to say presumably no more than myself, and a lot of us, those sections were not fully au fait with the exact details of what Superintendent Taylor's involved in, but the actual allegations, the substance
you are talking about is this alleged smear campaign. 195 Q. Yes.
A. And you are asking what did I do to check whether that had occurred. There was very little I could do in that regard. In terms of publishing that and feeling justified in publishing it, there are a couple of things in that regard that $I$ would say: First of all, this is -- in publishing that, it's a process whereby it goes through the editorial hierarchy inside in the Examiner, which backed up my decision that this was in the public interest and that this should have been published. Then you are talking about the substance of the issue. In the first instance, this was unprecedented. You had a superintendent in An Garda síochána nominally of good standing, was making a protected disclosure about what was occurring within the force. That of itself was completely unprecedented. Equally so, who he was incriminating in there. In the first instance he was incriminating himself. I don't know even since the protected disclosure or anything of that nature has come in, have we ever had a scenario whereby somebody making it was incriminating and incriminating himself to the extent that he was admitting that he was involved in a smear campaign to effectively brand Sergeant McCabe as a paedophile and to do so for no other than to ingratiate himself to his boss or further his career. That is that element of it. The second element: The other person he incriminated was former Commissioner

Callinan, somebody with whom he had a very good relationship, whom he looked up to and whom he regarded as something of a mentor.
CHAN RMAN I am sorry, I beg your pardon for interrupting you, but I don't understand your answer, that David Taylor was doing it to ingratiate himself and further his career, I'm not sure -- are you saying that?
A. Sorry --

CHA RMAN I just don't understand what you are saying. 11:46
A. Sorry, what $I$ am saying is, in terms of the context -in terms of the decision to publish the protected disclosure, it was unprecedented.
CHAN RMAN To publish where?
A. To publish it in the -- to publish that a protected disclosure had been made.

CHA RMAN Al1 right.
A. It was unprecedented in terms of the individual who was making it, and in terms of what he was admitting within it, that he had done himself. And -- are you with me?
CHA RMAN I do, I get you.
A. And the substance of that involved him admitting that he was involved in, I think what anybody would describe as lowest kind of behaviour, and his reasoning for doing that was no more than it would further his career. He wasn't personally motivated to brand Sergeant McCabe in this regard, he wasn't doing it from a -- any other reason other than --
CHAI RMAN Sure. But he told me he was following
orders and indeed in the note which you made of your first conversation with him you also note that as well.
A. But he also, and he said this to me and I believe he said in his statement, it was done in a manner that suggested there was no smoke without fire, which would suggest was beyond any -- you could reduce to following orders. That is the only reason I reference that, sorry.
CHA RMAN So did he say no smoke without fire when you met him?
A. Oh, he said that it was done -- I can't remember was it the first or second meeting, but he said words to the effect that in spreading this -- and as I say, he didn't want to concentrate -- he said, you know, he'd te11 the lads and, you know, okay, it was a -- the allegation was deemed no prosecution, but said in a way there's no smoke without fire. That kind of a way. CHA RMAN Right. Okay. No, it's just, you have him noted on7y following --
A. Sorry, that's my only reason for suggesting about his motivation.

196 Q. MR. DI GNMM Mr. Clifford, I don't think there is any disagreement between us that the fact of a protected disclosure of this nature being made by a serving superintendent in An Garda Síochána and indeed by a serving sergeant, albeit the sergeant was based on what Superintendent Taylor had told him, was significant, and was newsworthy. what I'm asking you about is whether you took any steps at all to check the truth of
the allegations contained in the protected disclosures or contained in what you were told by either Sergeant McCabe or by Superintendent Taylor in your conversations with them?
A. No, I wasn't in a position to do so, Mr. Dignam. It would have involved, for example, approaching Nóirín O'Sullivan and Martin Callinan and asking them were they involved in a campaign. I was reporting the lodgement of this protected disclosure.
197 Q.
Yes. You see, what you describe -- sorry, what the paper describes them as, in the editorial, and I appreciate that you don't remember whether you had any input into this, is revelations. So, something was being revealed. Now, I have to put it to you that that puts it's higher than simply allegations are being made by somebody. The newspaper is revealing wrongdoing by former Commissioner o'Sullivan and former Commissioner Callinan in their edition of the 4th October, and you hadn't checked or taken any steps to check what Commissioner o'Sullivan or indeed former Commissioner has to say about it.
MR. QU N: Chairman, if Mr. Dignam is going to pursue a line that in some way Mr. Clifford or the paper was actually saying that what was in these protected disclosures was true, then the full editorial and the full articles should be given to the witness, because I don't think they reflect the tenor of what is being put by Mr. Dignam.
CHA RMAN Yes, but it's a fair point to make.

Apparently the point being made is that the word used was a revelation. So I take a revelation to mean that you are digging and you uncover, I don't know what, an ancient gold chalice or something like that or that somebody comes forward and something that we don't know before is revealed as the truth. So that's what I take that to mean, Mr. Quinn. But I also understand that paper doesn't refuse ink and that quite often to get across a point or to show how serious things are people use hyperbole. So, I mean, if there is a point on that. There clearly is a point, Mr. Dignam, you can pursue it I think.
MR. DI GNAM Perhaps, rather than opening up a11 of the articles, and obviously mr. Quinn can do that in re-examination if he wishes, the paragraph in which the 11:50 word revelation is used is two paragraphs down in the editorial, and it states:
"Today's revel ations about an organi sed campai gn dri ven by seni or Garda management to undermine a whi stlebl ower 11:50 does not strengthen the hand of the force and will weaken any support for industrial action Gardaí might consi der."

And that was in the context of there being talk of industrial action.
A. Yeah, I didn't write that editorial.

198 Q. Okay.
A. "Revelation" was used, and I take your point. To me
the revelation was that this disclosure had gone in rather than the content of the disclosure.
Q. okay. Rather than a revelation about an organised campaign, it's the revelation that somebody had put a protected disclosure in --
A. Exactly.
Q. If I could just ask you then to deal with your conversations with Superintendent Taylor over the course of the summer/autumn of 2016. You had two meetings with Superintendent Taylor, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you had a phone call in the early summer, about early June, and then a meeting with him in, you think, late August?
A. Or early September.
Q. Or early September. And then a further meeting on the first weekend --
A. -- of October.
Q. Yes. In the day or two before this article actually appeared?
A. Correct.
Q. Yes. And in the first meeting, you say that that came about because you heard that Mrs. Taylor, Michelle Taylor, had met Sergeant McCabe and I think you said that that may have piqued your interest?
A. I that is a possibility. I genuinely cannot remember and I can't remember even whether I initiated the phone call but looking back on it that is a possibility, and equally the idea that $I$ would have rang him about the
fact that I was writing a book, I would find difficult to accept on the basis of, if I was ringing somebody I knew well -- you know, this was a guy who was hostile to me as far as I was concerned, prior to one conversation, I doubt very much I would have cold-called him and said give me a hand with this book.
205 Q. And if this was the case that you had heard that Mrs. Taylor had met Sergeant McCabe, where would you have heard that from?
A. I would have heard it from sources.

206 Q. And you don't feel able to disclose who would have told you that?
A. No.

207 Q. Now, at the first meeting, which was the meeting in either early -- sorry, late August or early September, Mr. Quinn on your behalf put it to Mrs. Taylor on day 76 that:
"At that meeting Superintendent Tayl or effectively laid out a case that he bel ieved that the criminal i nvestigation agai nst him was notivated by the then- Commi ssi oner, Nói rín O Sul I i van, wanting to get her hands on her husband's mobile phones."

That is your memory of it, is that right?
A. And that is what I have related today, I believe.

208 Q. Yes. And it was also put that -- it was put by Mr. Quinn on your behalf that you recollect Superintendent Taylor pointing out that the

Commissioner, Commissioner O'Sullivan's husband was part of the team investigating him?
A. Correct.

209 Q. And we know that to be, as a matter of fact, correct. And that:
"Mr. Clifford recalls Superintendent Tayl or saying that the reason she wanted to get his phones, i.e. Superintendent Tayl or's phones, was your husband was expl ai ni ng that on his phones was evi dence that would I ink Commi ssi oner O Sul Ii van to the smear campai gn."

And I think that has been your evidence today also, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

210 Q. Yes. And you are quite clear that that was the tenor or the substance of the conversation that you had with Superintendent Taylor when you met him in late August possibly early September?
A. Yes. He effectively made a case or presented a thesis, if you want to put it that way. I also, and again this is only my speculation, on the basis it was done, it was either practised or else he had done a similar exercise with people prior to me. That was my impression.
211 Q. Yes. That he had already discussed this with people prior to you?
A. If I could put it this way: The presentation of that case, the manner in which it was done, it struck me
that he had either practiced this or he had made a similar presentation to perhaps other journalists, perhaps other people, I don't know, that was an impression that I came away with from that.
CHA RMAN what you are saying is, it wasn't improvised 11:54 out, it seems to be a presentation like you would get a presentation like slides or whatever?
A. Yeah. Well, obviously, Chairman, not as professional as that, but just in terms of the general tenor. For example, there was some paperwork there, it was on the coffee table, and you know, small stacks at right angles, as would you, you know, and just the whole thrust of what he was saying, as I say, it wasn't something that struck me as being presented simultaneously or off the top of his head kind of thing.

212 Q. MR. DI GNMM And on page 210 of the transcript it was put to Mrs. Taylor by Mr. Quinn:
"During this meeting --"

That is the first meeting.
"-- your husband put a big emphasis on how, in his vi ew, the texts were key to everything and that he had used texts to bl acken Sergeant MECabe's name and the texts on his phone would show who was in the loop, namel y Cormi ssi oner O Sul Iivan. "

I think that has been the tenor of your evidence this morning also?
A. Correct.

213 Q. I think you say in your interview with the investigators that your recollection is that a lot of emphasis was placed on the text messages?
A. And that is because emphasis was placed on the phones.

214 Q. Yes. Now, you describe this morning, you say that the central character in this discussion was Nóirín o'sullivan, and you then went on to discuss, and I'm sorry, Mr. Clifford, I don't know whether I have mixed up the first and second meeting but you then said that he didn't dwe11, that Superintendent Taylor didn't dwe11 on his campaign?
A. That was the first meeting.

215 Q. That was the first meeting. And you say that he spoke in a general way about the campaign, you said that you were told by Superintendent Taylor that Mr. Callinan would send him a text and he would pass it on to other senior members and the media. You very fairly said that you can't say that Superintendent Taylor said it was by text, but simply that it was passed on, and you then described his central thesis, I think is the phrase that you used, was that Ms. O'Sullivan wanted to get her hands on the phone to secure that evidence, so 11:56 to speak?
A. Correct.

216 Q. Yes. And you referred to him referring to the appointment of Jim McGowan as part of that plot, is
that right?
A. Correct, to the extent that, yes, he was on the investigation team to be the one to take control of these phones.
Yes. And you then moved on to the second meeting, which happened very early in October, that first weekend in October, immediately prior to the articles in the newspaper, and you say that you contacted him at that stage because you had three or four things that you wanted to check with him. Yes. And they were put 11:57 to Mrs. Taylor by Mr. Quinn also. But if I could first ask you: what were the three or four things that you wanted to check with him?
A. The three things, three anyway, was the texts, the creation of an intelligence file and the deployment of a member to monitor his active on Pulse.
Q. And do I understand you correctly to say that it wasn't Superintendent Taylor who had told you about those things in the first instance?
A. Yes, those were issues I wanted to check with him, that 11:58 this formed part of his narrative, whether he specifically referenced them in the disclosure or not but that this formed part of his case that he was putting in the disclosure.
219 Q. Yes. You had been told those by somebody else and you wanted to confirm those with Superintendent Taylor, is that right?
A. I had acquired the information elsewhere.

220 Q. okay. And you feel unable to tell us who gave you that
information?
A. Exactly.
Q. A11 right. Now --

CHA RMAN Am I wrong in assuming it's Maurice McCabe?
A. Well, I'll put it this way to you, Chairman: I don't feel in a position to name anybody on the basis that one thing can lead to another and identify people. CHA RMAR Again, no, I appreciate that. But you will appreciate as we11 that 1 1istened here to a great deal of stuff that was irrelevant or nonsensical, and that is the case in every court case, you can narrow a court case of 50 days down to perhaps ten hours of evidence that actually really, really matters. So that is what I meant in that regard. So you are not confirming or denying it's Maurice McCabe, you don't feel you can?
A. I don't feet in a position to do so.

Yes. Now, you have heard, and I know you have been following, I'm sure, the Tribunal in a personal and professional capacity, but you have heard the -Superintendent Taylor's account that the only role text messages played was in him telling former Commissioner

Callinan and former Commissioner O'Sullivan when there was an item in the media about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Correct, yeah.

Now, was the emphasis that Superintendent Taylor placed on the role of text messages as benign as that in the conversation that you had with him?
A. No, Mr. Dignam, because basic logic, for that to be the case then there would be no great revelation, no great emphasis on the phones. And as I say, this idea of the phones being confiscated was central to what he was saying and therefore there would have to be something incriminating on the phones by extension. Now, can I just move to the chapter of the book, we know, and I won't delay on this, Mr. Clifford, we know that you asked Superintendent Taylor to fact-check for want of a better phrase, and I use that in shorthand, the section or the chapter from your book, and that he had it for up to a week, you think it came back fairly promptly?
A. Pretty promptly, yes.

227 Q. And you sent that to him in May of --
A. 2017.

228 Q. -- 2017, yes. And I am just going to refer you to a couple of specific sections or sentences in that extract. At the bottom of page 6619, right at the bottom of the page, going over on to 6620, it's stated that:

[^2]Meaning, Ms. O'Sullivan.
"-- appoi nted her husband, Detective Superintendent Jim McGowan, to head up the i nvesti gation."

And just below that, three lines below that, it's stated:
"Thi s move ensures that any inf ormation retai ned on the 12:02 devi ces was now in the possessi on of Headquarters."

On 6622, it's stated clearly, towards the bottom of the page, that:
"There were a number of strands to the campai gn, he tol d the i ncredul ous McCabe. The most basic was the conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands, of text messages to medi a and Garda personnel casting McCabe in a dark light. Journalists were briefed that McCabe was a person who had a record of sexually abusing children, excuses were invented as to why there was no of ficial record of these crimes or allegations."

And there is also reference, on page 6623, to
"An intelligence file had been created on McCabe in Garda HQ. The file was kept under a Christian name
whi ch coinci ded with the name of the offspring of a seni or officer. An intelligence file is only created if the subject is suspected of serious crime, usually i nvol ving vi ol ence, yet HQ, according to Tayl or, sought
fit to pl ace McCabe in such company."

Now, I think you are probably aware from following the Tribunal that, in fact, Superintendent Taylor is not making any of those allegations now, are you aware of?
A. I am aware of that, yes.

229 Q. But when you sent him this section of the book you were relying on information that you had, and I am not going to ask you just at the moment where you got that information but you were relying on information that you had, you clearly sent this to the Superintendent Taylor and he did not at any stage come back to you to say any of those items or statements are incorrect?
A. Correct.

230 Q. Yes. Now, in relation to the investigation into him, on page 6620, you write just on the third paragraph, you write:
"As per procedure, he was hel $d$ in a cell and had various personal effects renoved fromhimfor the period of his detention."

And you correctly identify that that is per procedure. But do I take it from that, that Superintendent Taylor was taking issue with having been placed in a cell and
having personal effects removed from him?
A. He did take issue with that to the extent that he described it in a way that he believed to be humiliating and he also suggested that one individual in particular who was present in the station that day who showed him some understanding or compassion, or whatever you want to call it, was subsequently, I don't know was it demoted or transferred, but he -- it obviously had a major impact on him and he certainly felt he could have been treated in a better way in that 12:05 regard, $I$ think that's definitely the case.

231 Q. Yes. And over the page on 6621, halfway down the page, you write:
"Those colleagues who were investigating him with what Tayl or consi dered excessi ve zeal were, as he had once been hi nself, only following orders."

And I take it that the description of the investigating members conducting themselves with excessive zeal came 12:05 from Superintendent Taylor?
A. Absolutely.

232 Q. And you have heard his position in relation to that and the position he now takes in relation to that, during the course of the Tribunal?
A. I have.

233 Q. And he didn't correct either of those statements?
A. No.

CHA RMAN I am not sure he has changed his mind,

Mr. Dignam. In fact, he hasn't changed his mind on that.

MR. DI GNAM I thought, and I stand to be corrected here, I thought he had said that he was no longer asserting that the individuals who interviewed him at least were oppressive or --

CHA RMAN We11, that is different. what he said was, he should never have been arrested, there was no need to arrest him. And if you are arrested, I know the reason you take off people's belts and laces and things 12:06 like that is because of the risk of suicide, which unfortunately is high in those circumstances.
234 Q. MR. DI GNAM Now, on 4111 --
CHA RMAN I mean, it's a general principle, that is what I mean, not in his specific case.
MR. DI GNAM Yes.
235 Q. On 4111, Mr. Clifford, you say, and I think you have said -- you have given evidence to this effect this morning, you say that, on line 196:
"I got the impressi on that he" -- meaning Superintendent Taylor -- "attributed his plight in respect of his arrest and suspensi on to his know edge of the campai gn whi ch he said was conducted through him agai nst Ser geant McCabe and specifically the allegation 12:07 that Nói rín Ơ Sullivan was at least aware of it. That was the gist of the conversation with himand I did mention it when l subsequently spoke to Sergeant Maurice McCabe. "

So that is the impression you got, am I right, from what was said by Superintendent Taylor, is that correct?
A. Yeah, it is -- I am probably, on reflection, under-stating it when I use the word "i mpressi on", because, you know, as I stated in terms of the specifics of what he said, he was pretty explicit in laying out that case.
Q. Yes. Now, you refer in your -- in the extract from your book, and I think also in your interviews with the investigators, to Superintendent Taylor telling you that he was being investigated for the leaking of the Roma children information?
A. Correct.

237 Q. Yes. Did Superintendent Taylor ever tell you that, in fact, he was also and had also been investigated for a multitude of leaking incidents?
A. No.

238 Q. No. the root of this or what was at the heart of this investigation was one leaking incident of the Roma children's information?
A. And I certainly believe that was -- I believe that, and I believe it was a widespread believe, to be honest.
239 Q. Yes. And, in fairness, I think in your evidence this morning you -- or just a few moments ago, you referred to your view of the proportionality of the investigation and indeed others' views of the
proportionality of the investigation may well have been based on their belief that it was one incident --
A. As far as I could determine, that was the case, yeah.

Yes. And can I take it from that that your view of things may have been somewhat different if you had been 12:08 aware of all of the facts in relation to the investigation?
A. My view of the animus that Superintendent Taylor appeared to have for Nóirín O'Sullivan would have certainly been in a different light, Mr. Dignam. It would not have affected, in my opinion, and I can only speculate at this remove, the decision, certainly from my point of view, whatever about my editor's, to pursue the publication of the story that that protected disclosure was made.

And if I could just come back to that then, the fact that you were aware of the level of animus that Superintendent Taylor had towards Ms. O'Sullivan, because I think that had been made clear to you by Superintendent Taylor in both the first and second meeting, did that not cause you any concern in publishing the article -- or, sorry, in giving the articles to the newspaper to be published on the 4th october?
A. It certainly gave me pause for thought, but you have to 12:09 put this into context; in many instances that I would come across and many instances of any nature for -- the most obvious example is a tribunal, that, fortunately, Chairman, I don't think you will be heading for the
record of 13 years, but the Planning Tribunal -- the Planning Tribunal, as I think we are aware, began over a grudge an individual had for his employer not providing a pension. That is the nature of these things. Now, absolutely, I took that into account, but 12:10 as I was saying to you before, $I$ balanced that against both the substance of the allegation in terms of my knowledge over the previous three or four years, both the fact that it was self-incriminating and that it was also incriminating somebody to whom Mr. Taylor
obviously looked up to. All scenarios like that in terms of publication, some sort of a balance has to be reached between suppressing information - and I was in possession of that information - and the fairness to everybody involved, and, in my opinion, that was achieved. It wasn't just desirable to publish it, but it was necessary to publish it.
242 Q. And I think you will accept, I take it, that the revelation that was made in those articles caused a storm of controversy during the course of that week, is 12:11 that --
A. It certainly did, Mr. Dignam, but I will also have to add to that, I'm afraid, that is not my responsibility.
243 Q. I was simply asking you was that -- would you accept that that started a storm of controversy, not about your article but about the contents of your article, or what was reported in your article?
A. When you say 'storm of controversy', there was definitely a reaction to the story, absolutely, yeah.

A large reaction, yes.
244 Q. And, in fact, you had a story on the front page of the Examiner the following Saturday where you quoted Deputy Wallace, where the headline said "Garda boss will be gone in weeks", and I think in the course of the article you quoted Deputy wallace saying Commissioner O'Sullivan would be gone by Christmas?
A. I don't recall that, but $I$ will take your word for it, yeah.

Now, can I just ask you why did you not write this story when you had the first meeting with Superintendent Taylor?
A. Oh, when I walked away from that meeting, as far as I was concerned, this thing, most likely, certainly in the short-term, would never see the light of day. For that to happen, Mr. Taylor would have had to incriminate himself. For it also to happen there would be potential legal problems all over the place. And let me put it this way to you: Perhaps if I had been more on the ball, I would have gone in there and recorded the conversation, but even if I had done that, I doubt very much if my newspaper would have published a story, even if I pushed it, on that basis, because it would just be replete with dangers.
246 Q. I think part of your explanation was that Superintendent Taylor had also said it was not for publication, is that right?
A. Oh, absolutely, yeah, yeah. But even if I disregarded that, is what I am saying.

247 Q. And can I then ask you, did you get a release, for want of a better word, from Superintendent Taylor, before the articles were published in the paper on the 4th October, that it was now for publication?
A. No, it didn't work like that at all. I approached Superintendent Taylor and he didn't sound surprised that I had knowledge of this and he agreed to meet me, and, in the course of that conversation, he -- this is in the second meeting -- he said something to the effect of, I don't mind you getting this story, sure you are covering the McCabe stuff, or whatever. Now, that didn't mean a thing to me, one way or the other. As far as I was concerned, I was going ahead with it. And it would certainly seem -- he certainly did not at any point there say, 'I would prefer if you didn't cover it' or 'I'm releasing you to that extent', to covering the -- reporting on it.
248 Q. And I take it, I think, and correct me if I am wrong, that you believed that the protected disclosures going in gave you clearance to publish the articles without checking with Superintendent Taylor that it was now for publication, is that fair?
A. Yes, what I checked with Superintendent Taylor were specifics that I understood to be in the protected disclosure. As a newsworthy event, as an event in which there is public interest, this was unprecedented.
249 Q. Yes. Now, just turning then - and I am almost finished, Mr. Clifford - but turning to the conversation, to Superintendent Taylor's conversations
with Sergeant McCabe on the 20th September and to the 21st September 2016, as I understand it there were three individuals party to those conversations: there was Mr. Taylor, Mrs. Taylor and -- Superintendent Taylor, Mrs. Taylor and Sergeant McCabe. If I could just ask you to look at page 4113 of your interview. CHA RMAN well, sorry, Mr. Dignam, we are talking here about the meeting in the house?
MR. DIGMM Yes, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN And the meeting the following day in the house, specifically between the Taylors and Maurice McCabe?

MR. DIGNM Yes, Chairman.
CHAN RNAN All right. okay.
250 Q. MR. DI GNMM So, Mr. Clifford, at the bottom of page
4113, you are asked about your book and you are then asked what your source for the information contained in the quote - I don't need to go over it again immediately above it is. And you say that:
"A source told me about the conversation bet ween Maurice McCabe and Superintendent Tayl or."

That is the meeting on the 20th September. And do I take it from the way that that is couched that you don't feel able to tell us who the source, who told you about the conversation between Sergeant McCabe and Superintendent Taylor was?
A. Correct.

251 Q. Yes. Can I take it that it was not Superintendent Taylor?
A. I just -- I don't want -- I wouldn't go any further than just saying I wouldn't talk about it, Mr. Dignam, just on the basis -- as far as I know, I'm the only person coming in here speaking in any detail about any interaction with David Taylor on the basis he has waived privilege. That is a precarious road to go down on the basis of identifying other sources, so I don't want to go any further than that.
252 Q. Now, you then go on to say:
"I establ ished what occurred in that conversation through sources."

And --
CHA RMAN I mean, at the end of the day, you know, Mr. Dignam, again it's a question of where we go on this, and I appreciate where you are coming from and the skill with which you are doing this, but, look, I am not asked in the terms of reference to comment on the media, whether the media did a good or bad job or whether paper will refuse ink, whether there should be higher standards in journalism. I mean, people can form their own view on that, and if they don't like what they read in a paper, they can stop buying it, or if they don't like what they hear on any particular form of media, they can just, you know, turn somewhere else.

MR. DI GNAM Yes, Chairman, I am not going to push the point. I simply wanted to get Mr. Clifford's answers and I am not going to dig any deeper or --
CHA RMAN No, I know, but, I mean, at the end of the day, what was said in the room, if you like, is between 12:17 Michelle Taylor and David Taylor and Maurice McCabe and the various reports of that. I'm not going to be helped, one way or the other, by anything else. And vis-á-vis Mr. Clifford and David Taylor and the waiving of privilege, I understand where Mr. Clifford is coming 12:17 from in that regard, but, you know, again it's a question of where are the side alleys in this and should -- if a hare runs down there, should I follow for the purpose of seeing if there is anything there. I would prefer to stick with what I am supposed to do. But you have a point to make, but maybe you would move and make the point.

MR. DIGNM Yes. May it please you, Chairman.
253 Q. I take it, Mr. Clifford, I just want to formally ask you the question, that you -- that you don't feel able, $12: 17$ because of journalistic privilege, to disclose who told you what -- how you established or who told you what to allow you establish what had occurred in the conversation between Superintendent Taylor, Mrs. Taylor and Sergeant McCabe?
A. Correct.

254 Q. Yes.
CHA RMAK But again, even -- suppose it were the case that I was to say, we11, that is something that doesn't
attract journalistic privilege, first of all I would have to explore that as to the facts and circumstances, but secondly, I presume David Taylor and Michelle Taylor spoke to other people, I presume Maurice McCabe spoke to other people, I presume he got advice. The circumstances under which information stays confined is extremely rare. And this is more like an inkblot, to be quite frank; it lands on the page and it spreads out. You know, it's not going to help me, because, at the end of the day, the primary evidence, instead of the dúi rt bean Ii om go ndúi rt bean I éi (go ndúi rt bean eile) rud éi gi $n$, is the three people in the room and what was written down in consequence of it. So that is the reason $I$ am not following it, Mr. Dignam. If you want to press it, I will certainly look at it. MR. DI GNAM No, Chairman. I just wanted to ask those questions to Mr. Clifford.
255 Q. Now, Mr. Clifford, then just turning to the -- page 4109 of your interview, you deal with the RTÉ broadcasts on the 9th March -- of May.
A. Hmm .
Q. And you -- you express your opinion in relation to those, and no doubt that RTÉ and Mr. Reynolds will deal with that when Mr. Reynolds comes to give evidence, but you say, and I'd ask you to confirm that this is correct, that you had seen a leaked copy of the O'Higgins Report prior to the broadcasts on the 9th May, is that right?
A. That's correct.

257 Q. Yes. And then on page 4105 you deal with the Tus7a notification, which was the subject of the RTÉ Prime Time programme on -- in February 2017, and you say that you were aware of an -- of an issue in Tusla in respect to Sergeant McCabe for a period of time before that became public knowledge, is that right?
A. It first became public knowledge in the Irish Examiner, Mr. Dignam, that afternoon. That's correct.
Q. Yes. And --

CHA RMAN So - I am sorry for interrupting,
Mr. Dignam - so the cascade, if you like, of controversy in relation to this matter was, you knew it first in some way or other, and then the Irish Examiner published it and then there was the Prime Time programme, is that correct?
A. Well, Chairman, I don't know when Prime Time became aware of it, but the publication of it --
CHA RMAR No, what I meant, when the Prime Time programme out?
A. The Prime Time programme occurred that evening and it was in the Examiner that afternoon.
CHA RMAN Sure. But again, I am not seeking to find out who knew what and in what order, it's just that seemed to be the way the public controversy, if you like, hit the public consciousness.
A. Correct.

259 Q. MR. DI GNMM And can I just ask you to confirm what you then say on page 4106, that you weren't briefed by anyone in An Garda Síochána in relation to this issue,

```
as you describe it, in Tusla?
```

A. Correct, yes.

260 Q. Yes. And then just a final point, Mr. Clifford, and it's a small point, but you say that you weren't aware how Garda wilson got the nickname which has been discussed over the course of the last period of time, is that right?
A. I feel very left out in that regard, Mr. Dignam. MR. DI GNAM Thank you, Mr. Clifford.

CHA RMAN Mr. Quinn, was there anything you wanted to ask?

MR. QU N: Just very briefly, Chair, one or two questions.

## MR. CLI FFORD WAS EXAM NED BY MR. QU NN

Q. MR. QU NN Mr. Clifford, you have been asked a few questions about what was published in the Examiner on 4th October 2016 by Mr. Dignam, on behalf of the two former commissioners. And I just want to ask you, but in this context say that both the solicitor for the newspaper and the editor at the time have both given instructions that no complaint was made about your articles or the editorial by anyone after their publication; can I ask you were you aware of anyone making any complaint about what you published in the newspaper on the 4th October?
A. No, my -- there was no complaint whatsoever that I am aware of at all, Mr. Quinn.

265 Q. Yes. And I think as one looks down through the article 12:23 there is reference to allegations, claims and the raising of concerns and, for example, I think five paragraphs down it says:
"The di scl osures were made in the Department of Justice within the last week."

I think you have explained in your answer to Mr. Dignam in some detail why this was an unprecedented set of circumstances and why, in your view, this was a newsworthy story, and I won't ask you to go over that again. But it then continues:
"And will raise fresh questions about the treat ment of whi stl ebl owers wi thi $n$ the force."

And then you continue:
"In particular, the seni ority of the officers making
the clains and the fact that one of themis admitting his own cul pability will gi ve rise to fresh concerns as to how those within the force -- how those who came forward are dealt with."

And again, can you say do you believe there was anything in what you were writing that was stating that this was true?
A. No, my belief, and it's -- hopefully it's conveyed very properly there, was that this was an allegation that was being made, but the weight of the allegation was pretty heavy on the basis that the person making it and what the allegation was in the context of much had gone over the previous years.

CHA RMAN Yes, it's the old principle; if you make an allegation against yourself, incriminating yourself, it's more likely to be true than if you are allegedly incriminating somebody else.
A. Absolutely. And as well --
A. Absolutely none.

MR. QU NE Thank you, Mr. Clifford.
CHA RMAN Is there anything, Mr. Marrinan?
MR. MARRI NAN I have no further questions.

## MR. CLI FFORD WAS QUESTI ONED BY THE CHA RNAN:

CHA RMAN Mr. Clifford, I have no issue with anything that you did, and, in any event, I have no -- I have no power to report on it, one way or the other. It may be 12:25 that something in relation to the articles concerning Maurice McCabe as an unnamed individual may call for some comment, but yours certainly don't. So thank you for your assistance. You had a very limited
relationship with David Taylor, as I understand it?
A. Correct, up to that point. He was in touch with me sometimes after that, but it was a limited relationship, yeah.

CHA RMAK We11, I mean, he wasn't a person you were turning to in the course of your work kind of again and again in relation to trying to verify a particular point or chase up a story or perhaps ask him 'Is there anyone I could talk to, do you think, in the civilian world with a view to verifying things?'?
A. No, Chairman. People in the position of Mr. Taylor, in terms of the way I do my work anyway, they are there to put out a particular line, and from an organisational point of view, I prefer to get the official line rather than being briefed or drawn into that milieu, or whatever, whereby there is back and forth, and that sort of thing. I had no -- when I met him that day in the house, he vaguely looked familiar and, beyond that, I hadn't encountered him prior to that. television because he did pieces to camera --
A. That was why he looked vaguely familiar, I think, yeah.

269 Q. CHA RMAN We11, I mean, it's been spoken of here indeed on a number of occasions, but most particularly by Professor Kenny, in relation to the danger of getting too close to your source.
A. Correct.

270 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, feeling that you have an obligation to them as opposed to simply, and it may sound callous,
but using the information that they give you with a view to informing the public.
A. That there is a danger of getting too close?
Q. CHAN RMAK Yes.
A. I mean, that always applies, it's always something you have to be vigilant about.
CHA RMAN Yes. And is that something you are aware of? I mean, you said you are in a very difficult position here, being the only journalist - that's what you said; now I don't know if that is the case - to have had interactions with David Taylor and to take at his word his -- what he said in the witness-box about waiving privilege and to take at his word the form of waiver which he voluntarily put forward.
A. I am not following you, chairman.

273 Q. CHA RMAN I wasn't quite sure, that is why I am asking you the question, because I wasn't following you.
A. Sorry. Sorry, what is the question? Excuse me. CHA RMAN Your interaction with him seems to have been so limited that you have never at any stage asked yourself the question, do $I$ have any ob7igation to this person beyond the fact that he has waived privilege?
A. Oh, I would agree with you. I mean, look, my attitude to Superintendent Taylor was, basically, because of his circumstances and according to his allegations, he changed his approach to what may have been perpetrated on Sergeant McCabe, or certainly in terms of the attitude there was towards him, but equally, as I say, when I initially encountered him, there is a human
element of sympathy, but, at the same time, I would be perfectly aware that had he not encountered his own difficulties, he would have been perfectly happy to go along his merry way doing whatever was required of him, and I don't mean to be callous in saying that but that would be my general attitude towards him, and, as a result, $I$ would have kept a certain distance, and I would be very conscious of that.

CHA RMAN Yes. We11, whatever epiphany there was, if there was one, occurred by reason of him getting himself into trouble in other matters.
A. Well, it's not for me -- I will say this: On the second meeting, I think again it may have been Michelle Taylor mentioned a spiritual person, because I remember that phrase, and sorry to impose it, but that is just the specific phrase, I am not attributing any -- I am not sitting here saying I believed he had an epiphany. I didn't. But as I say, if he hadn't encountered his problems, I doubt very much any of us would be here. CHA RMAN Yes. Well, they were indicating that particular thing at the time, yes. All right. The source in relation to the intelligence file, $I$ mean, you were asked about that, but again, my obligation, it seems to me, looking at the terms of reference, is to look at all electronic and paper files relating to Sergeant McCabe in Garda Headquarters and to consider any material relevant to the main terms of reference, which obviously involve besmirching his character. So I'm not interested -- I have had people
examine, and indeed I have examined myself, the relevant files, and there aren't any, but the person who was telling you that was -- I mean, telling you that as a fact, was --
A. Well, the origin of that was David Taylor.

CHA RNAN Yes. And apart from that, you may well have looked to other sources or to other people to see if you could check that out in any way.
A. Correct, correct, but he was -- he was the origin of that, as he was with the other issue about monitoring Pulse. and there is a Garda computer system up in Headquarters and it is called Oisín and it is related to intelligence matters, and I don't want to burden myself, obviously, by knowing anything more than does it have anything to do with Sergeant McCabe, which it doesn't, but where was Oisín coming from?
A. Oisín was coming from -- I won't name the specific senior officer. He is a well-known senior officer.
A. No, but this is where he explained to me. He suggested that on the basis that this was being done against sergeant McCabe, a grandchild of this individual was given the name, and there was an inference there that the individual himself would have been part of creating this sort of thing.
280 Q. CHA RMAN It wasn't anything to do with coming back from Tír na nóg, then, which is the most obvious
thing --
A. That realm of fantasy -- that was one realm of fantasy that wasn't entered into.

CHA RMAN We11, it's a bit more than fantasy, but there you go. I wanted to ask you as well - there is just two other matters - about this thing of relationship between Martin Callinan and Nóirín o'Sullivan. Now, you had mentioned to me - and it did come as something new, as quite obviously late in the Tribunal and it's -- no criticism is intended at all, Mr. Clifford, in that regard - he told you that, well, up in Headquarters or in the Commissioner's office, and you couldn't really say was it one or the other, but I'm tending towards the Commissioner's office, there was an obsession with Maurice McCabe, and then you added that the Commissioner and Nóirín O'Sullivan did not have a good relationship, you added that as him telling you that. Now, what are we talking about here? Are we talking about after the release of the letter to do with taping of conversations in Garda stations or are we talking about the fact that they, as can happen, two people are working side by side and they can't stand each other and they don't trust each other, or what are we talking about? what was he saying to you?
A. In terms of where it came from, Chairman, that note, as 12:33 I said, that I asked -- the investigators asked me did I discover, that is what brought it back to me specifically and it is in that note and that is why I referenced it. My recollection of that and why it led
me to read the note, $I$ wouldn't say -- I wouldn't characterise it as they weren't able to stand each other, but David Taylor certainly gave me the impression that they did not have any kind of a close working relationship. He also gave an example by his account of how Ms. O'Sullivan was very secretive compared -- in her dealings with the Commissioner, and he gave the impression, you could nearly say that himself and the Commissioner, Mr. Callinan, were at one and Ms. O'Sullivan was removed somewhat from them. That is the impression he gave again. And this was in the early part of his narrative about when he was Press officer.
282 Q. CHAN RMAN We11, was he, did you get the impression, making much of himself? Because, again, I mean, we have heard a lot of evidence, and as I -- I remember you being here for practically the whole of this Tribunal, almost as dutifully as $I$ have been, but as you will remember, Andrew McLindon was sidelined, which must have been deeply, deeply frustrating for him. Were you getting the impression that in some way David Taylor and Martin Callinan had some kind of a folie à deu, perhaps it was, or perhaps some kind of a close relationship whereby others were being excluded from what was going on, or what are we talking about?
A. Well, he didn't go into that kind of detail to suggest anyone was excluded, but he certainly gave the impression that he was very close professionally with Martin Callinan, and again, the note, and I had
forgotten this, at one stage he suggested that Nóirín o'sullivan, that they thought -- sorry, that himself and Martin Callinan were under the impression or they thought that Nóirín o'sullivan was leaking stuff to the media, effectively briefing the deputy commissioner, effectively briefing against the Commissioner. Again, this is -- he didn't give an example of that, or anything, but he threw that in, and, as I say, I only recall that because that is from the near-contemporaneous note I had.
283 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes. We11, was he trying to give you the impression that Garda Headquarters was some a kind of a viper pit where everyone was against everybody else and trying to destroy the other?
A. He wouldn't have to give me that impression, Chairman, I'd say I probably had that impression myself, but there was an element of that there. CHA RMAN Al1 right. We11, can we just turn to the note, if you wouldn't mind, it's 6628 , and would you mind just telling me where there is any reference to that, because it's not obvious to me. This is your note, what you typed up on your PC.
A. Sorry, yeah, the reference down there:
"MC and DT suspected she was rel easing info to us how di vi ded they were going back a number of years."

285 Q. CHA RMAN That is it, yes. So that is what that means?
A. Yes, that is my --

286 Q. CHA RMAN I don't get -- in a way, I don't get this, and on a human level I am finding this hard to understand, Mr. Clifford, that everything seems to be about PR and what the newspapers are saying, as opposed to what you are doing yourself, in reality.
A. Oh, I think that theme runs through the whole situation, to be quite honest with you.

CHA RMAK Okay. The last thing that I wanted to ask you about was, obviously I have a list of people who were never briefed, people who said -- who were said to 12:36 have been briefed by David Taylor and people who were added in late, and then people whom he never briefed at a11, and you come under the category, according to him, of people that he would never brief at all because he didn't trust you and nor did he trust Katie Hannon. Now, I don't know whether you and Katie Hannon worked closely; you are obviously entitled to do that --
A. No, no, I wouldn't say that at all.
Q. CHA RMAN I am sure you got on well?
A. Oh, yeah, I get on very well with her. She is an excellent reporter and a lovely person. CHA RMAN So it would seem, and this is just my impression, that if he had -- if it be the case that controversy in Garda Headquarters in relation to Maurice McCabe, let us say, let us take it as a given, started sometime around mid-2013, as I have been told, if the specific issue as to whether Maurice McCabe was to give evidence before the Public Accounts Committee was live November, certainly very strongly live in

December, and became very, very -- became red hot in January 2014, I'm finding it hard to understand what you could possibly have been writing about or what you could possibly have been saying so that when it came to the smear campaign conducted by David Taylor, he decided to exclude you and Katie Hannon way back in 2013; I don't know whether you were writing articles at that time?
A. I was. Like, there is a couple of things. I had previously written stuff that HQ and the Gardaí may not 12:38 have been happy about in relation to other individuals, nothing to do with whistle-blowing, just in relation to individual Gardaí who found themselves in a bad situation, and management were perhaps to blame, and various stuff like that in relation to, for example, the stuff -- your man in west Cork -CHA RMAN Anyway, don't worry about it.
A. Sorry, what I'm saying is, I may have had a certain reputation.
CHA RMAN In other words, you were a thorn in their side, is what you are saying?
A. Oh, I wouldn't go that far, but I may have had a certain reputation.

CHA RMAN what is less than a thorn in the side?
A. A bit of an irritant. But in any event, I was writing stories in October/November. The whole issue around the stuff going to the Public Accounts Committee, I had written stories in relation to that, in relation to the Commissioner and the Data Commissioner getting on to
the Public Accounts Committee. The Commissioner himself referenced, in one of the pieces you had here, about he'd read something in the Examiner. I had been writing those stories. I had also written some comment/analysis pieces about how the O'Mahony report, to my mind, and from what -- the evidence I could see, was effectively a whitewash. So that kind of stuff presumably contributed to that.
CHA RMAN A11 right, yes. So you had very definitely made your position known?
A. I made my position clear, that I wasn't toeing any 1ine. And to be fair, Chairman, I think you may have described it - I know it wasn't in a derogatory fashion - about pinning colours to the mast. The only mast I was pinning my colours to was one of facts, and, 12:39 once you followed that, that was the nature of things. CHA RMAN So if we -- the O'Mahony report comes out on 15th May 2013, and that certain7y was a point at which you made your feelings on the matter known, so we are we11 into 2013 and coming towards the very midpoint of it.
A. Yes, I think that's -- would be around, yes.

292 Q. CHA RMAN And would Ms. Hannon, to your knowledge, have been in a somewhat similar position?
A. I think it may have been later, later that year or early in '14, but -- I think, but myself and Katie had no interaction in relation to the story at that stage, whatsoever.

293 Q. CHA RMAN But it may that be she wasn't writing about

Maurice McCabe specifically, but, like you, had views on various other things?
A. Quite possibly, yeah. I mean, neither of us are dedicated security or crime correspondents.
CHA RMAN Yes. We11, I am not saying there is anything wrong about that, quite the contrary; I mean, you had your point of view and you had -- you wrote about it in consequence. All right. Thank you very much. We will take an hour.

MS. LEADER: Mr. John Burke, please. I just don't see RTÉ's legal team or Mr. Burke in the room, sir.
MR. MARRI NAN We have another witness, sir, that we could call.

CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MARRI NAN Mr. Tim Vaughan, please.

MR. TI M VAUGHAN, HAV NG BEEN SVDRN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN

MR. MARRI NAN Mr. Vaughan's statement is to be found at page 4079 of the materials, sir.
294 Q. Mr. Vaughan, you're no longer in journalism, isn't that 13:41 right?
A. That's correct.

295 Q. Would you just tell us briefly about your career in journalism, over what period of time it spanned and who you were working with and in what capacity?
A. I started in with The Kerryman in 1987, and in 1991 I was asked to join the then-Cork Examiner, and in 1995 I was appointed deputy editor and in 2001 I was appointed editor, until September 2016.
296 Q. And I think that you were interviewed by our
investigators on the 28th November 2017 and they went through the terms of reference of the Tribunal with you, term of reference by term of reference, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
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Q. And I think that you had no information to offer to the Tribunal except for in relation to hearing rumours in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe. I think the first rumour that you heard was, you overheard a conversation on a train, is that right?
A. Yeah. I heard -- I was on a train from Dublin to Cork, and I just overheard snippets of a conversation that was taking place in the aisle next to me. And the two gentlemen, they had -- reading newspapers, and the subject, I just heard McCabe's -- the name 'McCabe', and one of the guys didn't seem to be too enamoured of Sergeant McCabe, and there was a reference -- I just heard a reference to 'abuse' or 'abused', and that's all I heard.
Q. Can you help us in relation to the timeframe for this, when it was?
A. It was in 2014, but I am not one -- I am pretty bad, I used to be bad anyway at keeping diaries and things like that, so I couldn't really say with certainty, but 13:44 I think it probably was towards the latter half of 2014, but I couldn't swear on that.
299 Q. And I think that that was the first time that you had heard anything negative said about Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. It was. I didn't take much notice of it. I just -- it just, you know, sat in the back of my mind.
300 Q. At that time you were editor of the Examiner, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yes.

301 Q. And I think that you had upwards of 30 reporters who were working under you?
A. That would be about it, yeah.

302 Q. Yes. And I think that none of those had brought you any stories in relation --
A. No, I heard nothing and --
Q. -- to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, nothing at all. I'm based in Cork and, you know, didn't socialise much in Dublin media circles at all, 13:45 came here on business meetings, so I wouldn't have been mixing in that milieu too often.
304 Q. Now, I think that after overhearing the conversation on the train, $I$ think the next was that you heard something from a colleague that you knew in the media, 13:45 is that right?
A. Yeah. I suppose the context, I would -- as editor, I would have lots of trusted contacts, contacts outside the media and within the media, and I got a call, I had a conversation with one who -- I would always have one 13:46 or two who would keep me in mind if there was something of interest or of help to the Examiner, and I was having what was a general conversation with this source and we spoke about lots of issues and he mentioned that, did I know that there were rumours circulating in 13:46 Dublin media circles about Maurice McCabe, and I hadn't.

305 Q. And I think he specifically mentioned it in the context of a sexual abuse issue?
Q. That is Mick Clifford?
A. Mick Clifford, yes.

308 Q. Yes. And so did you have a conversation with him?
A. Yeah. I rang Mick, I'm not sure was it straightaway or how long later, but it would have been fairly quickly. Mick immediately said, look, he had been aware of it, he checked it out, and we had a brief conversation on that, but Mick was emphatic that there was nothing to it. We didn't get into any detail about any further detail of rumours that were going round. Once I had that assurance from Mick, I was happy with that.

309 Q. And I think there was some direction that the DPP had directed the matter --
A. That is my recollection.

310 Q. -- of the sexual assault allegation?
A. That is my recollection.

311 Q. And I think that you continued on then in the Examiner
up until 2016, was it?
A. Yeah.

312 Q. Now, I think that the investigators in particular were asking you in relation to any negative briefings that you may have ever received from Superintendent Taylor, and you were in a position to confirm that you didn't receive any negative briefing from Superintendent Taylor, isn't that right?
A. No, I didn't get a briefing from anybody, negative or positive.

313 Q. Had you ever met Superintendent Taylor?
A. No, I never met him.

314 Q. Encountered him as the Garda Press Officer?
A. No, I had no dealings whatsoever.

315 Q. And I think that they also asked you about any negative briefings that you may have received from Commissioner Martin Callinan?
A. No.

316 Q. Did you ever receive anything?
A. No, never met him, never spoke to the man.

317 Q. Or Deputy Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan --
A. No.

318 Q. -- during that period of time. And then, just finally, there's one matter if you could deal with, and this is in relation to your time in the media and your experience as an editor and also as a journalist. CHA RMAN Mr. Marrinan, just before you go on to that, maybe I'm getting things mixed up, but I thought there was three and, so far, I have written down two. So the
first one was the thing on the train and the second was the source who knows about Dublin media to say, 'Did you know about Maurice McCabe and sexual abuse allegation which is circulating up here?' But I thought there was a third one as well.
MR. MARRI NAN No, I think that is it, isn't it, the two instances?
A. No, only two, yeah.

CHAN RMAN We11, somebody said three. I beg your pardon, but anyway, there it is.
319 Q. MR. MARI NAN You overheard the conversation on the train between two individuals?
A. Yes, that's correct, yeah.

320 Q. And then subsequently you had a meeting with -- or you met a colleague --
A. It was a phone conversation.

321 Q. Yes. And that was an informal conversation, but as a result of that you were prompted to go to Mick clifford?
A. Well, because it was a second mention.

322 Q. Yes.
A. But at the same time, I didn't take it seriously because I considered Sergeant McCabe to be a man of integrity, and, with any whistleblowers, there's almost -- well, I would have assumed, that would be --
that some people somewhere would try to impugn his integrity, but I had no -- absolutely no evidence of that. But that is what happens with whistleblowers. But the person that I spoke to had nothing to do with
the, let's call it the McCabe story, neither commissioned, wrote or edited any story, and didn't know where the rumours were emanating from, and they were the only two occasions where $I$ heard it, until much later on, when it, you know, became further into circulation.

323 Q. At page 4093, if we could have that up on the screen, this is a -- if we could scroll down, when it does come up on the screen, to the bottom of the page. Yes, it's a question by our investigators:
"I have been asked to offer an opi ni on, gi ven my background as a newspaper editor, in rel ation to the foll owing: I have been asked whether, in my view, it is appropriate for journal ists, broadcasters personnel,
medi a personnel, to invoke journal istic privilege over thei $r$ contact and thereby not cooper ate with the Tribunal of Inqui ry where thei $r$ contact/witness has:
(a) wai ved journal istic privilege;
(b) decl ared bef ore the said Tribunal that it is thei $r$ wi sh and expectation that all such journal ists come forward to assist the Tribunal in thei $r$ inquiries, in ci rcumstances where the said journalist's contact witness is central to the examination of the terms of reference of the Tribunal."

And just give us your view in relation to that, please.
A. I can see from one point of view that it might be -that when somebody waives their protection, that, you
know, it should be okay for the journalist to acknow7edge that they are the source, but I think that's a very dangerous path to go down. There are consequences, or there can be unforeseen consequences of going down that path. I think protecting your sources is at the heart of journalism, and even if somebody describes themselves as the source, once you start pulling on that thread, it can quickly unravel and you have no way of knowing where it is going. For example, I think I said in my statement that you wouldn't know if somebody who admitted they were the source was operating under duress, or if they were one source and admitting -- and the journalist admitting that they were a source could reveal a second source, and a person might incorrectly claim to be a source so that the actual source might be identified by process of elimination. So there are a number of dangers to pursuing that.
324 Q. Yes. Well, presumably if you exclude those dangers as a possibility -- if we could just look at your answer to the question at page 4094 that was posed by the investigators, you say:

```
"It is an unusual one for me, in that l amnolonger an
editor."
```

But have you a huge amount of experience in that role and indeed as a journalist.
"If I was, I might have a different opi ni on. Journalistic privilege is something that will be decided by the courts and the Tribunal in due course. Speaking as somebody who is no Ionger an editor, while I would personally never reveal a source and I would go 13:55 to any lengths to protect a source, whi ch goes to the very heart of journalism in this case journalist colleagues may di sagree. But if the source wai ves their privilege, I see the merit in the vi ew that privilege then no Ionger exists."

That was the view that you expressed to our investigators. And then you go on to say:
"But l can see a potential difficulty in the general 13:55 sense if, for example, you do not know what pressure might be put to bear on the witness to wai ve thei $r$ privilege. As such, it is not al ways black and white. It is tricky for that reason. I have never before come across this set of circunstances."

And every situation is unique. But, I mean, if the circumstances are such that you can be quite satisfied that the source has not been put under any pressure to reveal that they are, in fact, a source, do you understand?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

325 Q. And in circumstances where, in fact, the source has acted voluntarily at all times, and very obviously so,
because is he the person who has brought it into the public gaze, as it were, under no pressure whatsoever, and in circumstances where he has had a relationship, as a source, with individual journalists, and he is now calling in aid the journalist to establish a case that he is making, do you understand?
A. Yes.
Q. So if you can exclude the possibility of opening up other avenues to identifying other sources, where could the danger possibly exist in terms of undermining the privilege in those circumstances?
A. If you are a journalist who would decide to reveal the source, whether the source chooses to or not, then it has the potential to cause problems down the line in relation to future contacts who might decide not to approach you with stories in the public interest.

327 Q. We11, you see, it would have the potential, if it was an absolute exclusion of naming a source under any circumstance, it may actually dissuade people from coming forward as a source if they thought that
ultimately the journalist was going to deny or not answer any questions where the source may need the journalist to establish a particular fact; do you see the danger there?
A. I hear what you say --

328 Q. Yes.
A. -- but I don't agree with it.

MR. MARR NAN okay. Would you answer any questions, please.

CHA RMAN I am just wondering, just before we go on to any other questions, may $I$ just ask a supplemental on that, $I$ know it is unusual for me to jump in at this particular point, but I grew up watching the watergate hearing, so that, $I$ suppose, puts a particular age on me; I am sure you probably watched them as we11?
A. Yeah, well --

CHA RMAN You did, I'm sure you did, yes. And, you know, Bernstein and Woodward, and all the rest of it, did great work and are justifiably heroes in the journalism world and in the wider world. But I understand that the person who was the source has been revealed now.
A. The --

CHA RMAN I'm not, I hope, living in kind of an isolated cloud or tower somewhere, am I?
A. David Taylor has revealed himself to be the source. CHAL RMAN Yes. Well, I mean, what privilege is possibly attaching to him now then? I mean, it's been widely discussed, we have acres and acres of newspaper around the world talking about this individual. We all know the name. So where is the journalistic privilege on that? And indeed I think Woodward and Bernstein were interviewed and confirmed it, isn't that right?
A. That, I'm not sure of.

CHA RMAN We11, I think that is the case, if you look it up. I mean, what are we talking about here?
A. We11, I suppose that's for the Tribunal to decide. CHA RMAN No, I know that. But, I mean, you know,
there are situations where, for instance, look, we've had this thing of source coming up, I can't reveal the source, I have always dealt with it up to this point on the basis that, look, this isn't essential to decide what I am trying to decide, and, as I said, you know, in a fifty-day case there may be ten hours of extremely relevant evidence, or five hours of extremely relevant evidence; every senior barrister in the Law Library will tell every junior barrister that when they come in, that things will hinge on five minutes of evidence, 14:00 or whatever. okay, we know that. But this is important. Here is a man who comes forward, people are accusing him of complete perjury on the basis of having a grudge against Nóirín o'Sullivan, of being in a sticky wicket and setting out effectively to use his situation and jump on the Maurice McCabe bandwagon to destroy Nóirín o'Sullivan, with a view to concealing his own nefarious activities. I mean, that is one of the scenarios. There are other scenarios. So how can it possibly be the case that a journalist is entitled in those circumstances to say, 'oh, yes, you did contact me and I hear your plea in public to say would you please say if $I$ am the source in what I have said'?
A. Well, it isn't the source's right to erode the journalist's right to protect their source.
CHA RMAN I wasn't ever suggesting it. Nor is it indeed the client's right to erode the right to have client's communications with lawyers for the purpose of getting legal advice eroded. That is certainly the
case. I'm not sure in the Woodward and Bernstein example here, what people are so worried about here, unless, of course, things are much worse or there is some kind of a side agreement. I can appreciate your point, Mr. Vaughan, very easily when it comes to, this is a thread that is dangerous to unravel, so if you unrave 1 it and you reveal another source, you can't do that, I understand that, I'm not saying whether it is right or wrong, but I do understand that very much. If - indeed, the European Court of Human Rights have spoken about - if you reveal a journalistic methodology, which is, for instance, and this is a bizarre example, that you had some kind of a listening device in Garda Headquarters and that was revealed, I mean that, again, would preclude you from revealing a source. But here is a man saying, I have done something really disreputable, I contacted A, B, C and D , I am the source in relation to that, and I would like you, please, A, B, C and D to come forward and confirm on oath in a public hearing that indeed it was me who did those things. Where is the journalistic privilege? I don't get it.
A. As I said, Chairman, that would be for the Tribunal to decide, but if you -- if the journalist is seen to have their right to protect their sources eroded in any fashion, then I think it has longer term consequences for others.

CHA RMAN But, I mean, who is eroding it?
A. The source.

CHA RMAN Source. We11, in the woodward and Bernstein example, do you think that erodes - source protection, for them to be talking about that, for the person in question to have come forward and said, 'Yes, I was Deep Throat' and 'Yes, I am the source of the articles that appeared', which exposed the then-president of the United States in a not very favourable fashion? I can't see a -- I can't see that that bulwark is in any way breached or dissolved or even threatened. Can you?
A. I think we have to disagree.

CHA RMAN Fine. I'm happy to disagree with people, but you have to give me a reason for disagreeing. What is the reason? Just take the Woodward and Bernstein example, were they in the wrong? I mean, having done such huge credit to journalism, are we saying that somehow they are now anti-heroes, having been heroes? what is the reason? I am grasping around trying to fathom what it is. I am very willing to listen.
A. I wouldn't -- I would not, myself, if I had a source who was claiming or revealing that he was the source, I 14:04 would not reveal that he was.
CHAl RMAN And if the net result of that was he was going to be called a malicious perjurer and he was actually asking for your help, it'd be the same?
A. I think you've got to -- I would -- it would be a the integrity of -- I don't think you can pick and choose in these matters.
CHA RMAN Nobody is picking and choosing, no more than

Woodward and Bernstein picked and chose. Maybe we have discussed it enough. But, I mean, is it possible that the reason has to be in those circumstances that there is some kind of a side agreement between the source that it's only -- I'm only going to go so far and you can't say any more, or that the relationship has become too close so that it is no longer based on privilege, it is no longer based on journalistic ethics, but is based effectively on a relationship with the person who has outed himself as the source?
A. Sorry, I don't get your point there, Chairman.

CHA RNAN Well, I'm struggling on this one. Thanks for your help.
MR. MEDONELL: Chairman, I have no questions.
MR. MCHAEL OHGGN: Similarly, no questions.
MR. GLLANE: No questions.
CHA RMAN I would have thought this touches you, Mr. Gillane, particularly in relation to the opinion that was expressed. You have no questions?
MR. G LLANE: we11, I attempted -- sorry, Judge, last
Friday I was attempting with Professor Kenny just to establish that there are these differences in opinion on this topic amongst experienced members of the profession, and the witness has said no more than I think what I put to Professor Kenny, so I don't feel

CHA RMAN All right.
MR. G LLANE: Thank you for the opportunity. CHA RMAN You don't need to thank me for the
opportunity. You're absolutely entitled to the opportunity under the rules in Haughey. For instance, could a journalist say 'I'm not going to confirm whether or not this is my phone number'?
A. If they were being asked in what circumstances? CHA RMAK 'Here's a list of contacts, for instance, between the Garda Commissioner and unknown persons, would you confirm if your phone number appears on this list'?
A. I've never had a problem with saying -- telling somebody --
CHAD RMAN Yes. We11, you might be surprised to know that there are some people in this room who do. Anyway, we will carry on.
MR. QU N: Chair, I appear for Mr. Vaughan. If I may, 14:07 I might just reserve my position until the end. CHAI RMAK Yes.
MR. DI GNMM Chairman, I just have one question.

## MR. VAUGHAN MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. DI GNAM

329 Q. MR. DI GNMM Mr. Vaughan, my name is Conor Dignam. I appear on behalf of An Garda Síochána, and I just wanted to clarify one thing with you. Mr. Quinn put it to Mr. Clifford, who had obviously reported to you, that no complaints were made in relation to the articles that had appeared in the Examiner on the 4th October, I think you're familiar with those articles?
A. Yes.

330 Q. Do you recall the then-Commissioner, Ms. O'Sullivan,
issuing a public statement the day following those articles denying any wrongdoing as alleged in the protected disclosures which are the subject --
A. This is the October 2016?
A. I finished as editor on the 30th September 2016. All right. Thank you, Mr. Vaughan.
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA GH I have no questions, Chairman. CHAL RMAN Thank you. MR. QU NE Chairman, I might just ask one or two questions of Mr. Vaughan.

CHAI RMAK Yes.

## MR. VAUGHAN WAS EXAM NED BY MR. QU NE

333 Q. MR. QU N: Perhaps following up on one or two of the questions, Mr. Vaughan, that Mr. Marrinan and the Chair were asking you, and I think they were perhaps of a general nature, drawing on your experience in the field of journalism and particularly as an editor for I think something approximating 15 years or so. Can I just ask you in general terms, would it be your experience that journalists who bring stories to the paper would have generally more than one source?
A. It's a standard -- it would be a standard rule in the Examiner, two sources, or in some situations where one journalist would have documentary evidence which would be stood up.
334 Q. Can I ask you that again. Just in general terms,
perhaps if a journalist was asked to confirm that a person was a source and if they were then asked to indicate what that person was a source of in terms of material, is that the kind of thing that could conceivably put in jeopardy the identity of a second source?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN But that is not the situation here. Nobody is saying that here, Mr. Quinn. There's not the slightest piece of evidence that that could possibly be 14:10 so here. And in relation to other things where it is possible that the source was otherwise, I haven't pursued the matter, so it's a hypothetical, but it's a hypothetical that is not occurring in this instance. If somebody wants to tell me that, I will listen very carefully, but at the moment it's just not on the evidence.

MR. QU N: And, Mr. Vaughan, can I also ask you that if a person who claims to be a source happens not to be a source, is it conceivable that, in fact, by confirming that somebody is not a source, the journalist could, either wittingly or unwittingly, potentially jeopardise the identity of a person who was a source?
A. Correct, yes.

And I think you said, in response to one of the questions from the Chair, something akin to the fact that the privilege was not therefore -- it wasn't held by the source, but was a privilege I think held by the
journalist, can you just elaborate on what you mean by that?
A. The privilege doesn't attach to the source; it's society's interest in free communication of news and opinions that the privilege attaches to. It attaches to the journalist, so it's not in the gift of the source.
337 Q. And I think just in relation to the woodward and Bernstein scenario, without getting into the detail of that, Mr. Felt who was identified as the source was identified some 30 years after the relevant events? CHA RNAN why does that help? what is the difference between 30 minutes and 30 years? I know it is Mark Felt, and I know as well that Woodward and Bernstein confirmed that he was the source.
338 Q. MR QU N: Do you think there is a relevance, Mr. Vaughan, to whether it is 30 minutes after the event or 30 years?
A. Well, I think anything that is live has a more marked piquancy and is something, really looking back with the 14:12 perspective of 30 , 40 years, I think it changes how people view things.
CHA RMAN should I come back in 30 years then and ask these questions?
A. I mightn't be around.

CHA RMAN And you would be happy, in 30 years' time, that I would know things that -- like people's phone numbers, for instance, that they are now concealing from me?
A. As I said, Chairman, I've no issue whatsoever about giving my phone number out, and if other people take a different view, you know, that's their position, but it's not my position.
CHA RMAN It may not or may not be, but the law is this: The People (Director of Public Prosecutions) v. JT, it says, perhaps in old-fashioned language, the law is entitled to the evidence of every man - man and woman, obviously - and if people have a reason not to give it, well they have to come up with a reason not to 14:13 give it. I'm sorry, are you finished, Mr. Quinn? MR. QU N: Sorry, Chair, just two more questions.

339 Q. I think as a newspaper editor you will be familiar with the rule that, in fact, an awful lot of highly confidential public records are, as it happens, only 1awfully made availab1e after the 30 years passage of time. Do you have any sense as to why that is?
A. To protect, you know, the reputations of living, of people while they are still alive.
340 Q. And then, just finally, one of the answers you gave, I think, to one of the questions that was put to you was that, even leaving aside the specific circumstances of any case, if a journalist were to confirm the identity of a source in a particular case, this could have adverse knock-on consequences, perhaps you meant to that journalist in terms of their future dealings; can you just elaborate on what you meant by that?
A. Could you repeat that, please?

341 Q. I think in answer to one of the questions you were
asked, you indicated that if a journalist were, either in a specific case or generally, to have a practice of confirming that somebody was a source when that person came forward and waived privilege, that this could have knock-on consequences for the journalist, I think, in terms of their attractiveness as a potential repository of information in the future. Could you explain what you meant by that?
A. We11, I think, you know, certain journalists have, and Mick Clifford would be one, that people would trust, and trust with their lives, really, in the knowledge that he wouldn't reveal sources. And I think once you go down that road of selectively confirming that somebody was a source, then I think that would -- it is my view that that would have a detrimental knock-on effect in terms of people trusting that journalist going forward.

CHA RMAN So it is the chilling effect, is what you are saying?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Yes. No, I am familiar with that, and that is obviously very important.

MR. QU NL I have no more questions, Chairman.
MR. MARRI NAN Nothing, sir.

## MR. VAUGHAN MAS THEN QUESTI ONED BY THE CHA RMAN

342 Q. CHA RMAN Just the situation, taking a view, and you are saying you can't even reveal that so-and-so wasn't
a source, maybe you would just tell me now whether I was in the wrong in relation to a situation that occurred quite a number of years ago, and I am bound by legal professional privilege, and $I$ have always taken it very, very, very seriously, never talk about clients' affairs. So, in the Law Library, people talking about one of the financial scandals that had occurred, let us say, in the last, I am going back up to 40 years, and saying so-and-so has such an account, let us say - and I am disguising the facts here - and I 14:16 said no, because the list is actually in my office, I'm asked to do an opinion in relation to a particular aspect and I can tell you that person's name is not on that list. So was I breaching privilege? I mean, rather than let vicious rumours circulate, was I doing the wrong thing? I mean, because that is what you just told Mr. Quinn.
A. I am not sure if we are comparing like with like. CHA RMAN Why? why aren't we comparing like with
like?
A. Em...

343 Q. CHA RMAN The vicious rumours, by the way, then stopped dead in their tracks. Perhaps would have reached the newspapers, causing trouble to that individual, which would have been completely unwarranted, perhaps resulting in a libel action and all that that involves, which I personally think is ludicrously expensive and with extraordinarily high damages, quite often completely unjustifiable in the
context of what people need to do to earn even small amounts of money to buy a car or anything important like that. Are you telling me I did the wrong thing? Not to personalise it. A person in that situation that I was in did the wrong thing. That person is not such a financial cheat, as people are now saying at this table, by way of merely discussing a rumour as opposed to being malicious about it. What is wrong about that?
A. I think you're still breaching client confidentiality.

CHA RMAK How? Where is the client confidentiality? The person -- the point was, the person in question wasn't my client because the person's name was not on the list of financial cheats that I was doing particularly opinion in relation to. Let's say it can have implications for a lot of different things, like income tax or extradition, etcetera, why am I breaching client confidentiality by saying no, that is not the person in question? why am I not doing the right thing and saying that this rumour has to stop here and there? If he was my client or she was my client and I said nothing, well that is a different thing, I couldn't possibly reveal that the person was seeking advice in relation to a matter.
A. Well, if you go back to the issue of the journalistic privilege and in relation to sources, $I$ just have to go back and repeat what I said already. CHA RMAN okay. We11, thank you for your assistance, Mr. Vaughan.
MR. MARRI NAN Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MARRI NAN The next witness, sir, is Mr. Frank Greany, please.

MR. MARR NAN Thank you for coming, Mr. Greany. You're here to give evidence very briefly in relation to any interactions you may or may not have with Superintendent Taylor in terms of Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure, and the reason that you were nominated by the Tribunal as a journalist who may have information to give is that your name featured in the Clerkin investigation as being somebody who Superintendent Taylor was in contact with by telephone. You're a journalist by profession, isn't that right? And who were you working with in 2014/2015?
A. I was working as a crime correspondent with 98FM from May 2013 until November 2015, when I took up my current role --

345 Q. Yes.
A. -- which is a courts correspondent with Newstalk and Today FM.

346 Q. Right. Okay. And I think that, unfortunately, letters went astray; you were written to by the Tribunal in
your old position with 98 FM , and that's not your fault in relation to it, but you were asked a series of questions by the Tribunal, and the questions are set out at page 4131. Your answers to them are set out at 4135, but they just -- that includes your telephone number, and we will just go through the questions that you were asked, in the first instance, at 4131. I think that the questions that you were asked was:
"1. Can you confirmyour nobile phone number."
which you did. And then you were asked was it the mobile number that you had used from July 2012 to February 2017, and you indicated that it was. You were asked:
"Were you bri ef ed negativel y about Sergeant Maurice McCabe by anyone? If so, by whom?"

And your answer to that was "no", that you weren't briefed negatively by anyone in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
"Have you any inf or nation or evi dence about an or chestrated campai gn di rected by seni or officers of An 14:22 Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Sergeant Maurice MkCabe by spreading rumours about his professional and personal life ?"

And again you answered "no" to that question, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

347 Q. Number 5:
"Were you contacted by Superintendent David Tayl or in rel ation to Sergeant Maurice MECabe?"

Your answer to that was "no".
"Were you briefed negativel y by Superintendent David Tayl or in rel ation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe?"

You answered "no".
"Were you briefed negativel y by Superintendent David Tayl or in rel ation to Sergeant Maurice MECabe to the effect that his compl ai nts had no substance?"

And you answered "no" to that.
"Were you briefed negatively by Superintendent Taylor in rel ation to Sergeant MECabe to the effect that the Gardaí had fully investigated complaints and had found no substance to his allegations that he was driven by agendas?"

Again, you answered "no" in relation to that.
"Was your attention drawn by Superintendent Tayl or to an allegation or suggestion of criminal misconduct made agai nst Sergeant Maurice MECabe in any respect?"

You answered "no" to that.
"Was your attention drawn by Superintendent Tayl or to an allegation that the root cause of Sergeant Maurice MECabe's agenda was revenge agai nst An Garda Sí ochána?"

And again you answered no in relation to that.
"Were you informed by Superintendent David Tayl or that he was instructed or directed by former Commissioner Callinan and/ or then- Deputy Cormíssi oner Nói rín O Sullivan to contact the media to brief the media negati vel y agai nst Sergeant Maurice McCabe?"

And you answered "no" in relation to that.
"Are you aware and have you any evi dence of any attempt made by former Commissioner Callinan or Cormi ssi oner O Sullivan or any other seni or menber of An Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct made agai nst him"

And your answer to that question was "no".
"Were you informed by a journalist or any other person of any matter referred to in the question above?"

And your answer to that was "no".
"14. Have you any know edge, inf ormation or evi dence rel ating to any of the matters above?"

Your answer to that was "no".
"15. Have you any know edge, information or evi dence rel ating to any matters within the terms of reference of the Tri bunal?"

And your answer to that was "no".
"16. Have you any records, however made, of any commini cations frondwith Superintendent Tayl or or former Commi ssi oner Callinan, Commissi oner O Sul Ii van or any other seni or Gardaí rel ating to any of the above matters?"

And your answer to that was also "no". So it would appear that you are a complete stranger to all the allegations that have been made by Superintendent
Taylor in his protected disclosure, is that right?
A. Certainly in relation to anything involving Maurice McCabe. We never discussed Maurice McCabe. He never mentioned to me and I never asked him about Maurice

McCabe.
348 Q. Yes. We11, I was just going to ask you that. In 2013/2014 when Superintendent Taylor was the Garda Press officer, did you have dealings with him?
A. Yes, absolutely. As a crime correspondent for 98 FM I would have had professional dealings with him, usually by text or phone call, doorsteps at crime scenes, things like that. I would have spoken to him.
Q. Was that on a regular basis?
A. Em, fairly regular, given my brief and the fact that he 14:26 was the superintendent in the Garda Press Office, he was the Garda Press Officer. I would have had relatively regular dealings with him. He would have maybe confirmed details in relation to investigations. If I had a detail that I wanted firmed up, he may answer me positively or negatively, but it was strictly professional during my time as crime correspondent.

350 Q. And when you say 'regular dealings with him', how regular would we be talking about? Once a week or --
A. Well, at the time when I was working as a crime correspondent with 98FM, crime in Dublin was rife, so I would have had -- in relation to serious criminal matters, I would have had -- I wouldn't even put a number on it. Maybe weekly, sometimes it could be a couple of weeks before Dave and I spoke. I would deal directly with the Garda Press office.

351 Q. We11, that's fairly regular contact with him, and did you get on well with him?
A. Yeah, I found him very professional, a very nice man to
deal with. I had taken on -- it was my first crime brief, $I$ found him to be exceptionally professional and helpful. You know, not to be a slur on any of his predecessors, but the Garda Press Office would have traditionally been a very difficult office to deal with. David Taylor was contactable and, you know, if you needed to firm up a detail, he would neither say yea or nay, which was clearly very helpful in my brief. And did he mention Sergeant McCabe at all in any conversations that you had with him?
A. No.

353 Q. And then he ceased to be Press Officer. And up until the time that he ceased to be Press officer in June of 2014, up until that time, are you saying that he never said anything negative to you at any opportunity that he had that was negative to Sergeant McCabe?
A. He never mentioned Maurice McCabe, whether it was in a negative light or otherwise.
354 Q. Right. In terms of other journalists who were working on stories, obviously perhaps at the same time, if there was some major event, a number of journalists might attend at a crime scene, or whatever, I don't know, but did you have regular contact with other journalists and crime reporters at the time?
A. Certainly within my brief, yes, other crime correspondents. Like you've mentioned, there would be a lot of hanging around at crime scenes as things developed and there would obvious7y be conversations. I would consider some of them to be personal friends of
mine.
355 Q. And did any of them ever say to you that they had been briefed negatively by Superintendent Taylor about Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, absolutely not.

356 Q. And did you hear any rumours at that stage from other journalists about Sergeant Maurice McCabe and any issues that he may have had --
A. No.

357 Q. -- in his past?
A. No.

MR. MARRI NAN Okay. Thank you very much. Would you answer any questions.
MR. MEDONELL: No questions, Chairman.
MR. MCHAEL OHGGNS: No questions.
CHA RMAN Is he on your list, Mr. O'Higgins, I am wondering, as someone who you say positively he did brief?
MR. MCHEL OH GG NS: No, he is not.
CHA RNAN He is not. All right. Thank you very much. 14:29 MR MARRI NAN Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

M. LEADER: The next witness, sir, is John Burke, whose statement is at page 5331 of the materials in volume 20.

MR. J OHN BURKE, HAM NG BEEN SUORN, MAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MS. LEADER:

MS. LEADER: Mr. Burke, you're a journalist, and you currently work with RTÉ, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yeah.

359 Q. And you specifically work on the weekly This week programme, which is broadcast on Sundays, I think, is that right?
A. That's right, since late 2013.

360 Q. Right. And before that I think you worked with the Sunday Business Post, is that right?
A. That's right, for six years, and the Sunday Tribune then prior to that.
361 Q. A11 right. So when did you take up employment with the 14:30 Sunday Business Post?
A. With the Sunday Business Post, 2007.

362 Q. And what did you do there?
A. I was the public affairs correspondent, so I would have covered, I suppose, general news but news that fell
kind of I suppose somewhere in between business and politics, and so forth.

363 Q. And when did you move to RTÉ from the Business Post?
A. In early 2013, May 2013.

364 Q. And on taking up employment with RTÉ, what did you do immediately on changing jobs?
A. For the first six months $I$ was actually assigned to a desk where they, in effect, train you up on -- I suppose, coming from print, there's a lot you don't
know about broadcasts, so I suppose you have to learn how to use various different radio and TV technology, so I was on a desk called the centralised news desk; I would have learned TV there, and so forth, you know, from a technical point of view. And then it was October/November 2013 when I joined the This week team.
A. Yeah, sure. I suppose it's very much -- it's a very smal1 team. At that stage it was -- the presenter/editor was Colm Ó Mongáin, then there was a second presenter who we had for half a week, if you wi11, who joined us from Friday/Saturday onwards, and then there was myself as the reporter. So, invariably, 14:32 I suppose I would look for news stories and deal then with Colm, who was the programme editor, and, in effect, run them by him. If he liked them and if he was certain, I could stand them up or otherwise we broadcast them.

366 Q. Now, I think the This week programme covers a wide variety of matters of fairly topical interest, is that right?
A. Absolutely. You could say there's no limits, as such, to the subjects that we would cover.

367 Q. And policing is one of those topics?
A. Absolutely. And that's, I suppose, something I would have done more of than other subjects, definitely, yes. 368 Q. Now, it also covered, certainly into 2014, matters
relating to Sergeant McCabe, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

369 Q. And when did that start; can you put a time on it?
A. It's difficult to put an exact time on it, but I think my own interest in the case arose from very early 2014. As I say, I only joined the programme quite late in the previous year, so it would really have been from around January, I think, 2014, onwards.
Q. Okay. And you'd been an active reporter in RTÉ on the This week programme since around October 2014?
A. Yes, exactly.

371 Q. All right. Now, do you know Commissioner Callinan?
A. Not personally, no.

372 Q. Have you ever met him?
A. No.

373 Q. Ever spoken to him?
A. No.

374 Q. What about the then-Deputy Commissioner Nóirín o'Sullivan, do you know her?
A. No, I did actually once interview her when she was a deputy commissioner years ago for a colleague's book, but it was actually a book of photographs by an Irish Independent photographer, Mark Condron, so the interviews had no relationship really to, I suppose, operational duties.
375 Q. And was that your only interaction with the deputy commissioner?
A. Yes.
Q. In relation to David Taylor, Superintendent, do you
know him?
A. I don't know him well. At that time when he was in the Garda Press office, I wouldn't have known him personally. He and I suppose other members of the Garda Press office, such as Andrew McLindon, would have 14:34 been people to whom we would have sent queries. Invariably the process by which I suppose I sent queries to the Garda Press office was, we'd send an email, so we had -- I suppose, or I would send an email, so it was unambiguous precisely what we were
looking for. And invariably the process was they wouldn't reply or they would come back, you know, with a very brief 'no comment'. I don't think we ever got any substantial return or reply from them. But invariably I would either phone and leave a voicemail with either David Taylor or Andrew McLindon to let them know we had sent the query, because a lot of what we would have done would have been towards the tail-end of the week, so we would have been probably sending a lot of those emails on Saturdays. And just to be sure there was never any claim that we were sending them to emails that weren't monitored over the weekend, we'd probably leave a voicemail or something just to say 'we sent you an email, query's in', and so forth.
377 Q. And if I could just tease that out a little bit, Mr. Burke.
A. Sure.

378 Q. When did you first, you think, started dealing with the Garda Press office?
A. I think every journalist has probably dealt with the Garda Press Office, you know, on a constant ongoing basis, but in terms of when I joined the This week programme, it would have been, you know, whenever I covered Garda stories, from, I suppose, late 2013 onwards. I mean, I think everyone at some point in time would have had reason to send some form of queries to the Garda Press Office if there was any element of a Garda story they were covering before that, so it wouldn't have been a sort of a starting period forever to have start dealing with the Garda Press Office then, but in terms of the intensity of the current issues that are all in the public domain now, not just this one, but a multitude of other policing-related stories, certainly I think everyone's intensity in terms of dealing with the Garda Press Office probably increased from 2013/2014 onwards.
379 Q. Did you ever at any time seek to introduce yourself to the Garda Press officer in any kind of formal --
A. No.

380 Q. -- or informal way?
A. No, no, and I would have always had I suppose a very specific view about press officers or State bodies, such as, you know, Gardaí, HSE. I suppose they're there representing, I suppose, a corporate body, and I'd always be very wary of, I suppose, back-channel communications, because in some respects you're then permitting I suppose what is a State body to mask what should be, you know, public information, by some sort
of back-channel arrangement, which wouldn't necessarily be how I would work, to be honest.
381 Q. So you never sought a colleague to introduce you to --
A. No.

382 Q. -- Superintendent Taylor --
A. No.

383 Q. -- when it looked like you would be covering Garda-related stories on a more frequent basis?
A. No, I wouldn't have seen the benefit in that to be quite honest. No. It wouldn't necessarily be how I'd work.

384 Q. A11 right. So any relationship, and I don't mean that in any sinister way at all, was built up over time, you think, from 2013 --
A. That's true.

385 Q. -- with Superintendent Taylor?
A. I mean, I think 'relationship' would even be perhaps over-stretching it. As I said, the process was always we would send queries and very specific queries, and I think you may have dealt with even some of them before previously in the Tribunal --
386 Q. Yes.
A. -- for which we awaited replies and invariably got none. I wouldn't like to characterise the relationship as a bad one; it was kind of what I expected. I didn't 14:37 expect the Garda Press office to come back and say, you know, you've got us, here's the full reply. Quite the contrary. But certainly my experience would have been that if the Garda Press office was responding to
anybody, they certainly weren't dealing with us as any sort of priority, and, I mean, we got very little information out of them, so $I$ suppose to call it a relationship is maybe slightly even to stretch it. Do you consider that the Garda Press Office, and in particular Superintendent Taylor, was a source of information for you?
A. No.
Q. Was it --
A. Other than I should say, obviously, formal replies, you know, on the record, but certainly not in terms of any off-the-record material, no.

A11 right. So did it operate more as a facility whereby you could check stories or run stories by?
A. Absolutely. I mean, when you're dealing with, I
suppose, a lot of material that relates in some part to allegations or incomplete material, and you have to realise there's lots of things you hear that you can't subsequently report on, but you still have to try and attempt to, I suppose, check with everyone who may have 14:38 information on that. And sometimes that involves just putting queries to the Garda Press Office because you have given them the opportunity to respond. As I said, they often didn't respond, but I suppose that's the facility that they were there for. At least, to give them an opportunity to come back when we had information that, you know, we could perhaps stand up from another source, but we obvious7y, out of fairness, had to put to the guards as we11.

Q. Now, I think the investigators showed you certain waivers which have been completed, and I just want to show these to you. They begin at page 5415 of the materials. And I don't think there is a necessity for you to look at the hard copies.
A. No.

But you will see there that Martin Callinan signed a confirmation confirming that he "doesn't clai mand has not clai med any privilege should he be identified as the source of any information, briefing, allegation or bel i ef communi cated to journal ists in the print, broadcasting or ot her medi a, directly or indirectly rel ating to Sergeant Maurice MkCabe. "

Do you see that?
A. I do indeed.

392 Q. And a similar such waiver was signed by the former Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan on the 20th April 2017. It appears at page 5416 of the materials. And finally, Superintendent Taylor signed a similar such waiver on
the 28th April 2017. And I think they were shown to you previously, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

393 Q. And I think the investigators also explained to you that it was the wish of Superintendent Taylor that terms of reference share it with the Tribunal?
A. Yes, I understand.
Q. I don't know if you were following his evidence before
the Tribunal, but that was repeated in his evidence.
A. I did indeed, yes.
Q. And you saw that --
A. Yes.

396 Q. -- when he told the Tribunal of that. Now, I want to go back just a little bit about on the record and off the record. And you've explained to us your dealings, as I understand it, with the Garda Press office on the record --
A. Yes.
Q. -- isn't that right? That would have been mostly by the way of an email communication, but may be a phone call or a text to say there is an email on the way?
A. Yes, exactly, yeah. I suppose the reason why I always would have gone for emails, even though it may seem quite impersonal, is just it rules out any ambiguity in terms of precisely what you wanted to know from somebody in that particular case.
Q. And I suppose it would have the advantage of the question being there, documented and the answer being there, documented, should there be any adverse consequences down the line in relation to broadcast?
A. Absolutely. Invariably the former, not the latter, I should say. But yes, absolutely.
Q. And I don't know if the This week programme goes out live, does it?
A. It does, yes.

400 Q. So it would have a particular advantage?
A. It would indeed.
A. Yes, positive.
Q. Okay. When did you first become aware of that?
A. I would say from media reports, actually, whenever they first appeared in the media, so quite late. I mean, it
was an aspect to the case that I think I actually wouldn't have particularly taken much interest in unless somebody had briefed me to say this was a significant and substantial piece of information. They didn't. And I suppose -- so I didn't have any requirement or wasn't in a position to actually need to follow it up, and certainly nobody said it to me in any way that led me to that process. Okay. We11, maybe if I could perhaps point to the Paul Williams publications in April 2014. They didn't name Sergeant McCabe; you're familiar with them, are you?
A. Actually since then, I am, yeah, and since they have been raised here. I have to say they passed under the radar for me largely at the time. I wasn't -- perhaps I was working -- and this is, I suppose, a product of being a programme like This week: you don't exclusively stay on track with, you know, one particular story. I mean, throughout 2013, 2014, I would I have done an awful lot of stuff on a variety of stories, so -- particularly issues in relation to Irish Water, which became a very big issue then as well. So I have to say that particular article and its significance passed me by at that time.
406 Q. So do you remember reading that article?
A. At the time it was published, no, not really, to be quite honest.

407 Q. When do you think you became aware of that? And there's a whole series of articles, are you aware of that now, pub7ished --
A. Subsequently relating to --

408 Q. Well, close to that time --
A. No.

409 Q. -- written by Mr. Williams?
A. No, I wouldn't be, to be quite honest.

410 Q. Just the one on the 12th?
A. Just the one that's referred to in the --

411 Q. Yes. I think it's a version of the same article?
A. Okay, okay. That's news to me, indeed.

412 Q. When was it brought to your attention?
A. I couldn't say it was ever brought to my attention. I suppose it is the process of this current Tribunal that has actually brought it to my attention, really. I suppose having not noticed it at the time, it's not something that anyone subsequently pointed out to me, I 14:45 have to say.

413 Q. And in relation to any gossip, or rumours, murmurings you may have heard in RTÉ, did you hear anything in relation to an allegation of sexual assault by Sergeant McCabe?
A. I didn't actually, and I suppose -- no, actually, I didn't. And I suppose to explain how I would work: I suppose the This Week programme is, I suppose, very siloed from the rest of RTÉ, as many programmes within RTÉ are, and there would have been, I suppose, a number 14:46 of people within RTÉ at any given time probably working on that story, yet each one of them, myself included, would have been working through a separate editor and, you know, would see themselves as probably not sharing
information even themselves within the organisation. That's just the nature of it, where everyone reports to different editors with, I suppose, different broadcast times, and so forth. So, no, it's not a subject I would have been discussing really with any great frequency or with anyone else in there.

414 Q. Now, you understand that Superintendent Taylor has nominated you as one of the journalists that he briefed negatively in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. I do, indeed.

415 Q. And he repeated that in his evidence here given on the 14th May?
A. Yes.

416 Q. You're familiar with that?
A. I am, indeed.

417 Q. And as far as you were concerned, you heard nothing of the sort from Superintendent Taylor?
A. It's not even a question of whether I remember anything. I am absolutely certain he didn't. It's not something that would have passed me by. Had he said anything like that, had somebody like the head of the Garda Press office made that point to me, I think one of the first things I would have done was attempted to check it out and I'd probably check it out with Maurice McCabe or representatives thereof. The fact I didn't,
I think actually speaks for itself. But absolutely, it didn't happen, and I am mystified as to why my name is included on that list. I would have had very little contact, as an individual, with David Taylor at that
time, over that period, other than the very sort of brief and almost formulaic means that I said earlier.
418 Q. I wonder could we have page -- just to be specific what Superintendent Taylor says in relation to you, Mr. Burke.
A. Sure.

419 Q. It's Day 74, page 135 of the materials. It will come up on the screen. Day 74, Ms. Ní Ghabhann, page 135. You see it? It should be -- so it's put to Superintendent Taylor that his telephone contacts
initiated with you are set out in the materials, and I will come to those in a minute.
A. Yes.

420 Q. And it's linked in with the --
" 2013 is the year when it all bl ew up and you got instruction, as you say, isn't that right?"

And he refers to the o'mahony report, the fixed penalty dossier, the naming of people. And what Superintendent 19:49 Taylor says then at line 14, referring to you:
"I spoke to himover the phone on my mobile and al so my I andline. You don't have my landline, it's not available there at that time."

Now, did you phone Superintendent Taylor on his landline or speak to him over the landline?
A. I would doubt that very much, no. I would say I only
ever dealt with him via his mobile phone. I suspect he's implying there that he rang me from his landline.
421 Q. Yes.
A. As opposed to me ringing him on his landline.

422 Q. Do you think that is possible?
A. Me ringing him or the --

423 Q. Him ringing you?
A. I have no idea what phone he had in his hand when he would have rang. But I think the impression that is being given there is that there was some form of regular correspondence and communication. There wouldn't have been. I mean, I think the small number of calls and texts probably, I suppose, illustrate that better than anything else. We wouldn't have been, by any means, regular correspondents.
424 Q. Then he says:
"I can't pin down the exact date. I can't hel p you in rel ation to that, but $I$ would have spoken to him
Q. And you think it was over the phone?"

And his answer is:
"Yes, over the phone, yes, because Mr. Burke is a reporter with News at One on Sunday so he would not be goi ng to scenes like the other reporters."

```
You see that? And that's correct, isn't it?
```

A. Oh, that's right, yeah, and I wouldn't -- I suppose I would have no call to go to crime scenes. I'm actually someone who's always worked with Sunday papers; you tend to, I suppose, not have to go out to cover incidents as they occur that might have to be reported, you know, for the following day, and so forth.

425 Q. Because that is the way he distinguishes you from other people?
A. Yes.

426 Q. And then Mr. McGuinness says to him:
"So that is a detail that you thi nk hel ps you pl ace it certai nl y over the phone?
A. Over the phone, yes."

And then he says:
"They' ve questions and medi a queries to the Press
Office seeking the Commissi oner's reply to various matters they were going to rai se on the Sunday progr amme. "

And that is actually -- you agree with that statement?
A. That's correct, yes, absolutely.

427 Q. Yes. And then it continues on in relation to the phone 14:51 records on it. And then if we could turn to page 137 of the materials, he is asked at line 6:
"Up to frombet ween the 8th and the 14th Decentor, was

Mr. Burke invol ved in any way with the Commissioner's appearance on the Crimecall programme?"
what he says is:
"As I said, Mr. Burke is a very respected journalist and I respect him He was covering the penalty points issue quite extensively at the time and there was a number of programmes, segments of programmes on the News at One."

And were you covering the penalty points?
A. Yes, definitely, yeah, we were.
Q. And did you speak to Superintendent Taylor, and I now say speak as opposed to email him, in relation to the penalty points?
A. I have certainly no recollection of any conversation about the substantive issues, other than literally to ring to say we had either looked for a guest or that, you know, that we had sent them a query.
429 Q. Because, you see, and I'm sure you understand this, but Superintendent Taylor's case is that he was told by Commissioner Callinan to slip a matter into conversations with journalists, and especially around the penalty points controversy, that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by malice and this was because he had been previously investigated --
A. Yes.
Q. -- by the guards in relation to an allegation of sexual
assault and that is why he was bringing up the penalty points and other issues in relation to policing?
A. Absolutely. And I'm entirely aware of, I suppose, precisely what he is saying in that regard. I think what's -- the missing piece is the conversations, we wouldn't have had any. We just didn't have that relationship, as such. It was -- and I suppose we kind of presumed we were a programme that was just coming out once a week, so perhaps we weren't priority to anyone with more pressing and regular needs. But my dealings with Dave Taylor would have been no different to my dealings with, I suppose, his civilian counterpart, Andrew McLindon. It was literally just to say, any chance of - and this was rare enough, that we looked for either the commissioner or someone else to come in to us, invariably that was always a no - but it was literally just to say, you know, here's a series of queries that we are sending to you, you know, can you come back to us fairly promptly. That would have been it. There wouldn't have been conversations or briefings or back and forth in terms of any of the substantial elements of the cases themselves.

431 Q. Al1 right. We can look at Superintendent Taylor's contacts with you, and that's at page 5418 of the materials which is in volume 20, but it will come up on 14:54 screen, if that suits you better. 5418. So the first one is in January of 2013, and at that time were you working with RTÉ?
A. No, actually, I would have been in the Business Post
for the first three of those.
432 Q. Yes. So there are two in February 2013, and that was a Business Post contact --
A. Yes.

433 Q. -- is that right? And there's two texts and one call of very short duration. Do you have any idea what they were about?
A. No, I have no idea. Perhaps if you look back to whatever was that particular story of the day, I may have been covering for the Business Post.

434 Q. Al1 right. Then you have contact in April 2013, a cal1, one minute -- I think, sorry, it's May 2013, it's just -- would you have started in RTÉ at that stage?
A. 16th May, yes, I think so. I think I started on the 1st May, actually, 2013.
435 Q. And you said at that stage you wouldn't have really been doing much by the way of reporting; you'd have just been trained up, is that right?
A. Exactly. But I suppose one of the functions on that CND desk was, I suppose if there was something, you would be in at 6:00am, for instance, so if something had happened and there weren't the daily reporters in yet, you'd put a call in to see if the Garda Press office had any particular details. And I see the time of that is actually before 8:00am, so I suspect maybe it was -- maybe a duty mobile was on, or something like that, I'm not sure. But there would have been calls on, I suppose, something that happened that morning, that somebody would have asked me, I presume, to put a
cal1 in.

No, this is Superintendent Taylor's phone bill where these records are from.
A. Okay. Then perhaps he's returning a cal1, I presume, that I would have put in to the Garda Press office.
All right. At that hour of the morning it would hardly have been an introductory call saying, I'm now working for RTÉ?
A. No.
Q. I think that is fair enough?
A. No, no, absolutely. And at twenty to seven in the morning, that CND shift, or the centralised news desk shift, started at 6:00, and invariably you just put in some early calls on whatever was happening that day.
Q. There was another early call in August - yes, it is a ca11 - August 2013. Do you think that that would have been at the same time of admission?
A. Yes, I would have been on the centralised news desk at that stage.

441 Q. And that is Superintendent Taylor phoning you --
A. Yes.
A. Yes. They were all substantially in relation to -- or all in relation to -- I would have done a lot of work at that time, in fact more on the Ian Bailey case, the Sophie Toscan du Plantier case. I actually did a very substantial report for the This week programme that weekend, and that is what they would have been about. And I think they would have continued on through the day. You will see there was about five calls --
A. -- because I would have done a report then subsequent to the programme which broadcasts from 1:00pm to 2:00pm for the TV news, and I've a vague recollection that Superintendent Taylor had a difficulty with an image that might have been used in the TV -- that is, I have to say, I can't be certain of that, but I have a vague recollection there was an issue with the image that was used in the TV broadcast, which is why he may have been calling me up at quarter past six in the evening on that. But that would have been all substantially about that story.
444 Q. Then we have a text on the 14th December 2013, and then a series of calls in March, on the same day, 14th March 2014, from Superintendent Taylor to you?
A. Yeah. I actually can't recall what they would have been about. It may have been for a story that we didn't broadcast. One of the difficulties, I suppose, when you're looking back is, you know, the best record you have is actually the stories that you broadcast, but there are many that you put queries into that you
just -- you don't. But I suspect the likes of the 15 -second call may have been a voicemail, or I see there is a 15 and a 25 seconds, so...
Then on the 5th April there is a text from Superintendent Taylor to you. I think you also
identified what that was in connection with, to the Tribunal investigators?
A. Yes, I did. It was, I think, also related to the Ian Bailey case, from my memory.
okay. And then there are two texts on the 15th June 2014. Do you think that might have been in relation to his move from the Press office at that stage?
A. I actually -- I am not entirely sure, to be quite honest.
447 Q Do you remember when he moved from the Press office?
A. I actually don't. It wasn't particularly, I suppose, a point that made any real significance to myself. It wouldn't have changed how I dealt with the Press office, irrespective of who was there, to be quite honest.

448 Q. Now, if I can just go to the email contact, and I will just go through the index of that, I think it's easier.
A. Sure.

450 Q. Is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. The first thing we see is an email from you to David Taylor dated 21st February 2014, and that relates to the 'disgusting' remark and the cooperation of sergeant McCabe with the o'Mahony inquiry, is that right?
A. Em... yeah.
Q. It's actually at page 5365 of the materials.
A. I presume you're correct, yeah.
Q. Yes. And you will see there:
"Dave, pl ease see a number of questions from RTÉ's Thi s Week for the Garda Commi ssi oner regar di ng the ongoing Garda whi stlebl ower i ssue."

Now, it's quite informa1; you cal1 him 'Dave' as opposed to 'superintendent' or -- did you know him at that stage?
A. No. But I suppose that would be -- I mean, I wouldn't address him formally as, you know, 'Dear Superintendent Taylor'. I wouldn't have known him, wouldn't have met him at that point. Dave is no more than, you know, dear John, as such, you know.

454 Q. Do you think you'd have phoned him beforehand to tel1 him this query was coming in?
A. I would say more than likely I would have sent the query and then phoned him or Andrew McLindon - more
likely himself, $I$ suppose, if it was addressed to Dave Taylor, just to say that I'd sent the query.

455 Q. Yes. And it relates to the 'disgusting' remark by Commissioner Callinan and it also refers to the
cooperation issue:
"Mnister Al an Shatter said in the Dál that there was no cooperation by the whistlebl owers with the O Mahony internal revi ew. What mentber of An Garda Sí ochána tol d 15:01 the M ni ster/Department of Justice there had been no opportunity by the whi stlebl owers with the O Mahony i nqui ry?"

Had that piece of information come to you from a source 15:02 other than Superintendent Taylor in relation to the cooperation issue I'm asking you about now?
A. I suppose that's a question as such --

456 Q. Yes.
A. That would relate to statements that were made in public.

457 Q. In the Dáil. We11, there is a direct reference here to Minister Shatter?
A. Yes. So I suppose that doesn't portray any particular level of knowledge, it's really a question as to -- and 15:02 I suppose the purpose of an email like that is, I mean it would be fantasy to suspect that the Garda Press office is going to reply and say who informed the Garda Commissioner, but you can't fairly report on an issue that relates, I think, to -- here in this case, to comments by the Minister for Justice and the Garda Commissioner without first at least asking them if they are willing to say who informed the minister, but -and I suspect in our subsequent report we would have
said and we asked if they could inform us who informed the Minister in that case, but, and I suspect, though I haven't even it, I presume there was either no reply or a one-1ine reply.
CHA RMAN This is the standard line: so-and-so was unavailable for comment?
A. Absolutely, yes. But you can't not -- you can't proceed, I think, fairly without asking the question.
Q. ME. LEADER: Yes.
A. But I would have had no illusions that anybody was going to send me an email going, hands up, you've got us, you've asked the question.
459 Q. I think the answer appears at 5366 of the materials. And it just doesn't particularly answer the questions, it just sets out what the state of play is in relation to the fixed charge penalty notices?
A. And I should say, just even something that I noticed even in reviewing those emails myself, invariably I think you will find that whilst I would have sent emails to either David Taylor directly or Andrew McLindon themselves, invariably it was somebody else in the Garda Press office who would have come back to us as well. So it wasn't necessarily, you know, deliberate or specific contact with either of those individuals, with the belief that they would generate any better result.
460 Q. Yes. Now, the next set of emails are dated 28th February 2014, and again that's at page 5363 of the materials, and it relates to the cooperation issue,
again. It's asked in the context of an upcoming RTÉ programme.
A. okay.

461 Q. Were you aware of Sergeant McCabe's statement in relation to the cooperation issue with the O'Mahony inquiry?
A. I'd have to see how my question is phrased, to be honest, to remind me, but it's just not popping up on the screen.

Yes. 5368 of the materials. Were you aware of Sergeant McCabe's statement in relation to the --
A. I would have been, yes, absolutely.

463 Q. And that was on the 24th February 2014?
A. Yes.

464 Q. Right. So it's not referred to there at a11, as far as 15:05 I can see?
A. In the reply from the Garda Press Office or in my question?
Q. In light of the statements and the statement made by Sergeant Maurice McCabe, that is the reference to

Sergeant McCabe's statement made on the 24th?
A. I see. I'm sorry, that page isn't in front of me at the moment.

466 Q. Sorry, I beg your pardon. 5368. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

467 Q. And had you spoken to any of your colleagues in RTÉ in relation to the cooperation issue?
A. I wouldn't have, no.

468 Q. So your information from there is from sources other
than other journalists or from the public record, is that right?
A. Yes.

469 Q. Now, the next set of emails, it's an email from you to David Taylor dated the 20th March, and that relates to you looking for an interview with the Commissioner, do you remember that one?
A. I don't in particular, but, I mean, that would have been something we would have done, I think, perhaps two or three times during the whole process --
A. -- but without any real expectation, I think, of getting one.
471 Q. Then there is an email on the 22nd March 2014, which mentions the Séan Guerin Report, do you remember that one? It's at page 5371 of the materials. You see you say:
"Good eveni ng, Dave. Can you inf ormme whet her the Séan Guerin SC revi ew has made contact with An Garda Sí ochána yet in rel ation to his revi ew of allegations made by Sergeant Maurice McCabe? Has M. Guerin met or intervi ewed any menbers of the force regarding this issue. Has any information been sought by Mr. Guerin or sent to himby An Garda Sí ochána? Can you cone back 15:08 to me tomorrow morning?"

I don't think -- and I can't see any reply in relation to that. It may have been that --
A. I think there were probably quite a few emails that we may not have got replies to, I think.
472 Q. Then in relation to the 4th May, you email the Garda Press office in relation to a complaint Sergeant McCabe made in relation to bullying against a number of named and unnamed members of the Gardaí, so it would seem you were keeping a fairly close eye on the story?
A. Yes, absolutely. I suppose there was so much happening, certainly I would have, I suppose, had an eye on it, definitely, but, I mean, $I$ suppose it was in the context of, $I$ suppose, being the sole reporter on a programme and lots of other things happening also. So, I mean, I could probably list half a dozen stories that I was also, I suppose, trying to maintain the same watching brief on. So I suppose at the risk of saying one dips in and out of stories, and you obviously have to be as well-informed as you can be, it would have been a story I definitely covered for the programme in as much as I could, being the sole reporter on that programme, but it would have been one of a number, certainly quite a number. I think the big stories, certainly for me around the middle of that year, would certainly have been, $I$ think, Irish water, because it was an issue we went into, got a lot of detail on. I think in terms of actual Garda controversies
themselves, if you don't mind me putting it that way, I think I probably would have paid more attention to the Ian Bailey case throughout 2014 than probably the whole penalty points issues. But it was certainly one of a
number of stories that I would have attempted to keep up to speed on and I suppose would have dipped in and out of in terms of high points, certainly.
473 Q. Now, if we could come to your query to the Press office of the 4th July 2015, and this is actually addressed to 15:10 Mr. McLindon. Superintendent Taylor had gone at that stage?
A. Okay.

And it's at page 5376 of the materials. And you say -is it in front -- yes:
"RTÉ understands that Sergeant MECabe has contacted Garda Headquarters to request that he be rel eased from the new role heading up the traffic unit at Mullingar. What is your response to this and your understanding of the circunstances behi nd Sergeant MECabe's deci sion?"

The source of that information, was it Superintendent Taylor?
A. Superintendent Taylor wasn't a source for me at any stage.
Q. Yes. So it's not. We can take the answer is it's not?
A. Yes, absolutely, it's not. But obviously I can't say who it was.
Q. Yes. I am being careful not to ask you that.
A. Ah, no, I do appreciate that.
Q. "Secondly and separate to the above, RTÉ's This Week understands that at a recent session of the Justice O Hi ggi ns i nqui ry, counsel for the Garda Commissioner
rai sed questions over the motivation of Sergeant McCabe for bringing certain matters regarding alleged Garda misconduct to attention. Does this amount to the view of the Garda Commissi oner in terns of her view as to why Sergeant MECabe raised these issues in the first i nst ance?"

Do you see that question there?
A. Yes, indeed.

478 Q. Now, as I understand your position is, you had heard nothing about an allegation of sexual assault at this stage?
A. That's true.

479 Q. Nothing. And you had heard nothing about sergeant McCabe being motivated by revenge on the guards?
A. That's true, yes.

480 Q. So did you not ask yourself, what's this all about?
A. I suppose in the first instance I should say I ultimately didn't have enough information to report on that story.
Q. Yes.
A. So I suppose you could read that query and suggest it shows that I had, you know, access to full transcripts of the O'Higgins inquiry, which wouldn't have been the case. I suppose I put the information to the Press
Office that I had, but ultimately I couldn't advance my own knowledge of those issues, beyond, I suppose, the full extent of what's posed in the questions. So whilst I see the point you're making, absolutely, I
wouldn't have been sufficiently across the background detail in terms of what might have been the alleged malice, or whatever, or questions over Maurice McCabe's motives, so I certainly would have been aware of or would have been informed that this issue in relation to 15:13 motivation, and I suppose that was what I saw as the central issue of the story, I suppose, that I was attempting to get at, was this issue of questioning motivation on any level. But no, even at that point I wouldn't have been, I suppose, across the underlying issues in terms of whether there had been a previous background in relation to any allegations of sexual misconduct, or otherwise.
482 Q. We11, can I put the question this way: It doesn't seem that you were that surprised by the issue of motivation entering into the equation in July 2014?
A. In terms of --

483 Q. '15, I beg your pardon.
A. I wouldn't at all expect that from the question. I suppose the very fact that I put the question about an issue of motivation being raised would suggest, I suppose, I was surprised and did see it as an issue of -- certainly a very newsworthy issue, if it could be established. I suppose, for me, the issue of motivation was the juxtaposition, if it could be established, I should say, that Sergeant McCabe's motivation was questioned on any level, given that there were at that time very public pronouncements in support of whistleblowers. So I suppose on that level
that is how I viewed the information that I had, which wasn't, by any means, as comprehensive as I would have liked it to have been, and, had it have been, I suppose I would have been able to report on it at the time.
484 Q. You see, the Tribunal has heard evidence from a number of people saying that the rumours were widely circulated, certainly in 2014, and you were a person who is working in the newsroom in the national broadcaster and up to 2015 you don't appear to have heard anything about these rumours, despite the fact that Superintendent Taylor has said he briefed you about the matter?
A. Absolutely. And I suppose (a) he didn't brief me. 485 Q. Yes.
A. But actually, it wasn't -- I suppose I'm not a person who engages in discussions on rumours, and I think all I can say is certainly it's not something I would have been aware of, it's not something I would have discussed with others. It is -- just the nature of how I work and how I worked on the programme is that I do very much work on my own and report to a single editor. There isn't a scenario, and especially when you are working for, I suppose, a weekend programme, you're not in any particular mix of other journalists. And even internally within RTÉ, I wouldn't have discussed that case, or indeed any other case really, or story, I should say, with my colleagues; they report to different editors. I suppose there's a competitive element to that as well. But even just in terms of any
rumours, certainly nobody discussed any rumours with me or anything that that has subsequently emerged in relation to -- and I suppose a lot of those rumours have turned out to be false, which is maybe why people may have not raised them or discussed them with me. I can't explain.

486 Q. Did you feel a bit foolish that maybe you were the last person to hear about all of this, since you were covering the Sergeant McCabe story?
A. No, by no means. I mean, I can only speak to my own account of it. I suspect I am by no means alone in terms of people who didn't hear what, now, people say were rumours. I would dispute -- obviously, I mean, if you are basing any sense that this was widely disseminated on Superintendent Taylor's account, my only experience of Superintendent Taylor is that he has told the public inquiry that he discussed this with me, and I know for a fact he didn't. So, I mean, that would lead me to question that account. We11, I was thinking more of the evidence Alison O'Reilly has given to the Tribunal or, perhaps, Paul Williams having interviewed Ms. D, or the politicians, such as Mr. McGuinness, in relation to the matter, or maybe Ms. Harris as we11, or Mr. Kenny, who all have given evidence and have said that there was a rumour going around in political circles, and I think that covers journalistic circles, and we've also heard from perhaps Chief Superintendent walsh that there were rumours in Garda Headquarters at the time. So here we
have a journalist looking for stories in relation to a programme which is on in the middle of the day on a Sunday which perhaps many well-informed people listen to and you have heard nothing about it?
A. Yes, absolutely. I mean, I can't account for the evidence given by other people. I can only give you my own genuine account of it. And that is the case, absolutely. I mean, I would caution the extent to which some people might claim to be wise after the fact of whether things were widely known or not. I can only 15:17 say nothing was discussed with me, either by colleagues, by other people in journalism or even people who would have been principal characters in this particular issue.
488 Q. And we know, of course, that in December 2013, the Commissioner was speaking in very derogatory terms to one of the RTÉ journalists, Mr. Boucher-Hayes, in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Again, the first account $I$ heard of that was when it was actually reported in the Sunday Times, I think earlier this year. I would have had no knowledge about that whatsoever.

489 Q. Mr. Mooney's article?
A. Indeed. So even that, I suppose, illustrates a point: I would never have had a -- like, Philip Boucher-Hayes would be a journalist who would have covered elements of this story also. I would never have had a conversation with Philip about his coverage, nor he with mine, likewise any of my other colleagues in RTÉ.

And I don't think that is particularly strange, given that we report to different editors and with the purpose, I suppose, of keeping whatever knowledge we have to ourselves. At times, RTÉ can almost be, understandably, you know, almost like different separate media within themselves where you have different editors who obviously want programmes or want stories reported on their programme and not, you know, going elsewhere beforehand. Well, Mr. Kenny, in an article which he referred us to this morning, dated the Sunday -- it's the Sunday Independent on the 2nd March 2014, open1y -- and this can be brought up on screen in front of you, 3881 of the materials. This is Mr. Kenny who gave evidence last Friday. And if we just go to the sixth paragraph down:
"It is understood that McCabe has al so been subj ected to a serious accusation by a seni or garda that was subsequently referred by Gardaí to the DPP, who found no basis on whi ch to pursue the matter."

So Mr. Kenny, in 2014, actually wrote about this, having checked the matter out?
A. True. I suspect, that was probably one of the very
A. Well, indeed. But I should say, I mean, if there was a degree of innuendo and somebody wasn't named -- I mean, likewise, $I$ wouldn't be a very regular reader of Mr. Williams' articles either.

492 Q. We will put aside the regular reader. You're a journalist in the business of looking for news and at this time you were actually covering the Sergeant McCabe matter --
A. Yes.
-- all through 2014, there was a query went in in 2015. Mr. Kenny was writing about it open7y in 2014. Mr. Williams wrote articles, although not naming Sergeant McCabe. So did you ever at any time maybe refer to Mr. Reynolds, a very experienced journalist in RTÉ in relation to crime matters, and just say, is there something I'm missing here, or anything of that nature?
A. I wouldn't have done and we wouldn't have that, I suppose, working relationship, as such. Paul Reynolds would work, I suppose, very much, I suppose, on a 24/7 basis for, I suppose, covering news as it happens. We would have seen ourselves very much as almost working I say 'we', I suppose the This Week programme - as almost being like a Sunday newspaper within a broadcaster, in the sense that we reported for one deadline once a week. It just wouldn't have arose. I suppose we just didn't have that relationship for sharing information, no more than Mr. Boucher-Hayes and myself or Katie Hannon on Prime Time.

494 Q. Now, I think this morning was circulated some text messages between yourself and Superintendent Taylor, and that's at page 7522 of the materials. You had seen these already?
A. I have indeed, yes.
Q. They're on your phone. And you'11 see -- so in September 2014 you're contacting Superintendent Taylor in relation to a matter, and you will see at the very first text it is sent on the 14th September 2014 ?
A. I just don't have those yet.

MG. LEADER: Sorry, I beg your pardon.
CHA RMAN It's 7522, isn't that it?
MG. LEADER: 7522. It was just circulated this morning.
CHA RMAN It is on the system, is it?
MS. LEADER: Sorry.
CHA RMAN I wonder is it on the system? It's not?
MS. LEADER: So it's 7522 of the materials.
CHA RMAN Just hang on.
MS. LEADER: I have an extra sheet.
CHA RMAN Mr. Kavanagh, is it on the system?
MR. KAVANAGH It is on the system.
CHA RMAN It is. If we just wait a second, Ms. Leader.
MS. LEADER: Now, these are messages that you didn't

## object to being circulated in public?

A. Yes, absolutely.

497 Q. Isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So if we look at the first text message, these were taken off SIM3, which is the phone Superintendent Taylor had between September and December 2014 ?
A. okay.

499 Q. So you see a text message from you to David Taylor and it relates to -- you make an apology to him and you say "Ring you tomorrow froma good I andline". Do you see that question?
A. I do indeed, yeah.

500 Q. So was that the norm with regard to communications between you, ringing from a landline, if you would explain that, please?
A. Yes. No --

501 Q. Yes.
A. I actually had a think about that. I can only presume it means maybe mobile signal was bad, or something. I mean, it wouldn't relate to anything in particular. This particular period itself was after Superintendent Taylor had left the Press office.
502 Q. Yes.
A. And certainly it is absolutely true to say we had no real engagement or relationship beyond, you know, very formal, as such, sent you a query, and no reply comes back, when he was in the Press office. When he left, I have a vague recollection that either he contacted me with I think what would have been best described as unsolicited praise or other stories that I was doing, invariably non-Garda stories, and you will even see that in, I think, one of the texts or two of the texts

503 Q. Yes.
A. And we agreed to meet then. We had never met before that. I think either he or I said we must meet for a coffee. We met at least once, maybe more, maybe twice, 15:24 I have a vague recollection we met -- we definitely met in Temple Bar and said we would meet again. I'm not entirely sure if we -- I have a vague recollection we may have met again in Fairview for a coffee or -- I'm not entirely sure if that actually went ahead. But that would have been the context of it, and it would have been, I have to say, unusual. I even recall getting the text, you see four down, it says:
"J ohn, great scoop on Hogan. You're good, Dave".
504 Q. That is the 28th September?
A. Yes, that would have been absolutely out of character to any sort of messages I would have received from him when he was in the Press office. And it was quite odd because that was a text about a story that $I$ had done that day on the Irish water issue and, you know, the level of knowledge or whatever that the then-Minister for the Environment had on $X$ amount of million they had spent on consultants. So I suppose that was certainly the character of some very brief correspondence I had from him after he had left the Press office, where he seemed eager to set up a meeting, we met for a coffee, but nothing ever really came of it, to be quite honest.

505 Q. A11 right. So that is the "great scoop on Hogan", the

28th September 2014?
A. Yeah.

506 Q. Then's some text messages in November 2014?
A. Mm-hmm.

507 Q. One from you to Superintendent Taylor:
"Gi ve you a call in ten mimes, Dave. John. "

So, again --
A. I presume that's from a missed call, or something like that.

508 Q. okay. And then the next day there is a text from you to Superintendent Taylor:
"Meet today or tomor row morning, same pl ace as last."

That would seem to suggest that you were more than people who had a professional relationship, as has been described by you earlier on?
A. Sure, absolutely. Well, at this point he had left the Garda Press office. I suppose I had never sought nor had particularly wanted anything more than exactly a formal relationship with him as the head of the Press office. I suppose when a senior garda who is no longer in the Press office and is no longer, I suppose, touting a corporate line, if you will excuse that phrase, has an interest in sitting down and meeting you for a coffee, as a journalist you are going to go along and see if they have anything interesting to say. We
may have met a second time, as I say, and I think those texts kind of support it, although I see there's a cancelled meeting as well.
509 Q. Yes.
A. But, I mean, that was the contexts of those texts, and I would say they are relatively brief but sum up, I suppose, that relationship. There wouldn't have been -- certainly no particular relationship developed out of it, for lack of a better way of describing it.
I suppose it wasn't a relationship into the future but what they reflect as to your past dealings with him --
A. Yes.

511 Q. -- that those texts might suggest that it was maybe a bit closer than phoning him to say that there's a query going into the Press office?
A. Sure, I would say they are entirely contrary to the prior relationship, and I would have even marked at the time that they were odd in that sense. I mean, he never would have, I suppose, sent me a text or left a voicemail saying, you know, good story today, John.
That wouldn't have been in any sense how we engaged when he was in the Press office. So I suppose it marked a change in that regard. And as to what the purpose of it was, I have really no idea, but it led to us meeting for a coffee, and that was about it, really, 15:28 as such.

512 Q. Al1 right. I just want to turn to your initial statement.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Ms. Leader, just to clarify this.

This particular time, November 2014, it's well prior to his arrest on the 28th May '15 then?
MS. LEADER: Yes.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MS. LEADER: It's prior to the first phone being taken from him. This comes from that first phone, yes.

CHAI RMAN Yes.
MS. LEADER: Now, it may be me, I don't quite understand this in your statement, but if we could just go to page 5361 of the materials, which is your
statement which you made on the 8th September 2017, 1ast year. And if we go to the second-last paragraph of that, what you say is:
"I do wish to bring to the Tribunal's attention that I do have certai $n$ i nformation pertai ni ng to the above."

And "the above" is referring to the negative campaign in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
A. Yes.

514 Q. A11 right.
"This is not direct information, but is merely an account of a conversation bet ween a confidential source and a third party where I was not present."
okay.
"I wi sh to assert journalistic privilege in rel ation to
the identity of the source. I hope the Tribunal will respect this clai mof privilege. I can say that this source has not wai ved privilege. I can al so say, if it is of assistance in considering this matter, that it is clear fromthe public work the Tribunal has al ready undertaken that the detail of this reported conversation is al ready known to the Tri bunal."
A. Yes.

515 Q. I'm just slightly mystified by what all of that is about.
A. I can see how you would be. I suppose a11 I can say by clarity is that it would relate to a conversation that a source of mine would have had with a person who has, I suppose, come to the Tribunal's attention already and it would relate to a conversation they had with that person. It would only have been thirdhand information really, as such, and it would have been after issues in relation to the allegations of a smear campaign had come into the public domain, in any event.
516 Q. Okay. So we will just break that down a little bit. So it's a conversation between a confidential source, that's your source, and not Superintendent Taylor?
A. No, David Taylor was never a source of mine.

517 Q. Yes, yes. I just want to be clear about what we are al1 talking about.
A. Sure.

518 Q. And I suppose the same goes to Assistant Commissioner O'Sullivan -- or Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan at the time and Commissioner Martin Callinan at the time?
A. Yes. Although I suppose I would be wary of getting into a process of elimination, but absolutely.
Q. And they have waived privilege.

CHA RMAN No, I think those are the three people we are actually interested in.
A. Of course, yes.

CHA RMAR So, I mean, I appreciate that you may claim a privilege in relation to something, and if the necessity to rule on it comes up, I will rule on it, but --
A. I don't foresee that, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Similarly, I don't want to run down these side roads.
A. Absolutely.

520 Q. MG. LEADER: And then that source told you about a conversation he or she had with a third party. Do you know who the third party is?
A. I do indeed.

521 Q. okay. Was it a guard?
A. Again, I'd rather not be drawn any further on the

522 Q. I mean, we will just take it step-by-step for the moment.
A. Sure.

523 Q. So you'd rather not be drawn, but would you be -- wel1, 15:31 we will leave it at that for the moment.
A. I don't think it would aid the Tribunal in any way. It is an issue that has come entirely to your attention already. I wouldn't add anything to it, other
than that I had a -- that a source who has had a conversation with somebody who may have been in some knowledge.
524 Q. With somebody else?
A. But it's nothing more than I think the Tribunal is already well aware of.
CHA RMAN All right. We11, that is fine. It's not going to add to anything I already know?
A. I don't believe so.

CHA RMAN okay.
MS. LEADER: The detail of this reported conversation
is already known to the Tribunal; you're happy of that -- about that?
A. Yes.

526 Q. And that that person may or may not have or we may have or may not have chased up that conversation?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.

528 Q. was it anything to do with the D allegation or the
allegation of sexual assault against Sergeant McCabe? or was it an entirely different matter?
A. I'd rather really not get drawn any further on that matter, if that is okay.
529 Q. Okay.
A. Suffice to say is the Tribunal will be in no sense disadvantaged by me not telling you what I know.

530 Q. And just in relation to the time-line for this, as I understand it, your position is you knew nothing about
a smear campaign or an allegation of sexual assault which was tied in with Sergeant McCabe, up until at least 2015 when you sent the query into the Garda Press office?
A. Even at that time I wouldn't have been aware. I mean, the information that $I$ had that led me to ask that question related to the challenge, as I was informed, to Sergeant McCabe's motivation.
A. I didn't have a detailed understanding of what the underlying allegation was in terms of why Sergeant McCabe may have, as alleged, any particular reason to feel malicious towards senior management, or otherwise. It struck me that the important aspect of that was in establishing whether that challenge was made, and whether you could establish the juxtaposition between, as I saw it, whether right or wrong, a public position of support in favour of whistleblowers versus the actual challenge to a whistleblower's, for lack of a better word, motivation in raising issues that led to an inquiry.

532 Q. A11 right. Now, a poison pen/anonymous letter has come to the Tribunal's attention which the Tribunal knows was sent to RTÉ. Are you familiar with that letter?
A. On7y since it arose in the proceedings to this

Tribuna1. It was never brought to my attention.
CHA RMAN Was that brought to our attention by RTÉ?
ME. LEADER: No.
CHA RMAN That's what I thought.
A. My understanding is, did that go to the Prime Time programme or --
MS. LEADER: We11, it's certainly where it ended up, in any event.
A. It was certainly never brought to my attention. CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Gillane, yes, we11, you know, you are the one who made the assertion of total cooperation by RTÉ, and there's a number of things, apart from a claim of privilege, which of course may be legitimately made in due course; there's also the phone numbers --
MR. G LLANE: Judge, can I --
CHN RMAN And now there's this letter, which is a poison pen letter, which apparently was in RTÉ's possession but they never gave it to the Tribuna1. So I mean, I get a bit worried when I hear these things. I'm not a jury sitting there innocently while counsel put a question to a policemen 'Didn't he refuse to cooperate?' knowing of course he said absolutely nothing.
MR. G LLANE: Chairman, can I just try and explain those things because there are a number of issues involved.

CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. G LLANE: Firstly, there's more than one anonymous
letter. RTÉ did bring one anonymous letter, that it was aware of, to the Tribunal's attention.
CHA RMAN We11, I mean, the duty is to bring everything to the Tribunal's attention. I mean, that's it.

MR. G LLANE: I appreciate that.
CHA RMAN There's no exception to that, Mr. Gillane, you know.
MR. G LLANE: As soon as we were made aware of the possible existence of the other letter we chased that 15:35 up and then corresponded with your solicitor in relation to what we knew of it. Can I say just in relation to the phone numbers --
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. G LLANE: -- all of the individuals who I represent 15:35 I think have confirmed their phone numbers and did so in early course to the Tribunal. When I was referring to phone numbers that was in relation to somebody else entirely, not a client of mine. And lastly, just because I don't want the Chair to misunderstand me when 15:36 I was asking questions of Mr. Kenny on Friday; it wasn't that $I$ was asserting anything even remotely approaching some sense of total cooperation wherein I was entitled to some type of reward, I was merely trying to point out to Mr. Kenny who I thought might be 15:36 misunderstanding me that $I$ wasn't advocating some extremist view of privilege and it was at that point I put to him that my clients had attempted to assist the Tribuna1. So it wasn't any suggestion that there was some sort of, as I say, encomium that we were worthy of 15:36 or anything of that nature.
CHA RMAN Al1 right. We11, I mean, a horse can attempt a six-foot fence and maybe not get over it, Mr. Gillane. I'm not going to make any comment beyond
what I have said.
MR. G LLANE: May it please the Tribunal.
CHA RMAN And I'm not sure this is a six-foot fence either but anyway, we will find out in due course.

MS. LEADER: Finally, we have heard from the 1ast witness, Mr. Vaughan, that he overheard on a train that there was a sexual abuse allegation connected somehow with Sergeant McCabe, and do you in any way feel that maybe you should have known about it having reporting on it at the time and knowing Superintendent Taylor.
A. I don't feel I should. I mean, I suppose the fact that I didn't I suppose illustrates the extent to which he, like many others, you know, didn't bring it to my attention. As I said, you could easily look at a reporter's coverage of a story and think they're going to be across all manner and every level of detail on it, which is not the case unless I suppose they have the time to deal exclusively with that story sometimes and to the exclusion of everything else. It's not the nature of how I could have worked at the time covering many other stories. And certainly, I suppose, I can only say that information came to my attention much later. I'm not sure how widely known it was. I would doubt how widely known it was by virtue of the fact that it wasn't brought to my attention. But I would also not be somebody who -- I would say, and I'm sure all journalists would say this, I attempt, where possible, to deal only in issues and reports that $I$ can verify entirely and wholeheartedly. I wouldn't be
somebody who engages, you know, in rumour or idle gossip. It is not something that I think anyone probably would have seen of benefit in bringing to my attention. It certainly wouldn't have been something that I think anyone who would have watched how we report issues on the This week programme would have used to any benefit in terms of our reporting. But also, I suspect people may have been reluctant to bring it to our attention had we acted on it in a different way. I don't know. Certainly it wouldn't have been in any sense reflective of the relationship I had with the Garda Press Office to expect that David Taylor, if he was saying this to other people, I have no idea, he certainly never said it to me.
M. LEADER: If you would answer any questions.

CHAL RNAN Can I just clarify, Ms. Leader, the poison pen letter that we have been referring to, and we haven't read it out publicly, because it is poisonous, nobody brought it in to you in RTÉ and said here's the latest?
A. No, absolutely not.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. The first I learned of any poison pen letter was I think maybe referenced in the last few weeks here or days perhaps to the existence of those. No.
CHA RMAN And could I just ask one other thing, and Ms. Leader has carefully gone through the fact that when you're writing in the letter which has now, I suppose, become a focus of attention, that that
fortunately has passed in July 2015, you weren't aware that there was any of these rumours, I'm just wondering when did you ever become aware that there were any of those rumours.
A. I suppose really only when it became reported in the public domain.
CHA RMAN So, we're talking about 2017 and the Prime Time programme --
A. I suspect, yes.

CHAD RMAN -- and the Irish Examiner and that kind of thing?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN That is fine.
MG. LEADER: I think just in relation to that poison pen letter, I think Ms. Hannon may have referred to it in a Prime Time programme, you didn't see that, did you?
A. It doesn't ring a bell to be quite honest, no.

534 Q. In 2016?
A. That one had been sent?

535 Q. Yes.
A. No. Obviously she didn't get into any particular detail, I presume that I should remember it.
536 Q. I think maybe there were two sentences, perhaps three referred to --
A. No, I don't.

CHA RMAN Three from the poison pen letter that got into the broadcast, yes?
ME. LEADER: Three that a poison pen letter had been
received, $I$ think, was the air of it.
A. I should say, newsrooms receive letters from, you know anonymous letters from members of the public all the time, invariably they make -- you know, they don't stick in one's memory.
M. LEADER: If you would answer any questions.
A. Sure.

## THE WTNESS MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MEDONELL AS
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537 Q. MR. MEDOWELL: Mr. Burke, Michae1 McDowe11 is my name, I'm one of the counse 1 for Sergeant McCabe. Can I bring you back to 5361 of your statement to the Tribunal dated 8th September 2017 firstly.
A. Yes, I think we're on it.

538 Q. It's the second last paragraph I just want to ask you about. You say:
"I do wish to bring to the Tribunal's attention that I have certain information pertai ni ng to the above. This
is not direct information but is merely an account of conversation bet ween a confidential source and a third party where l was not present. I wi sh to assert
journalistic privilege in rel ation to the identity of this source. I hope the Tribunal will respect this clai mof privilege. I can say that this source has not wai ved privilege. I can al so say if it is of assistance in consi dering this matter that it is clear fromthe public work that the Tribunal has al ready
undertaken that the detail of this reported conversation is al ready known to the Tri bunal."

I appreciate your desire to protect your sources, but could you confirm to the Tribunal that there are four conversations that I believe that we are dealing with and that it must be one of them: One is a conversation with Mr. Philip Boucher-Hayes in December of 2013; the second is a conversation in January 2014 between Martin Callinan and the Comptroller and Auditor General; the third is two conversations between John McGuinness and Martin Callinan; and the fourth is a conversation between John Deasy and Martin Callinan on the same day as the PAC meeting? Now, are we agreed that we're talking about one of those conversations?
A. I really can't go into any greater detail, I'm sorry. CHA RMAN I'm not going to press it. Because I mean I actually didn't think it was any of those, Mr. McDowe11. I don't know why you think that. Maybe I'm totally wrong. But I'm not interested in
chasing -- look, if the issue comes and I have to confront it of course I will look at it very, very carefully, but I don't think this is an instance. Again, it's a question of dúirt bean liom go ndúirt bean 1éi and we don't have either of mná in question
A. Again, I would take every effort I could to help. It is certainly something that doesn't disadvantage the Tribunal in not having my account of it, I can assure
you.
CHA RMAN We11, fortunately I don't think about these things too deeply, because I could not go asleep tonight now thinking about the enigmatic nature of that statement.

MR. MEDONELL: Maybe I can try one more time on page 5382, and it is also on a different page. This is your email to the Garda Press office. And you go to some pains in the first paragraph to say that it's a two-parted query and it relates to separate matters involving Garda Sergeant Maurice McCabe. Can you explain why it was that you wanted to emphasise that they were separate matters?
A. I suppose in some respects they're two separate stories, you could argue, or potentially reported as two separate stories, and it may have been possible, although un7ikely, that the Garda Press Office may have confirmed one but not the other. And certainly there are, $I$ know, restrictions in relation to reporting the proceedings of an ongoing inquiry, whereas --
540 Q. If you go to the first one, it says:
"RTÉ understands that Sergeant MkCabe has cont acted Garda Headquarters to request that he be rel eased from the new role heading up the Traffic Unit in Muliingar. What is your response to this and your undertaking of the ci rcunstances behi nd Ser geant McCabe' s deci si on?"
"What is your understanding of the circumstances behind Ser geant McCabe' s deci si on?"
A. I would say it was unlikely but possible at that stage that the Garda Press Office may have confirmed some details of that. As I say, unlikely. But I would have had less certainty that they would deal with the second issue. And I suppose that is why I would have broken it up into two parts.
541 Q. It is clear that you must have understood that there was a connection between the two, because you were taking out your Occam's razor to separate them --
A. Well, I would say this, if I may: The distinction is that one of those two there is, as I understand it, a barrier from actually responding to it. Had I included them in one general question $I$ may have got the 'We cannot comment on the ongoing work of an inquiry' answer to both of them. But as I said I had no realistic expectation that $I$ would get a reply to either of them.

542 Q. And the second query you make is:
"Secondly and separate to the above, RTÉ's This Week understands that at a recent session of Justice Kevin O' Hi ggi ns' i nqui ry counsel for the Gar da Commi ssi oner rai sed questions over the motivation of Sergeant McCabe for bringing certain matters regarding Garda mi sconduct to attention. Does this amount to the view of the

Garda Commi ssi oner in terms of her view as to why Sergeant MkCabe rai sed these issues in the first i nst ance?"

Are you telling this Tribunal that the information that 15:46 gave rise to these queries that you put to the Press Office didn't hint at the 2006 allegation in any shape or form?
A. I am, yes.

543 Q. I see. Just lastly then could I ask you to go to page 15:46 7522? And these are your emails?
A. They are text messages, sorry.

544 Q. Text messages rather. You said in the first one:
"Sorry Dave, got in the door at home and was handed a restless baby, ring you tomorrow froma good I andl ine." 15:47 Are you contending that that was due to your desire to have good quality reception?
A. Well, I presume it's because I was probably holding a baby at that time and had no interest in having a conversation on the phone. I mean, a good landline I presume can only refer to what was -- if there was a call that preceded that $I$ don't know, a bad signal. There's no sense in which a good landline, if I was ringing from RTÉ, would be any sort of covert line or anything to that effect, if that is what you mean. I $\quad$ 15:48 mean, clearly there are text messages going back and forth there that aren't trying to conceal any interaction. So a good landline there could only mean a better quality line, $I$ presume. I mean --

545 Q. We11, you're conversant with the phrase 'ring me from a landline', which is usually used by people who are concerned that their conversations might be overheard?
A. Well, actually invariably --

CHA RMAN This is the first I have heard of it, Mr. McDowell.
A. -- in broadcasting terms when we conduct --

MR. MEDONELL: We11, you have heard it now, Chairman. CHA RMAN Well, I have, yes.
A. Well actually, Mr. McDowell, I'm sure when you have done media interviews yourself, journalists would always ask you to speak on a landline rather than a mobile, the signal quality is a lot better.
546 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Yes. This was not to do with a mobile --
A. No, not an interview obvious7y.

547 Q. -- or sorry, an interview?
A. You're asking me to recall something that happened four years ago, for which I can't account for a phrase. I can only presume the mobile signal wasn't, you know, optimum or something like that.

CHA RMAK You are definitely confirming there was a baby?
A. Yes, indeed. There was indeed.

MR. MEDOVELL: Chairman, my question was serious.
CHA RMAN No, no, I appreciate it is serious. I'm not trying to make fun of it, Mr. McDowell.
MR. MEDONELL: Many people would understand what I am saying, Chairman.

CHA RMAK We11, I mean, there was of course a famous instance in history, and I'm not going to mention it at a11, and indeed wasn't there a newspaper shutdown in Great Britain over that campaign, so...
MR. MEDOVELL: You've lost me again, Chairman.
CHA RMAN No, I don't think I have.
MR. MEDOVELL: The News of the world.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEDONELL: Yes.
CHA RMAN So no, I do understand. I didn't think
though -- there was a problem in the early days in mobile, whereby things perhaps went, you could -- but I mean it happened also on a landline, sometimes you could have a conversation and hear people talking in the background.
MR. MEDOVELL: That is the point.
CHA RMAN But it happens in both mediums.
A. I can just say it doesn't in any way relate to I think whatever your suspicion may be, Mr. McDowell.
CHA RMAN I'm lost there, I don't know what the suspicion is. Is there a suspicion?
A. That it would relate to some --

548 Q. MR. MEDONELL: I don't want to speak in riddles. I have got to suggest to you that it was a phrase that, ring me from a landline because it is less likely to be 15:50 intercepted in some way.
CHA RMAN Oh, in other words, that you're going to have some kind of high secret type conversation. MR. MEDONELL: Yes.






CHA RMAK Okay. I'm very slow to get to that, but I do understand. okay. I understand.
A. That is what I took was your implication. No, that wouldn't be the case.
549 Q. MR MEDOVELL: I see.
A. Those type of conversations would have to be occurring for me to mean that and they weren't.
Q. When we go to the text of the 28th September he sends you a text saying "Great scoop on Hogan, you' re good, Dave", that was an unexpected compliment coming from him in these circumstances?
A. Absolutely, yeah. And it would have been, I have to say, uncharacteristic to the relationship we would have had when he was in the Press office. And in fact there would have been, I think, two or three messages like that, and they stand out, I think a voicemail I think I remember on one occasion. You know, you don't expect to get a complimentary call or text or whatever, which is unsolicited and out of the blue from somebody you previously dealt with in a different role entirely.
551 Q. That's the point I was going to put to you; that it must have come as a surprise?
A. Absolutely.

552 Q. What is this man doing ringing or texting me --
A. Yes absolutely.

553 Q. -- to compliment me on my work which is nothing to do with him, this is the Irish water story?
A. Precisely, yeah.
Q. I see. And you politely say: "Thanks a million, Dave,
much appreci ated." Could I put it to you that those exchange of texts are at least consistent with Superintendent Taylor having a reasonably friendly relationship with you?
A. I wouldn't. I mean, the tone of the texts are friendly 15:52 on both sides, that may relate to a way of dealing professionally with people whom you aren't friends with equally. We wouldn't have been friends. I mean, up to that point or up to a point where we would have met for a coffee, that is referred to in one of those texts, $I$ would never have met the man before that. So we wouldn't have been then, or since, or in any capacity, friends or friendly beyond being pleasant in, you know, professional dealings, as one would be with everyone. We11, could I bring you then to the text that you sent on the 12th November at quarter to two in the afternoon, it reads: "Meet today or tomorrow morning, same pl ace as last?"
A. I see that, yes.

556 Q. Why is that so obscure?
A. I don't think it is obscure. We would have met at a coffee shop I think in Temple Bar, so he would have known the place I was referring to and so would I, though I actually couldn't tell you where it was. Just it was roughly in Temple Bar. This is four years
later, or nearly. So I wouldn't necessarily agree that it's obscure, it's literally -- I presume a call preceded it or a suggestion we must meet up again whenever. And that is what that relates to. I
couldn't honestly say whether we did meet up for a coffee a second time. I have a vague recollection of some arrangement being made to go for a coffee in Fairview somewhere, but I am not entirely sure that ever took place.

557 Q. We11, you see, on the 12th you say -- or sorry, he says to you "tonorrow midday, same location" and you say "perfect", isn't that right?
A. Yes.

558 Q. And that suggests that you thought you were going to meet in the same place you previously met, but you weren't going to mention it?
A. I don't understand.

559 Q. You weren't going to mention the location?
A. It was just a coffee shop in Temple Bar.

560 Q. I see.
A. I mean --

561 Q. Then the following day, an hour before the meeting he sends you a text, is that right, saying "Sorry, John, have to cancel, sorry" and you reply "No problem Dave, ${ }^{5: 54}$ tomorrow suit?". You were looking to meet with him, isn't that the case?
A. Oh yeah, I mean, I would say absolutely in a scenario where a journalist is -- where a senior member of An Garda síochána offers to meet a journalist for a coffee, and there are any number of issues both in and not in the public domain that are of interests to journalists that senior Gardaí may have some knowledge of, you're going to meet somebody for a coffee. I
wouldn't say there's anything indicated from those that reflects a pressing desire, other than perhaps maybe I was around the day after and not around later in the week. I don't know. I couldn't tell you what day of the week that was. But I mean, you're asking me to contextualise a text message that was sent three and a half, nearly four years ago. I can't say any more than that reading it back to you.
562 Q. I have to suggest to you that it suggests that although he was no longer the press secretary or the Press office of An Garda Síochána at the time that he was in communication with you and you were sufficiently interested to want to arrange an alternative meeting when he cancelled it with less than an hour to go?
A. I'm not sure what that would indicate that would be outside of the normal operation of a journalist --

563 Q. I see.
A. -- eager to meet people who may know anything.

564 Q. The last thing I just want to ask you about, Mr. Burke, is this: were you conscious in 2014, after the accession of Nóirín o'sullivan to the position of Acting Commissioner and later her appointment as Commissioner, were you conscious of any negativity towards her in senior Garda circles?
A. I would say there was -- I have a vague recollection
nothing from anything that anybody said to me. But I suppose, not being exclusively somebody who covered crime related matters I wouldn't probably have been
dealing with the people who may have had those maybe and may be expressing it. But I've a vague recollection there was issues expressed in newspapers about I suppose, I suppose about dissent in the ranks, I don't know, $I$ think that was maybe a commonly expressed theme at the time, I'm not entirely sure.

565 Q. I'm talking about not merely the ranks --
A. Senior rank.

566 Q. -- top rank, that people close to her were antagonistic towards her?
A. I wouldn't have any knowledge of any individuals or named individuals or couldn't have named individuals who might have been antagonistic towards her or otherwise, I wouldn't have that level of detail, if that was the case even.
MR. MEDONELL: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Mr. O'Higgins, I don't know how far you can put this but I'm certainly content if you simply want to put your client's instructions. I mean, we don't have times, dates or places and unless you have been supplied with them since that --

MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: I think I can deal with it, Chairman. I will on7y be a few minutes.
CHA RMAN It's entirely up to you how you approach it, I appreciate you have to put a case and the detail so far is very limited.
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Yes, and I don't anticipate I wil1 be any length of time.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M CHAEL O H GG NS AS FOLLOVB:

567 Q.
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Good afternoon, Mr. Burke.
Michael O'Higgins, counsel on behalf of Superintendent
Taylor, I'm not going to be long in asking you
questions. Ms. Leader took you through and highlighted
telephone and email contact, isn't that so?
A. Yes. When Mr. Taylor was in the Press office.

568 Q. Yes.
A. That period.

569 Q. I'm referring only to the time he was in the Press office.
A. Yes, okay.

570 Q. I think she mentioned that when Superintendent Taylor gave evidence there was some focus on some calls that occurred between the 8 th and the 14th December?
A. Yes.

571 Q. And Superintendent Taylor said "Mr. Burke is a very respected journal ist, he was covering the penalty
points issue quite extensi vel y at that time and there was a number of programmes, segments of programmes on the News at One." I presume that's correct?
A. Well, yeah, he called our programme the News at one, I presume he means the This week programme on a Sunday.
572 Q. And when asked would those conversations at that time be related to the penalty points issue he said it may be in relation to the coming up to PAC and coming up to various reports that were coming out at that time,
A. That is what he said, yes.
Q. Is that a reasonable assumption on his part?
A. No. Certainly in terms of contact with me, no. I had no conversations with him that went into any detail in relation to the Garda position or indeed either briefings or otherwise or even factual discussion on it. I never particularly found the Garda Press office willing to share any information, certainly not with our programme or with myself personally. So we wouldn't have had those conversations that I think he may be referring to there. And I think you will see, even from that list of calls and texts, all of those calls and texts are very brief, I'm not sure where a conversation of the nature he's implying would have squeezed in there.

574 Q. Yes. I mean, the impression that one gets from your evidence is that the relationship with him was very stiff and stark and formal?
A. Well, it was just one-way traffic. I mean, we never got anything back, even in terms of replies to our queries from the -- well, not never. I should say, invariably we got no comment or no reply.
Q. Certainly the written replies were the party line, so to speak?
A. Yeah. And there was no verbal communication to take that place. And certainly if there was it would have been reflected in our reporting, but there was none.

576 Q. Now Ms. Leader in express terms said you know or are
you aware what Superintendent Taylor's case is, and she proceeded to outline what his case was, you remember that earlier?
A. Yes.

577 Q. The only thing I would add to it is that in evidence he 16:00 said that the contacts that he had with journalists where he mentioned or where he briefed negatively were opportunistic, but in response to Ms. Leader you indicated that you knew precisely the case that he was making?
A. Well, as is set out in his evidence.
Q. She set it out for you, but you were aware of it yourself.
A. Yeah.

579 Q. I don't think there's any need for me to repeat it.
A. Ah no, no. No, not at all.

580 Q. I have to formally put it to you that he is correct in that regard. By correct I mean that he did negatively brief you in the manner described.
A. No, he didn't. No. Not at all. And I would actually say that that implies a relationship that would be contrary to how I would work in terms of dealing with people in Press offices, in any event. But no, he didn't.
581 Q. I understand.
A. That never occurred.

582 Q. I put my case and you understand?
A. I do indeed, sorry, yes.

583 Q. Just finishing up then and just two other aspects. One
just so that there is no mystery about it: when you met him for coffee post his time in the press release, there was nothing out of the ordinary, they were general conversations about politics and about the general state of An Garda Síochána?
A. Indeed. That's my recollection of it.

584 Q. And can I just ask you with regard to the conversation which you want to keep confidential, and I'm not interested in asking about the sources who participated in it were, but can I ask you: Did the conversation support that there was a campaign to discredit Sergeant McCabe?
A. I really can't get into, I think, any greater detail than I've said, other than, you know I can't bring anything additional to the Tribunal's knowledge.
585 Q. And does it follow then that if I ask you if it was capable of supporting you can't comment whether it might have supported Superintendent Taylor's involvement?
A. It would have almost, I would say, no relationship to Superintendent Taylor at all.

586 Q. Al1 right.
A. I can say that.

587 Q. Did I understand you to say that you have informed the Tribunal the detail of the conversation?
A. Oh no. No.

588 Q. You haven't?
A. No, I haven't.

CHA RMAN No, no. No, no. Never.

MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Sorry, I took that up wrong. CHAN RMAN No, no, that is fine, Mr. O'Higgins. MR. MCHAEL O HGG NS: Thank you very much. CHA RMAN If it was, I mean, I have said this before, we do absolutely everything openly so it would be in the papers. We couldn't do it any other way. I don't know if any other tribunal has ever tried, but I don't see any --
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: I picked that up incorrectly. CHA RMAN Yes. Just to be absolutely clear: Everything that we know is here. I mean, there may be irrelevant stuff sitting up in boxes upstairs, but that is another question entirely.
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: May it please you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Gillane, do you have any questions? You're going 1ast.

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

589 Q. MR. DI GNM Mr. Burke, my name is Conor Dignam, I appear on behalf of An Garda Síochána and in particular I have some questions for you on behalf of former Commissioner Callinan and former Commissioner o'sullivan. And there are really only two areas that I want to cover very briefly. The first is Ms. Leader explored with you during the course of her examination your knowledge of rumours that were going around about Sergeant McCabe and you were very clear that you had no knowledge of any such rumours.
A. Yes.

590 Q. And towards the end of your evidence you explained that you weren't even sure how widely known those rumours were. Now the Tribunal has heard evidence from a number of people and that evidence was to the effect that there were rumours circulating. But I'm not sure how closely you followed the evidence in the Tribunal, I'm not sure whether you're aware that Minister Eoghan Murphy said he hadn't heard any rumours other than Sergeant McCabe was slightly odd, as he put it in his evidence; Mr. McCarthy, the Comptroller and Auditor General, said that he hadn't heard any rumours; Minister Shatter I think said the same thing, although he explained that that may be because he was in a slightly more rarified atmosphere of being a Minister at the time; and indeed the former Minister, Mr. Howlin, who gave evidence just a few days ago, said that he wasn't aware of any rumours until he left Government, which I think was in 2016. Do you have any comment to make in relation to that and how widely known the rumours were or can you assist us in that regard?
CHA RMAN You could always say you'd join a very distinguished group of people.
A. I think I will go with that, yes. I can only tell you what I know or didn't know, and I wasn't aware of any rumours.

591 Q. MR. DI GNAM The second issue I wanted to cover with you was, in relation to this original statement and
your reference to this conversation, and I appreciate your sensitivities in relation to that, but can $I$ begin by asking you firstly when -- the way you describe it in your statement, which is on page 5361, is that you have certain information pertaining to the above and it's not direct information but is merely an account of a conversation. Can I ask you when you got that account of whatever that conversation is?
A. Yes. It would have been after the issues of a smear campaign, if that is how it could be described, or not even actually a smear campaign, but any acquisitions being made of a sexual nature against Maurice McCabe were aired in the public domain. So it would have been, $I$ suppose, to put a time on it, it would have been some time during last year.

CHAN RMAN So, it was post February 2017.
A. Oh, it would have been, yes.

592 Q. MR. DI GNM And is that a conversation in respect of which there has been a dispute about the contents of the conversation before this Tribunal?
A. I really don't want to get into any further detail on it.

CHAN RMAN Mr. Dignam, can I just say, and it is important not just from your point of view but from the point of view of other parties, just because I'm taking the view, look, I don't need to know about this doesn't mean that if you wish to press this issue and to raise this issue now, I mean you can if you wish. MR. DI GNAM Yes.

CHA RMAN But I'm not sure I'm going to gain anything from it, but then again I could be wrong.
MR. DI GNAM Yes.
CHA RMAN And in the event that you think I am wrong I'm certainly not going to hold it against anybody for pushing their case. That is what you are there for, you know.

MR. DI GNAM Yes. Just to be clear the timing, the reason I was asking about the timing, Chairman -CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. DI GNAM -- may lead to me wanting to push the point.
593 Q. But, in relation to the timing at which you became aware of this conversation or the account of this conversation you're quite clear that that was some time 16:07 in the last year, so since 2017, is that right?
A. Yes.

594 Q. Thank you.
CHA RMAN A11 right. So it was, you heard the rumours and sorry, as a media person you followed the media coverage and then you heard about this. I'm not saying in the next week or anything like that.
A. Sure.

CHA RMAN I mean, you've got an entire year to play with so it's not as if the spies will be zeroing in.
MR. DI GNM Sorry, Chairman, if I might ask one further question in relation to that.

CHA RMAN Yes.
595 Q. MR. DI GNAM Your source, as you describe him or her,
is that a person who has made public statements about that conversation?
A. I'm sorry, I just can't go into any further detail.
well, it's just, this may be important in relation to the question of privilege, because if it is a person who has made a public statement about the conversation it'd be difficult to see how the privilege still attaches, Mr. Burke.
A. I see what you are saying. I still can't say any more, other than it is something, it is a matter that is entirely known to the Tribunal. I know that doesn't assist you to any greater degree I'm sure, but --
597 Q. I'm not sure how much it assists the Tribunal, Mr. Burke.
A. Or the Tribunal.

CHA RMAN If you want to press the matter you can, Mr. Dignam, but I think, you know, there is a time when you put horse over a big fence - and sorry, I seem to be going back to that analogy a lot - but even still, this may not be it, but I'm here to listen to whatever anybody has to say. That is the way that it is. If you want to revert to me on it, please do. At the moment, from what I can see, I don't think it is helping anybody. Heaven alone knows, Mr. Marrinan mentioned the other day the rule against
self-corroboration and the exceptions thereto.
MR. DIGNM Yes.
CHA RMAN: There's some extent to which the Rules of Evidence may not be terribly helpful to finding out the

truth, there's some respects in which they are very, very sensible. Testing something by reason of someone's prior inconsistent statement of course has been allowed since the mid 19th Century. We seem to have done a lot of testing of people by reason of the notes they took and their consistency. So, the degree to which I'm helped by that I don't know. But at the moment I don't think that I am. But I'm here to have my mind changed by persuasion if you wish.
MR. DI GNM Chairman, I think I pushed it as far as I need to push it.

CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, that is fine.
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA GH I have no questions, Chairman. CHA RMAN No questions, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh. Thank you very much for being here, Mr. Burke.
MR. G LLANE: Sorry, Chair, could I put two or three questions?

CHA RMAN I beg your pardon. I forgot you were of course appearing for Mr. Burke, thank you.

## THE WTNESS MAS EXAM NED BY MR. G LLANE AS FOLLONG:

598 Q. MR. G LLANE: Mr. Burke, just you can confirm or you already have confirmed that from the point at which you took up your position in RTÉ Mr. Taylor was already in situ as the Press officer and between that time and Mr. Taylor's departure you'd never met him physically face-to-face during that period nor before?
A. That's correct.

599 Q. In terms of your attempt to get information in relation


to programmes that either This week broadcast or were interested in broadcasting I think you have indicated the general mechanism was through emailing the Press office and that would have been either preceded or followed up with telephone calls to include voicemails just to confirm that the email had been sent?
A. That's correct, invariably followed.
Q. The upside of sending the email being that there was a clear indication as to what it was you required?
A. Absolutely.
A. No. There was no benefit. Working for a Sunday programme it wasn't, I suppose, the type of story that had any benefit for us.

604 Q. And do I also understand that in terms of your
engagement with Mr. Taylor then after he'd left that office, between mid September 2014 and mid November 2014, to put it this way, you were interested to see what might come of that, is that right?
A. That's all. And nothing did, I should say.
Q. Did anything come of that?
A. No.

606 Q. Can you just also confirm that you did confirm your phone number to the Tribunal investigators when you were asked?
A. I did indeed.

MR. G LLANE: Thanks very much.
CHAI RMAN yes, you did indeed.
A. Thank you.

CHA RMAN Thank you.

THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAN we might just go off transcript for a second.
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| 'Dear [1] - 168:18 | 150 [1] - 38:8 | 180:23, 181:10 | 134:16 | 5416 [1]-153:19 |
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|  | 196 [1] - 89:19 | 31:20, 138:23, 174:5, | 4 [2] - 4:8, 4:21 | $6 \text { [1] - 161:27 }$ |
|  | 197[1]-6:21 | 196:1 | 40 [2] - 133:21, $136: 9$ | $6617[1]-29: 7$ |
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| thanks [1] - 18:9 'there [1] - 45:14 |  |  | 4102 [2] - 9:15, 37:15 |  |
| 'tried [2]-101:9, | 2 |  | 4104 [1] - 37:17 |  |
| 101:17 |  |  |  | 6622 [2]-32:25, |
| 'we [2]-149:23, |  |  | 4106 [1] - 99:28 |  |
| 200:17 | $2[8]-2: 25,3: 8,3: 13$, | 37:9, 37:10, 66:20, | $4108[2]-38: 6,66: 13$ | $34: 13,86: 25$ |
| 'we' [1] - 181:23 | 4:4, 4:4, 4:22, 4:32, | 85:22, 85:23, 99:3, $115: 26,139: 14$ | $4109[1]-98: 19$ |  |
| 'Yes [2] - 128:4, | 5:3 | $115: 26,139: 14$, $153: 18,153: 21$, | $4110 \text { [2] - 40:21, }$ | 6624 [1]-34:21 |
| 128:5 | 20 [3]-56:26 | $\begin{aligned} & 153: 18,153: 21 \\ & 187: 11,196: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 66:29 | $35: 21$ |
| 'you [1] - 12:9 | $2000 \text { [1] - 8:5 }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:14, 215:16, } \\ & 216: 16 \\ & 2018[3]-1: 18,7: 2, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
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| 1 | $2001 \text { [1] - 115:23 }$ |  | 4112 [2] - 44:17, 67:6 | 110:19 |
| 1[2]-3:31, 139:10 | 53:9, 201:7 | 220:23 | 4113 [3]-45:9, 95:6, | 00 [1] - 165: |
|  |  |  |  | $6 \mathbf{T H}_{[1]}-220: 22$ |
| 10 [1] - 5:2 | 2007[1]-146 | 20th [4] - 95:1, | 4118 [1] - 67:23 |  |
| 100 [10]-6:7, 11:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 2012[1]-139: 13 \\ & 2013 \text { [24] - 8:11, 9:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 95:24, 153:18, 172:5$21[1]-2: 25$ | 4131 [2]-139:4, | 7 |
| 22:23, 22:27, 23:20, |  |  | 139:7 |  |
| 25:29, 55:1, 55:4, | 112:7, 113:18, | 210 [1]-81:17 | 4135 [1] - 139:5 |  |
| 57:17 | 113:20, 138:23, | 213[2]-6:23, 44:18 | 4879 [3]-46:29, | 7 [4]-2:12, 2:30, |
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| 115 [1]-6:11 | 156:18, 159:16, | $230[1]-45: 9$ | 94:3, 100:19, 100:27, 130:26, 173:3, 174:5 | $74[2]-159: 7,159: 8$ 7522 [5]-182:3, |
| 12 [1]-17:10 | 163:27, 164:2, |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 182:12, 182:13, } \\ 182: 18,201: 11 \\ 76[1]-79: 17 \end{gathered}$ |
| 12th [3]-157:6, | 164:11, 164:12, | 23rd [1] - 31:11 |  |  |
| 205:16, 206:6 | 164:15, 165:20, | 24/7 [1] - 181:20 |  |  |
| 13 [1] - 92:1 | 165:27, 166:21, | 24th [2] - 171:13, |  |  |
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