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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLONS, ON FRI DAY, 8TH J UNE 2018:

MR. MARR NAN Conor Lally, please.

MR. CONOR LALLY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR FERRY, AS FOLLOVG:

MR. FERRY: Good morning, Mr. Lally. My name is John Ferry and I am one of the barristers representing Superintendent David Taylor, and following your
evidence yesterday $I$ just have a couple of short matters to put to you in relation to your evidence and the case of Superintendent Taylor.

Now, just yesterday, Mr. Marrinan started off by
informing the Tribunal that you had become aware of this issue in relation to Sergeant McCabe as far back as 2011 and maybe even 2010, and you outlined in your evidence that you'd been given very, what I thought was quite specific information about the case; that
included that an allegation had been made against the sergeant, that it had been investigated by the Gardaí, and an interesting part of your evidence, I thought, was that you also had the detail that the Gardaí had recommended to the DPP that there be no prosecution, and you then went on to say that there was no prosecution recommended. Now, I appreciate that you said that you couldn't -- you said "I genui nel y can't recall who told me about this", but it was very
specific information that you had appeared to have received back in the early days, is that correct?
A. It was very specific information, yes.

2 Q.
What I mean by that, Mr. Lally, is, you know, normally in day-to-day speak in Ireland, people, if they are talking about somebody, they might give a view, he's a good guy, he's not a good guy, this or that; I'd say is it not unusual that somebody goes into that line of detail?
A.
well, I mean, as I say, it's so long ago I didn't know Maurice McCabe at the time, you know, he wasn't a wel1-known figure, really, when I heard about this, all the controversy that has happened since then. So, I guess if I had heard this information, you know, three or four years later, I'd probably recall exactly who told me and how $I$ heard it and so on. But the level of information that I had from the off, I mean, it's quite possible when somebody began talking about him, I may have asked lots of questions and you know, who is this guy and where is he from and why is he speaking out now and so on, so it's possible the level of information that I had was detailed because I asked.

3 Q. Yes. And would it be correct that it was from a trusted source or from somebody that was, you know, a responsible source, because that type of information mean, it's not really pub talk? So do you think it was a sort of an official source that was familiar with legal circles?
A. We11, I mean, anybody -- if I was speaking to people about this particular issue I presume they will have involvement in the criminal justice system or they would be writing about it or whatever. As I said in my evidence yesterday, it's a long time ago and Maurice McCabe just simply wasn't the well-known person then that he is now and I just can't recall where I first heard this.

4 Q. Yes.
A. I just can't remember.

I appreciate that you have said a few times that he wasn't the well-known person back then that he is now, and that's one of the themes sort of running through this Tribunal, that there have been lots of witnesses, including Garda witnesses, who seem to have had little or no knowledge about Sergeant McCabe and the Ms. D case really at any stage, so you are saying that back in 2011/11 you got very, very specific, basically factually correct information?
A. Well, what I said yesterday was, was that I think I had my first, you know, lengthy piece on penalty points published in 2012, and looking back on it now, I felt when that article appeared in the media, $I$ had known about the allegation for about a year at that stage, possibly longer. But I found it very hard to put a specific time on it.
6 Q. Yes. And again, one of the features about the Tribunal and for somebody like myself who has been here for a few days of it, is that the central issue is almost
desensitised in some way, so what $I$ am getting at is: while you are saying that Sergeant McCabe wasn't a big figure or whatever back when you heard it first, I mean it is the case that you are somebody who was submerged in the whole sort of Garda land; you are working with The Irish Times, involved in crime reporting, and wider crime reporting, like for example, reporting about penalty points wouldn't necessarily correlate to murder investigations, so you are somebody who is, you know, entrenched in that whole Garda crime justice area, so while you say he wasn't a well-known figure at the time, wasn't it a startling allegation to hear about a member of the guards, of any rank, that an allegation of its type, like you didn't flesh it out yesterday but were you aware that the allegation related to a minor and a female, was that part of the information that was given to you?
A. Yes. I am not sure that I was aware of that. I'm not sure what I knew about the age of the person at the centre of it, and I'm --
But leaving, say we leave that out of it. I mean, one of the issues, $I$ think, is that it's easy to sort of desensitise the gravity of what was being said about Sergeant McCabe, but I mean for you, somebody in your position to hear that, surely that was, that was a big, 10:29 that was a big red flag issue because it could have led to an enormous story in relation to An Garda Síochána?
A. Sorry, I just catch the last bit of that.

8 Q. I'm saying it's something that would have been a red
flag issue to somebody like yourself, as a crime reporter, because it could possibly have led to a massive story in relation to An Garda Síochána, if there was any merit to any of the facts therein or any
of the issues that was being -presented to me, I find it very hard, looking back now, to see how it would have led to any other story.

9 Q. Yes.
A. Even a small story. I mean, you just couldn't -- you couldn't and you wouldn't want to do anything with it. It was a dead piece of information from the very outset.

10 Q. Okay, we11, I'11 accept that but I mean from my position I would have thought it wouldn't be the type of story you would hear about members of An Garda Síochána on a regular basis, a pretty starting revelation about anybody, let alone about a member of the police force?
A. I don't know, there is a -- I mean, I have been, since I have been working in the crime area there has been a and, you know, certain allegations have been made against them. I don't think it's -- you know, you hear -- you would hear things all the time. I mean, as
far as I was concerned --
11 Q. I will move on from that, Mr. Lally, and accept what you are saying there.
A. Just hang on a second. I just haven't completed that answer. You know, you would hear things all the time about people, about, you know, Gardaí, about other people, and in the business that we're in, you think in stories all the time and when you hear information, you're automatically almost processing it in your head: Is this a story? Can I do anything with this? what tends to happen is, if the information that you hear, you kind of process it instinctively and you say to yourself I don't think there is a story here, you tend to forget about it and just kind of move on.

12 Q. Yes. But that would be -- I don't mean to cut across you, are you finished your answer? I don't mean to be stating the obvious but that would have been my understanding of a reporter in your position. That your brain is like a computer and it's constantly processing all the different bits that you are getting in, with a view to is there a story here or not. I mean, that is obviously how you are tuned -- we are all the same, whatever line of work we work in, so you are getting information and you are trying to ascertain is there a story here or not.
A. Yeah.

13 Q. One of the things that you then said yesterday which I just want to consider or have you consider is that, whoever you heard this from, you said that:
"Frommy recollection, even the person who tol d me, it was kind of in the context of, you know, Sergeant MECabe fell out with An Garda Sí ochána."

## A. Yes.

14 Q. Now, for somebody who had been given information that an allegation had been made, so, for example, if you are working in The Irish Times and an allegation is made by somebody about your work or some aspect of your job, and if that's investigated, so in this case you had information that was investigated by the guards, so if it was investigated by The Irish Times management and then you said it was recommended by the guards that there be no prosecution, so if The Irish Times management recommended that there be no sanction taken against Conor Lally and if whoever the adjudicator was acted upon that and imposed no sanction, why would Conor Lally fall out with Irish Times management over that?
A. Well, I mean, I suppose if I was investigated and I was ${ }^{10: 33}$ unhappy with -- I mean, it's a hypothetical question about a controversy in The Irish Times that hasn't happened.
15 Q. oh no, no, I appreciate that. But your evidence was that whoever told you, and you genuinely can't recall McCabe fell out with An Garda Síochána and then you went on and say:
"This appears to have been the start of it all."
A. No, what I was saying there was, my feeling is -- and I mean, again, $I$ can't remember the specifics of this incident, I just -- if sergeant McCabe had been as well known then as he is now, I would recall obviously, but he wasn't. And that's the context for the very first hearing of this.
16 Q. Yes.
A. I haven't finished answering the question.

17 Q. Sorry, I don't mean to cut across you.
A. Hang on a second. You keep doing that. What I feel is, is that it's quite possible that $I$ was having a conversation with somebody about whistle-blowing and questions being raised about penalty points and so on and so forth, and it's quite possible I said who is this guy, Sergeant McCabe? You know, where is he based? what is it all about? You know, what is this all about? And I think somebody may have said to me, well actually, he fell out with the guards because what happened was there was an allegation against him and so on.

18 Q. Yeah.
A. And this appears to be the start of his, of the fracture in his relationship with the guards. I feel that that is the nature of the conversation I had with the person, but I can't be sure because it's too long ago and he wasn't a high profile person then.
19 Q. Yeah. And Mr. Lally, it's just my own fault, if I'm cutting across you there, I don't mean to do that, it's
just, maybe I thought you had finished your answer. But what I'm getting at is, for somebody who is putting this detailed information to you, you had formed this view that Sergeant McCabe had fallen out with the guards, and you then went on to say that "nobody was trying to drive home a point that he was a bad guy, or you had to be wary of himor anything like that". But the question I would have there is: If you had heard that somebody had fallen out with Garda management, if you were a member of Garda management, would he not be somebody that perhaps common sense would say you better be wary of this person?
A. You said there earlier that I had formed the view that he'd fallen out with the guards. I hadn't formed any view. I hadn't a clue who he even was at the time or anything about this allegation against him, so I didn't form any view. What I'm telling you is, this is the information, this is the first time the information has been relayed to me, and it was relayed in this particular context. It was an explainer for -- it was the person who was telling me, it was their view that Sergeant McCabe had had a difficult time in work, he had more or less fallen out with the guards and this was the reason why he had fallen out with the guards, but that was the view of the person who was telling me this; I didn't know anything about it.
20 Q. Yes, no, I appreciate that.
A. I had no view.

21 Q. I think what you had said was that it was said to you
in the context of Sergeant McCabe having fallen out with the guards. So whoever was giving you the information, was giving you that context?
A. Yeah. And I mean, when I say it was in the context of explaining how he'd fallen out with the guards, what I was trying to explain was, this person was essentially trying to put context on who they felt Sergeant McCabe was, they felt he was a person who now had a fractured relationship with the guards, and I was just trying to basically tell the Tribunal that this is how I first heard this information, rather than somebody from Garda management coming up to me and trying to convince me that what was at the centre of the allegation was true or, you know, or anything like that. It cropped up in the context of an explainer rather than somebody trying 10:37 to malign Sergeant McCabe. And that's what I meant.
22 Q. And I understand that, what I started questioning you in relation to is that $I$ found it interesting that whatever information you had been given, as I have already said, it was very specific and almost in a legal terminology?
A. Well, that might be my phrasing of it now.

23 Q. Yeah. okay.
A. Do you know what I mean? Maybe I've been -- that may be the way I speak about these things. I am not necessarily saying the exact phraseology, I am using now in how I explain the event was the exact phraseology was used previously. The one phrase that does jump out at me was the person said to me it was
completely thrown out or it was completely rejected or that kind of phrase but that is the only clear thing that kind of stayed with me.
24 Q. you used a word this morning that you also used yesterday and that is "explainer", and yesterday you said:
"Frommy recollection the kind of telling of this particular story was an explainer for how he fell out with Garda management basically."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

So again, whoever was giving you this information, was saying that this investigation, the file to the DPP, the result, that that had resulted in explaining why Sergeant McCabe had fallen out with Garda management?
A. That was the -- that was the view of the person -- that is my recollection of the opinion held by the person that I first learned about this from.
Q. Yes. And we now find ourselves seven or maybe eight years further down the road and one of the unique
things about this Tribunal is that there have been practically no garda rank witnesses before the Tribunal, because one of the features, as we all know, is this deals with senior management in An Garda Síochána, management in Garda Headquarters. So,
whoever was talking to you almost eight years ago, was presenting this story to you in a way that it was a falling-out with Garda management?
A. Yeah. I mean, it may not have been eight years ago,
you know, I can't --
27 Q. Well, 2010 or 2011 is I think when you were timing it.
A. As I say to you, I wrote my first piece in 2012, looking back on it I think I knew about it for about a year, possibly more, at that stage, but literally it would be very, very hard for me to put a timeframe on it between 2010 and 2012 specifically when I first heard about this.

28 Q. Yes.
A. So I was giving a time span there rather than an absolute period for when $I$ heard this.

29 Q. But I think the way that you opened your evidence was that you were more or less saying, look, I had heard about this long before the timeline that the Tribunal is dealing with, 2012 -- or 2013, 2014?
A. Yeah.

30 Q. You had heard about it, you said, 2011 and maybe 2010?
A. Okay. Again, my recollection on the timeframe is I wrote my first story about -- my first lengthy story about penalty points in 2012. My recollection is that I knew about this about a year at that stage and it could have been even longer.
31 Q. Yes.
A. That's the best I can do.

32 Q. Yes. And when I mention there about the rank issue, this was a story about a garda sergeant. Now, when you start writing about the penalty points issues, isn't it the case that you already have information on Sergeant McCabe that he has fallen out with Garda management?
A. No, I have -- I have a person believing that he -- I have a person who spoke to me about this first, believing that he had fallen out with Garda management. I didn't have any view on it, I mean, I just didn't know at the start what happened, and I still don't know, to be honest.
Yes. And again, in relation to your evidence yesterday, you say that "the story started to resurface in 2013 or 2014", but I think you said you can't be 100 percent sure. But it was a story that, after your first interaction with whoever you were talking to, resurfaced again sometime later, and in relation to it resurfacing again, I think you were ensure how you came to the information, but it may have been from our journalists, is that correct?
A. Yeah. I mean, I think it resurfaced in the context of obviously Sergeant McCabe's profile began to rise quite a bit, culminating in his appearance before the Public Accounts Committee in 2014. I think if you look at the period of about, you know, 12 months before he appeared at the Public Accounts Committee, his profile was increasing all the time. And I mean, when I say it resurfaced, it's quite possible that because he was in the news more I was just talking to more people about him, so this came up again. You know, it's possible that simply there was more interest in him, we were talking about him more and this cropped up again.

34 Q. Yes.
A. Just to clarify, like, it's possible -- when I say it
resurfaced, it's possible it simply came up in conversations again that $I$ was having with other journalists.
Yes. Now, just, I think going back to what you had said at the outset, you said that the story -- I think you said there was nothing you could do with the story is that right? Nothing you could do with the information?
A. Yeah.
A. Yes. person, it's been through the system and it's been rejected pretty comprehensively by the system, I mean, it's you know -- it would be very legally -- it would be very hard to do anything with that even if you were inclined to, it would be very difficult.
37 Q. Yes. But in relation to the fact that he'd fallen out with management being part of whatever information you were given, what if that was not correct?
A. No, you see, you're assuming that I believed he'd fallen out with Garda management. I never said that. No, I am not, Mr. Lally. I am just saying that was your evidence, that is what you were told.
A. Okay. You keep going back to that point again so just 1et me be absolutely clear with you, okay? When I say
it was an explainer for how he had fallen out with Garda management it was put to me in that context by the person I first spoke to. That is not the view I held, that is the view that that person held and they
put this forward to say what has actually happened is he has fallen out with the guards and why he has fallen out with them and then went through what the allegation was. So, I didn't hold that view, the person I spoke to did. I didn't hold any view. I didn't know Sergeant McCabe, I didn't know what was after happening, you know. I had no opinion on it. well, if that didn't form your view or attribute to whatever view one might have, was there some other source that was also giving you information about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yeah, I had a range of sources, yeah.
Q. And what information were they giving you?
A. Look, I mean, I was writing about the termination of penalty points, so that's what I would have been speaking to people about.
41 Q. Yes. So what I said there was, what if Sergeant McCabe was genuine from the outset and you start writing about penalty points, why do you think whoever had spoken to you in 2010 or '11 had added on that rider that he fel1 out with management and, as you put it, that was the start of it?
A. Well --

42 Q. I'm saying if he was genuine, why would that be added into it?
A. You said if he was genuine, I believe he was genuine. Just to make that absolutely clear.
43 Q. Yes.
A. So, there is no if about it. I believe he was genuine.

As I have said a few times, the person who I spoke to first, $I$ don't believe they were trying to say this with any venom or to convince me that Sergeant McCabe was a bad guy or anything like that. It's quite possible it could have been somebody who was quite comfortable with a person blowing the whistle from within An Garda Síochána. I can't remember who it was, to be perfectly honest with you. But my -- I think what they were trying to get across was, here is a guy who had worked in the guards for a long time and then he turned whistleblower and this person that I spoke to, it was their view that the beginning, that the beginning of this lay somewhere in his being unhappy with how the case was handled or in this allegation being brought forward, but that was the view of that person, that wasn't my view.

44 Q. Yes.
A. So that person's opinion didn't in any way inform my approach to the story as I began writing about the termination of penalty points. People express opinions 10:46 to me all the time on a whole range of issues, they don't find their way into my journalism.
45 Q. I appreciate that, and I'm not saying that for a moment, Mr. Lally, but for the purposes of the Chairman and the job he has to do, it appears that whoever it
was that gave you the initial information, you think -I think you agree they were a responsible and perhaps a trusted source because they were speaking in very specific legal language.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

46 Q. But whoever they were, and for whatever reason, they added on the rider that Sergeant McCabe had fallen out with management and that that was the start of it?
A. I think --

47 Q. Sorry, sir, and I have to say that if somebody was saying that to a journalist who then goes on to start writing about issues affecting An Garda Síochána, that was a very, very interesting rider that was added on to a factually correct statement, because it would appear that while the first part of the statement was completely factually correct, it doesn't appear that the second part of it was factually correct about him falling out with management, and that was added in, and I say that must have had -- I am not saying must have, but that may have been intended to plant a seed in your mind in relation to the motivations of Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, I don't -- I actually don't think it was. I think what happened was, his name came up, the whole idea that he was -- you know, that he was blowing the whistle about penalty points or whatever, and I feel, again it's a long time ago now, $I$ feel when this came up I would have asked questions: We11, who is this guy? what's it's all about? And has he blown the whistle before? And has anything ever happened in the past? And what is this all about? Is there any background here? And so on and so forth. I can't recall exactly what questions $I$ asked.
48 Q. Yes.
A. You also said that the person phrased this in very legalese kind of language; I don't think they did. I think perhaps my recall of it now is couched in that phraseology. But I feel that the person saying he had fallen out with the guards, 1 think that was -- that was only supplied after I'd asked questions, you know, I mean, has this guy been happy in the guards up until now and why is he coming out now all of a sudden and so on, that kind of thing.
Yes. But wasn't it providing whoever was -- whoever was providing you with that information, was providing you with an agenda for anything that that sergeant might do in the future in relation to any issue affecting Garda management?
A. No, I mean, I have very specifically said several times 10:49 that I don't believe that information was relayed to me at the start in any way to turn me against Sergeant McCabe or to suggest that, you know, you had to be wary of him, he wasn't to be trusted, he was unreliable or anything. I think this just cropped up in a much wider 10:49 conversation about lots of other issues.

50 Q. Yes.
A. I don't even think this was a conversation about Sergeant McCabe or anything like that. This just cropped up during the course of a conversation.
51 Q. Yes. And moving on then to 2013 and 2014 when it resurfaced, again while, I think you said yesterday you felt it was journalists that were talking about it, I think you said that you can't specifically recall who
they were?
A. Yeah. I mean, when I say it resurfaced, I have a feeling, because I was talking about Sergeant McCabe more maybe to other people and, you know, they were -there was more happening around the issues that he was raising, $I$ just think it's possible this just cropped up again during the course of the conversations with other journalists.
52 Q. So --
A. I wasn't like, it's very hard to recall this really, 10:50 because it was information that was just going to go nowhere, you weren't going to do anything with it. As I said, it was dead information from the start, and I just wasn't, you know, tracking who I was talking to or who told me what or when I heard about it. It was just 10:50 information that was going to go absolutely nowhere. And you know, that's it.
53 Q. Yes, yes. But I mean, in 2013/2014, I know you find it hard to be exact, but was it the exact same information that was going around, doing the rounds, or would there 10:51 be variation on it?
A. I think it was the same type of information, yeah.

54 Q. So it was the same: File to DPP, no prosecution, nothing to see here, he's cleared?
A. Yeah. At no point did anybody ever try to convince me 10:51 or supply with me with partial information to suggest that he was guilty or there was anything to it or anything like that. I heard about this all in one chunk and that's how I continued to hear about it.

55 Q. Yes. And again, Mr. Lally, when we are here in an air conditioned room in Dublin Castle it can be difficult to keep in touch with context, but that period of 2014 where you had a sergeant about to appear at the Public Accounts Committee, surely that was -- and you might give us some information on this, what was the feeling on the ground amongst journalists at that time about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Oh, wel1 I mean, I suppose, I mean he was causing a lot of waves within the Garda organisation. I mean, it was 10:52 certainly, from our perspective, I mean, we'd be, you know -- he was at the centre of a lot of dramatic events that were ending up on the front page and on the TV news and so on and so forth, and I suppose it was keeping us occupied and we were covering the story and I mean, I suppose we are journalists, we like drama, and it was a big story and you're glad to be covering big stories.
56 Q. And the big story involved Garda management?
A. Yeah.

57 Q. And we've had the most senior guards in the country for the last ten, well, maybe last 20 years come before the Tribunal giving evidence on various stages, and what you had, in effect, was a situation where a low ranking officer, a sergeant, was going into Government buildings to talk about matters that you'd reported on arising out of penalty points, and wasn't it a seismic case in Garda history?
A. Yeah, I'd say it was, yeah.

58 Q. Because crime reporters who would be reporting on issues such as what has happened around Dublin this week, of murders and stuff, were actually reporting on penalty points issues and a sergeant being called before the Houses of the Oireachtas?
A. That's right. So it was big news?
A. Yes.

60 Q. Yes. And it appears that, apart from yourself, there were, and I know you haven't given a number but you have given a plural, it appears that journalists from the crime reporting sector were reporting on that with a background story that Sergeant McCabe had been investigated, etcetera, and I presume, that the story was out there that he had fallen out with Garda management?
A. I mean --

61 Q. Well, I mean, that is what I am getting at. If you step back from your own position and look at --
A. It was clear from -- I mean, it was clear from his own actions that he was going head-to-head with Garda management. I didn't need anybody else to tell me that.

62 Q. Yes. But if the reason --
A. He was issuing press statements challenging Martin Callinan's account of various things. I mean, I could read those press statements and realise that he was, you know, at loggerheads with Garda management. I wasn't really waiting for anybody else to tell me that.

63 Q. Yes. But, it's one thing if somebody is raising issues in the workplace and you have been told that they are 100 percent squeaky clean and they are a decent guy. It's a different thing if you have been told they are 100\% squeaky clean in relation to a certain matter; however, because of that they fell out with Garda management and, therefore, they have issues with their management, do you get the distinction?
A. Yeah.

64 Q. And in this -- in accordance with your evidence, which started out with very, very specific legal type details, that was the position you were coming from.
A. Yes.

65 Q. Now, isn't that evidence of a negative briefing that was in the ether --
A. No.

66 Q. -- in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. I wouldn't agree with that, no.

67 Q. Well, what if the man was completely genuine, what if he was innocent of any wrongdoing and furthermore, what 10:55 if he was a well-intentioned member of An Garda Síochána who had witnessed poor practices and was bringing them to attention?
A. I believe all those things were true. I believe he was all of those things, well-intentioned and bringing poor 10:55 practice forward, but I will go back again: The tone of the conversation $I$ had with the person at the very outset of all of this, it simply wasn't loaded against Maurice McCabe and it's that simple. And my
recollection of it is, $I$ asked questions because $I$ actually don't think I'd heard of him before or exactly what he was doing, and I think maybe I asked the person who told me lots of questions until they said, I may have pressed the person, well, when -- why is it happening now? when did it start? How did it start? And it's quite possible the person only told me well actually he fell out with Garda management over this particular issue when $I$ asked him lots of questions. CHA RMAN Could I interrupt, gentlemen, for just a minute. As I understand it, and it's good to know this now, that the first mention of Maurice McCabe by name was in Sunday Times on 24th November 2010, an article by John Mooney. Now, as I understand it, Mr. Lally believes that he had this conversation that he is remembering as best he can with somebody who he can't remember, or perhaps there was more than one person, I don't know, in 2010 or perhaps 2011, so it could be in around the time of the article. But at that stage, David Taylor wasn't Press officer so that can't be evidence of a negative briefing as of that point, can it? Certainly not emanating, it seems to me, Mr. Ferry, from your client.
MR. FERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN So I'm just a wee bit confused. Is there something perhaps I am missing that you could help me on?

MR. FERRY: We11, I think his evidence has been that that was what he was made aware of in 2011 or 2010, but
he then went on to say it resurfaced. So, it resurfaced at a later period and it resurfaced at a period when Superintendent Taylor was in the Press office, and we have had evidence of how he came into the Press office.

CHA RMAN Sure, I appreciate that. Another way perhaps of looking at it, Mr. Ferry, is that if there is something there, like a plant in the ground and it's there and it's weak and suddenly a great deal of rain comes some years later or the right conditions, it grows up very quickly and this could be an appropriate analogy in relation to the fact that here is this in the ether but when Sergeant McCabe comes better and better known and there is more controversy about him, that this thing gets talked about more and more, not necessarily evidence of a negative briefing by anyone in Garda Headquarters but it could be that, or it could be the plant in a dry season type situation where the rain comes. I do understand that. There is nothing wrong with any of the questions you are asking, by the way, it's helpful, but I'm kind of puzzled as to how this thing in 2010/2011 could be anything to do with Superintendent Taylor.

MR. FERRY: We11, the only thing that I think is relevant of that is the rider that Sergeant McCabe had fallen out with management.

CHA RMAN Yeah.
MR. FERRY: So that's -- I think if Sergeant McCabe was a genuine officer bringing genuine issues up, that this
thing of having fallen out, and the evidence of Mr. Lally about how everything was dealt with so well by the guards, even the detail that the guards had recommended no prosecution, I mean, there is nothing to suggest in any of that, that he would have any reason to fall out with his management because they seem to have completely cleared him.
CHAN RMAN No, it's perfectly legitimate. well, just so long as we do remember that I'm talking about the 23 months from July 2012.
MR. FERRY: Yes. That is where I am at, at present in relation to the issue of resurfacing and it was amongst journalists.
68 Q. And what I was saying, Mr. Lally, is that the journalists had a similar version to what you had been told and I think you had said there that it wasn't being presented in a manner of trying to do down Sergeant McCabe, I think that is kind -- I may have misquoted you there now, but your last answer was saying it wasn't to try and do the man down, but you see, the evidence of Superintendent Taylor, I don't think you were here for that, you may have read it, but Superintendent Taylor's evidence isn't that he was, you know, opening up a flip chart and giving directions to journalists, it was that he was instructed that the agenda was that sergeant McCabe was driven by revenge as a result of being investigated and that was the agenda. So there is a distinction there between -- I mean, is it the case that people outside of here are
thinking, well listen, the reason why Sergeant McCabe is here is because there was something to the allegation, or are people aware what is actually being suggested here is that the Commissioner wanted people to be made aware that he was driven by revenge as a result of being investigated, can you see the distinction between the two?
A. I absolutely can. Like, nobody ever told me he was driven by revenge and the initial conversation that I had with the person in the very early stages, and this is kind of the point that I'm keen to be clear on, when I say that person told me they believed he'd fallen out with Garda management, they weren't saying he'd fallen out with Garda management so in revenge he is now blowing the whistle. I have a feeling that I probed them and I continually asked, well, why is this happening now? You know, what is this all about? How come this guy has been in the guards for a long period of time, there has been no problems, and he's coming forward now? Is there any particular issue there? And I think the person said, well, actually, there was an allegation, he was completely cleared of it, and he appears to have fallen out with the guards -- with, you know, Garda management at that time, and I think it was local Garda management, and I'm not even sure the
phrase was "fallen out with". I think they were trying to point to the fact -- I was pressing them, is there any fracture here at all between Sergeant McCabe and the organisation? And after I pressed the person said
well, actually, he was involved in an issue in whatever it was, 2006, 2008, and I fee1 that's the context.
69 Q. Yes.
A. This idea that this was a seed that was planted in my head, my recollection is, I had to ask lots of questions before $I$ got that answer, so --
Q. Yes.
A. -- it wasn't a seed, there was nobody saying that he's now blowing the whistle in revenge because he fell out with Garda management. That is just not the kind of conversation that happened.
71 Q. Yes. But going back to what you described as the hypothetical example, if the manager of The Irish Times received a report from a reporter who'd been investigated some years earlier into wrongdoing in The Irish Times, and they thought well, where did we hear of this fella before and somebody says oh, sure that's the fella that was investigated earlier, could you see how that could come into the ether in relation to a whistleblower?
A. I'm not quite sure I understand your question. well, there was something negative in his background that he had fallen out with management as a result of an investigation earlier in his career. If you were the editor of The Irish Times and a reporter comes forward and there is stuff in the media and you are being invited to go up to the Houses of the Oireachtas, wouldn't one of the issues be, well sure this fella fell out with us years ago over an investigation we
did, and therefore, that's a reason behind what is happening?
A. Yeah, like, are you asking me did people in the guards say that to me?
73 Q.
No, I'm saying that you are saying back in 2011 that it wasn't really that relevant, but what I'm saying if you roll forward and you are in senior Garda management, you are told in 2011 he had fallen out with management, if you roll forward to 2014 and that Garda manager has got a sergeant going before the Oireachtas, doesn't than issue that he had fallen out with Garda management become a much bigger issue?
A. Yeah, I'm not so sure about that. I mean, you know, he was -- the allegation was made, he was cleared, you know. I'm not --
CHA RMAK I think Mr. Ferry's question in fairness is this: Doesn't it make it much more likely that they would want to put a spin on it? Because I mean every story we have, I suppose, the basic facts and then you have the remembrance of the facts and then you have the 11:04 way people look at the facts and then you have the way people recount the facts. So I suppose the idea is, if this thing was there, wasn't it the case that this coming up, this embarrassing them would mean they would like to twist things a bit or ram the knife in a bit deeper, that's I think the basic question. Is it, Mr. Ferry?
A. We11, look, I mean, al1 I can say is that nobody from the guards ever came near me with this particular line
or spin on it.
74 Q. MR. FERRY: Yes. I will move on from that then. During your time as a crime reporter, I think that you had many contacts, which would be obvious in your line of work, with the Garda Press Office.
A. Yeah.

And you would have a relationship with Superintendent Taylor while he was a Garda Press officer?
A. Yeah.

76 Q. And during the course of your evidence, I think you also said that you don't recall ever talking to -- or I think you said:
"I don't remember ever having a conversation with Superintendent Tayl or about Maurice McCabe. I know that does sound strange but I have no recollection of having a conversation with hi mabout Maurice McCabe."
A. Yeah.

77 Q. So you're saying that during his term in office as a Garda Press officer, I know I have seen some phone records, there was lots and lots of contact and that is understandable, so you are saying that you never had a discussion with him about Maurice McCabe?
A. I didn't say that. I said I don't remember any specific conversation with him about Maurice McCabe.
78 Q. You don't remember, yes.
A. I mean, the Maurice McCabe issue was obvious7y huge, Dave Taylor was the head of the Garda Press Office, I probably would have at some stage asked him about some
issue around this particular controversy, but what I'm saying to you is, I cannot -- I honestly cannot remember even one conversation that I had with him on this issue. Like, the specific detail of a conversation that I had with him.
79 Q. Yes. But in the course of his evidence, Superintendent Taylor, one of the specifics that he was able to point to was that he said you were the only journalist that ever pushed back against anything that he suggested, and that was when he talked to you in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe not cooperating with the o'mahony report.
A. Yes, I heard that evidence.

80 Q. Yes. Do you remember Superintendent Taylor talking to you about Sergeant McCabe not cooperating with the o'mahony report?
A. I don't. My recollection about the O'Mahony report issue is that, I think -- I think either Sergeant McCabe issued a statement on it or Garda Headquarters issued a statement on it or maybe they both did, and I think that's where that -- I think that's where the information that $I$ wrote about came from.
81 Q. Yeah. Now, I went back to just look at the transcript and I think that Superintendent Taylor attributed that conversation to a telephone call he had with you, so not face-to-face, and he said that he remembers it because you pushed back and basically said that you didn't believe it, you didn't believe that Sergeant McCabe had not cooperated with the o'mahony report?

CHA RMAN Mr. Ferry, you don't happen to have a reference for that, do you? Because it would possibly help Mr. Lally and me certainly in the event that we could put it up on the screen.
MR. FERRY: Yes, it's at page 140, and I think -CHA RMAN And what day is it?

MR. FERRY: Day 74, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Day 74. It will just take a minute to come up, if you wouldn't mind just taking a breather there.
MR. FERRY: It is at the top of, yes, day 74, Chairman. 11:07 Day 74, page 140.

CHA RMAN So it's the second day of his evidence, from the look of it.

MR. FERRY: I think that is the first day, is it?
CHAN RMAN Is it?
MR. FERRY: Just there at line 2, Mr. Lally, he was being asked about, was there any reaction from any of the reporters. So he says:
"The onl y person that ever pushed back on anything I reported was in rel ation to the Sergeant McCabe not cooper ating with the John O' Mahony report. Mr. Conor Lally pushed back and basi cally sai d he di dn't bel i eve it."

CHA RMAN Let's go on to the rest of it, if you wouldn't mind. I am sorry, I don't have it in front of me.

MR. FERRY: And then the question was:
"Yeah. Well, was that a key part of the briefing?" And he says:
"Vell, that was another part of the briefing in 11:08 rel ation to the O Mahony report and the engagement of Sergeant McCabe with it."

And then I think it was Mr. McGuinness says:
"Well, that was a battle really that was being fought out in public, isn't that right?
A. Yes. But, as I say, there is the public and private battle that was going on, do you know.
Q. But you thi nk he pushed back on that, is that right?
A. Yes, yes, he did."

So as I say, that was, when I checked back I think that
is, Superintendent Taylor attributes that to a
telephone call that he had with you. But does that help refresh your memory in relation to the O'Mahony report on Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, look, as I have said in my statement to the Tribunal, $I$ really can't get into, for reasons of
source protection I really can't get into specific conversations that I had with individual Garda members. CHA RMAN No, and I'm not asking you to, do you understand? It's just that he has given evidence and
that's all you need to focus on.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN That you had some kind of a conversation as to an issue which is actually, I'm not reporting on, but which may form part of the report, which was this: He raised the issue in relation to fixed charge penalty notices. The Commissioner appointed Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony to look into it. There is evidence on one side that Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony felt he just couldn't, because it was a confidential disclosure, actually ring the person who had made it, namely Sergeant McCabe, although indeed he suspected very, very strongly that it was him, and on the other hand, we have the direction given to Sergeant McCabe, stop accessing Pulse, but, at the same time, if 11:10 you have anything further by way of evidence if you think you need to add well then go to Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony. Now, a public controversy broke out, and RTÉ is part of it, to the effect that Sergeant McCabe is the kind of man who moans but doesn't actually cooperate with proper investigation. So it's all very well to say something but when people are trying to look into it, clearly that is your chance, you have to put up at that point whatever you have got or, as the phrase says, shut up. So that is the point that is being raised here. Now, I don't think anyone's trying to undermine your journalistic privilege but what you are being asked about this: Superintendent Taylor gave specific evidence that you had a phone call
or perhaps some kind of a chat, and there is nothing wrong with that, and I presume in any event, it would probably be in open circumstances, and that in the course of that, this thing of did Sergeant McCabe cooperate or not, came up, and you just weren't prepared to accept the party line, put it that way. If there was a party line, I'm not saying he was. But he is saying there was a kind of a party line, McCabe doesn't cooperate working group proper investigations, and you said I'm not accepting that or something to that effect. That is all you are being asked about.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Do you have a recollection of any such conversation?
A. There is a description obviously of that, of what Dave Taylor says, I don't recognise any of it. CHA RMAN I mean, it's a terribly bald description.
A. Yeah. I mean, I just don't recognise what he's saying. I just, I have no recollection of anything, of the events as he outlines them here.
CHA RMAN We11, in other words, what he seems to be saying is you were showing a bit too much independence, that is what he's saying on this issue, but you -Mr. Ferry is asking you do you remember any conversation with him about that issue.
A. I don't remember any conversation with him about that issue, and I'm not sure that conversation took place, actual1y.
82 Q. MR. FERRY: But you don't --
A. I think I'd recall that conversation.

83 Q. Yeah. Because in saying yesterday that you don't remember ever having a conversation with him about Maurice McCabe, that wouldn't be correct if Superintendent Taylor's correct in relation to the O'Mahony report?
A. Sorry? the o'Mahony report, that you have just read there, that you pushed back, then what you said yesterday wouldn't be correct when you said that you don't remember ever having a conversation with Maurice McCabe?
A. I don't remember ever having a conversation with him about Maurice McCabe.
Q. But could it be possible that you don't remember but Superintendent Taylor is correct in relation to the O'Mahony report aspect in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. I would remember that -- I would remember that conversation because, as far as I'm concerned, if that conversation took place, that would be an effort to negatively brief me about Sergeant McCabe, and I would remember that. We are now into territory here where Sergeant McCabe is a very well known person, this is really heating up now, this is what, 2013, 2014, this is a serious business now, so this is not like the conversation that I had several years earlier. This is a conversation that $I$ would recall, right? The nature of my contact with Garda Headquarters just is not as it
is outlined here. It's just that simple. If this took place I would recall. This never took place. Well, in relation to your contact with Garda Headquarters, and particularly the Press office, you would have had experience of other Press Officers apart 11:14 from Superintendent Taylor, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

And there are phone contact records and, as you have already said, there was a lot of contact directly to Superintendent Taylor. Would that have been the norm before his tenure? When John Gilligan was the Press Officer, for example, would you have been talking to Superintendent Gilligan on the phone?
A. I would have been, yeah.

Yes. So Superintendent Taylor was similar to the previous Press officer in that he was having telephone conversations and I'm sure face-to-face conversations with crime reporters?
A. Yeah. that would have been a negative briefing and you were never briefed negatively, but again it's all to do with context. Did you find Superintendent Taylor a man that you could have a chat with?
A. I wasn't close to him, I didn't regard myself as being particularly close to him, I didn't have that many dealings with him to be honest. When you spoke to him, I mean, did you have a conversation or was it just I put a question and I seek
an answer? Did you have conversations with him?
A. It was kind of professional exchanges, really. I mean, it was -- as I say, I wasn't particularly close to him, he wasn't a guy $I$ would be having a long drawn out chat with.

91 Q. Yes. Because, you see, I have to put it to you that while you have been saying that you weren't briefed and there was no negative briefing, the height of Superintendent Taylor's evidence is that he would work and he would drop this information into conversations as opportunities arose. So, in other words, if he was talking to a journalist and an issue came up about Sergeant McCabe he would drop it in that there was an issue about Sergeant McCabe and that he had an agenda because there was a revenge agenda against An Garda Síochána because of the investigation. But the way it was being done, it wasn't being done according to his evidence, by any formal briefing, it was being done, and the evidence he gave was that he said:
"I would take the opportunity when the conversation would arise, because sometimes l would have daily or hourly connection with the media."
A. He wouldn't have had an hourly connection with me, that's for sure.

92 Q. "And sometimes we would be tal king on one matter and then it may drift into a matter in rel ation to Sergeant McCabe. "

And it was in that context that if Sergeant McCabe came up along with journalists that he would drop in that there was an agenda there and that there was an issue with Sergeant McCabe in relation to revenge and he was motivated by maliciousness against Garda management. So, do you see the distinction there?
A. I do.

I appreciate that you are coming here, you are a respectable crime reporter, and obviously you don't want to think that you have been played here or that somebody has taken you, you know, for a ride, but it's not a situation where somebody is saying you were having official briefings, it's been described as a briefing. But the reality of it, according to Superintendent Taylor, was it was just slipped into the conversation whenever Sergeant McCabe's name would come up?
A. The nature of what you have outlined there, that never
occurred between me and any member of An Garda Síochána, ever.
94 Q. But it occurred with whoever you spoke to back in 2010, 2011?
A. It was a totally different type of conversation. what you are -- what you're outlining here is the slipping in of information to try and influence reporters against Sergeant McCabe. That's not the nature of the conversation $I$ had back at the start, totally different.
evidence could form a view that, actually that was what happened in 2010 or 2011 because whoever was speaking to you back then did drop in a negative piece of information, very subtly, that this man had fallen out with Garda management and that was the start of it?
A. I think you are forgetting one thing about the evidence that I gave: The person that I spoke to back in 2010, 2011, wasn't a guard. So the whole premise of your question is just completely crazy.
I appreciate that. But there is more than one way to skin a cat, Mr. Lally. And regardless of who it was or what it was or when it was, but you can't recall, you then proceeded -- you then proceeded with your journalist's career which moved on to penalty points, which became the biggest issue in the history of Garda management, which has resulted in a number -- two garda commissioners leaving their post, a Minister for Justice leaving his post, high officials in the Department of Justice leaving their post, and the low ranking Garda sergeant is still standing, and you were reporting through all of that at a time when the low ranking Garda sergeant was, there was an issue that he was going to be called before the Houses of the Oireachtas, and whoever had spoken to you, had planted that in your mind that he had fallen out with Garda management and that was the start of it?
A. Yeah. But the person that I spoke to at the outset wasn't a guard, and wouldn't have been wielding any Garda agenda. I don't think you quite understand that.

Like, look, let me be very, very clear, okay: The person that I spoke to at the start of all of this, who relayed this to me, they relayed it to me after I repeatedly asked them questions, who is this guy and what is the story? Okay. Just this was not any part of any campaign to do down Sergeant McCabe. It just wasn't, okay. The idea that somehow they were trying to tell me that, you know, he was acting in revenge or they were trying to plant a seed in my head that would grow years later, it's just complete nonsense. The person wasn't a guard, they weren't -- they weren't pro-guard, they weren't trying to wheel out any Garda agenda, they hadn't been poisoned by any Garda agenda. The nature of what you are outlining is just fantasy, complete fantasy. And the nature of this interaction that's been outlined by Dave Taylor, again total fantasy.
97 Q. Tota1 fantasy?
A. Sure, I mean, he has no evidence to even, you know, back it up. He can't say where this happened, how many 11:20 times he talked to me, where did he talk to me. Like, he has absolutely no evidence whatsoever. This just didn't happen, it's that simple.
98 Q. Yes. And the people that he said he was talking to can't back it up either, they can't remember?
A. Because it never happened.

99 Q. And there are other people also, but anyway, when it was 2013, 2014 and it was big news, at least journalists were talking about Sergeant McCabe and the
issue, you had heard about it, but you had discounted it. So I put it to you that if Superintendent Taylor was talking to you about Sergeant Maurice McCabe as he said in his own direct evidence, in relation to the o'mahony report, and I put it to you that he says that he was talking to you in relation to Sergeant McCabe in relation to the agenda and revenge against the guards, that what I'm saying is, that if Superintendent Taylor had been talking to you about Maurice McCabe, that that would not have alarmed you or startled you in the sense 11:21 that you hadn't heard the story before. So you've clearly given evidence that you had heard this on and off from 2010, 2011?
A. I never said 2010 , 2011. What I said was I wrote my first story in The Irish Times on penalty points in
2012. I have a feeling looking back on it now, I knew about it for about a year at that time, possibly longer. okay? Like, the timeframe pre-dates Dave Taylor's time even in the Press office.
100 Q. No, I appreciate that. But I think in fairness to you now, you are saying you never mentioned 2010, 2011, I think that is what you opened with yesterday?
A. I did mention it, but I didn't specifically say that that is what the timeframe was. I haven't put a specific timeframe.
101 Q. What I am saying is, if Superintendent Taylor had mentioned it to you it wouldn't be, for want of a better term, a JFK moment, that you'd, wow, that is the first time I ever heard that, because you had heard
about Maurice McCabe and the complaints much earlier?
A. Yeah. The revenge element would be, you know, a JFK moment.
Q. Yes.
A. And that's why I'm so clear that the evidence as it's been outlined here didn't happen, because I would remember it because that would be a kind of, I won't say a JFK moment but it would be something that I would certainly recall.
Yeah. So anyway, to finish up, you can't recall or 11:23 remember who told you the story first of all back whenever it was?
A. Hmm .
Q. You can't recall or remember what journalists told you the story whenever it was?
A. Hmm.

105 Q. And you don't remember ever having a conversation about Maurice McCabe with Superintendent Taylor?
A. That's right.
Q. So therefore, how can you exclude Superintendent Taylor 11:23 as being one of the people that spoke to you about Maurice McCabe when you don't remember who spoke to you about Maurice McCabe?
A. Dave Taylor has put in a protected disclosure that has led to the creation of this Tribunal and he can't remember anything, okay?

107 Q. No, no --
A. He can't remember anything. He can't remember any details of any of this.

108 Q. We11, he can remember talking to you and, for example, he has --
A. When was that?

109 Q. He has given evidence that he spoke to new relation to the O'Mahony report?
A. And when did he speak to me? what date was that? And where was I? In reply to what questions?
110 Q. He said in his evidence that he couldn't be specific of the date or the time it --
A. There you go.

111 Q. -- but he can remember what it was about and he can remember speaking to you.
A. okay.

CHA RMAN We11, I think Mr. Ferry's point is that Mr. Taylor, Superintendent Taylor gave evidence on oath 11:24 of this.
A. Right. We11, I mean, as $I$ have said, first of all, $I$ just didn't have that kind of relationship with Dave Taylor, that is for starters. He would have been reading what I was writing about Sergeant McCabe, he would have -- he would have firmly gotten the view that I was an independent person and I think if he was trying it on with anybody in the media he wouldn't come to me. I just didn't have that kind of relationship with him, that's all I can say to you. If he had come 11:24 to me at some point and tried to say that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by revenge, I would recall that. I don't recall ever having any such conversation with anybody from An Garda Síochána, and I think if that
happened I would recall it.
112 Q. MR. FERRY: Yes.
A. And we can sit here for hours, that's what happened, you know.
113 Q. Yes. But it's interesting that you can't recall that but you can recall, from the outset, that Sergeant McCabe had fallen out with management.
A. No, I can recall being told that by a person when -114 Q. Yes.
A. I haven't formed that view. I didn't form that view 11:25 back then.
Q. Yes.
A. As I asked the person, wel1, what is this all about, where did this come from, how did it happen, and when did it happen, and so on, the person volunteered, we11, 11:25 there was an issue and this, you know, seems to be where he fell out with Garda management. That was the view of that person. Not my view.
116 Q. Well, in circumstances where you can't remember the person who told you, you can't remember who the journalists were, you can't remember Dave Taylor talking to you, would you agree that perhaps then you just don't remember Dave Taylor talking to you about Sergeant McCabe but that it may have happened?
A. If anybody in An Garda Síochána had come to me and tried to smear or negatively brief me about Sergeant McCabe, I would recall that.

117 Q. Yes.
A. That would be a big moment.

118 Q. Yes. Well, I put it to you that, finally, you were one of the journalists that was negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe.
A. I don't agree with that statement.

MR. FERRY: Thank you, Mr. Lally.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much, Mr. Ferry. Was there any questions from RTÉ?
MR. G LLANE: No.
CHA RMAN You will be at the end, in any event.
Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh or, sorry, Mr. Doyle you are here.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, just one or two questions.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M' CHEÁL

## O H GG NS:

119 Q. MR. ḾCEÁL O H GG NS: Mr. Lally, Mícheál o'Higgins on behalf of former Commissioner Callinan and former Commissioner o'Sullivan. The gist of the allegation against former Commissioner Callinan insofar as it has been put, is that he was angry or irritated and took personally, it is alleged, the allegations made by Sergeant McCabe relating to the FCPN, the fixed charge penalty notice system, and that, as a result of that, it is said, he instigated some class of smear campaign, 11:27 all right. That being the central plank of the allegation, can I just ask you about the matter that Mr. Ferry was canvassing with you on behalf of Superintendent Taylor, and that is the conversation
that you believe you had with somebody who wasn't a garda, as to -- which possibly occurred perhaps, and you are not in a position to state with precision when it was, but may have occurred in the region of 2010 or 2011, all right? Just focusing on that for a moment, that is the area I am going to ask you one question about. The point has already been made by the Chairman and others that that was at a time, it would appear, if it was 2010 or 2011, prior to even Superintendent Taylor being in the Press office, but can I ask you: Are you aware that Maurice McCabe and John Wilson came forward with their complaints about the abuse of the FCPN system actually in April 2012, isn't that so?
A. I wasn't sure about that.

120 Q. All right. But if that be correct, and I think it is, ${ }_{11: 28}$ that would mean that, whatever conversation you had with this person who wasn't a guard, even predated that, wouldn't that follow?
A. That would follow. I mean, what I said was that I had my first extensive story about the penalty points issue 11:29 in The Irish Times towards the end of 2012. I felt at that time I knew about it about a year and possibly far longer. It's possible that I'm over-estimating the period of time that I knew -- that I'd heard about this for. I have found it impossible to put a timeframe on 11:29 exactly when I heard about it.
121 Q. Right. The only other point I want to ask you is: were you aware that insofar as Superintendent Taylor is seeking to, I won't say cling on to what you have said
of your conversation as to 2010 or 2011, but at least to derive some benefit from it, were you aware that according to Sergeant McCabe's own correspondence with his then superintendent, Superintendent Clancy, many years ago, it was Sergeant McCabe's position that the D 11:29 investigation, that is to say the Garda investigation into the D allegation, had caused his own relations with his Garda colleagues to become strained, were you aware of that?
A. Am I aware of that now or was I aware of it back then?

122 Q. Are you aware of it now?
A. I am aware of it now, yes.

MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: okay. Thank you.
CHAL RMAN Was there anything else?
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: No, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Marrinan?

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

123 Q. MR. MARR NAN One matter. If I could have page 6480 up on the screen, please. 6480. Yes, this is part of an anonymous letter that was certainly sent to RTÉ -CHA RMAN This is the famous letter?

MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
124 Q. You just might be able to help us. This was in
circulation in late February/early March of 2014 . Did you ever see that anonymous letter?
A. When I was interviewed by the Tribunal investigators I was shown this and that was the first time I'd ever seen it or heard of it.

MR. MARRI NAN Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN Yes. So that was basically this year, so it didn't get to The Irish Times.
A. Well, I certainly didn't see it.

CHA RMAN Mr. Lally, just to say I am sorry for
holding you overnight. I had an educational thing that I was doing and in fact the Bar Council and the Law Society were invited so the fact that it came as a mystery to them is a mystery to me. So thank you very much.
A. Okay.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MARRI NAN The next witness, sir, is Debbie McCann, 11:31 please.

CHA RMAN I am talking about the Hardiman lecture series, which members of the Bar attend so enthusiastically.

MG. DEBBI E MECANN, HAM NG BEEN SUORN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN
125 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Now if you wouldn't mind just pulling the microphone close to you and speak up into it, please. Ms. McCann, I think that you're a journalist 11:32 with the Irish Daily Mail?
A. No, I am a journalist with the Irish Mail on Sunday. 126 Q. Irish Mail on Sunday, I am sorry. Would you just give the Chairman a brief history of your?
A. Yeah. I started in Provincial Newspapers after leaving college around 2006. I worked with Provincial
Newspapers for about two years. I then went traveling to Australia and I came home and I went into the News of the world, and from there I went into The Mail on Sunday.

127 Q. Now, I think that in the first instance, if we could just look at the history of your interaction with the Tribunal, just for the purposes of recording it and maybe any comment that you wish to make in relation to it. I think the Tribunal first wrote to you on 15th March of 2017?
A. Yes.

128 Q. And that's at page 3718 , if it could be brought up on the screen for you. And you see there, it's addressed to you?
A. Mm-hmm.

129 Q. And in paragraph 2:
"As you are al so no doubt aware the Sol e Member of the Tri bunal, Mr. Justice Charlet on, del i vered an opening statement on 27th February 2017. In this opening statement he called for all those people with know edge of the matters and the terns of reference to provi de a written statement to the Tribunal by close of business
on the 13th March 2017. A copy of the opening statement is available on the Tribunal's website --"

And then it gives the address:
"-- and is al so encl osed herewith, for ease of ref er ence. "

And then the next paragraph says:
"Frominf ormation in the possession of the Tribunal it appears that it may be that you were be in contact with Detective Superintendent Dave Tayl or while he was Press Officer for An Garda Sí ochána and after he had ceased that role. In the event that you have information rel evant to the terms of reference of the Tribunal, it would greatly assist the work of the Tribunal if you woul d submit a statement contai ning such information."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

130 Q. And then it goes on in the next paragraph to deal with:
"In the event that you wi sh to claimany privilege over any such inf ormation or the source of such inf ormation this can be set out in any statement whi ch you may furnish to the Tri bunal."

So the response to that came from Mr. Kealey on your behalf on the 26th March of 2017. It's addressed to Ms. Mullan, solicitor for the Tribunal. And then in the second paragraph --
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Marrinan, it may be that it follows on the next page, but it's a different page. MR. MARRI NAN It's 3719.

CHA RMAN It's al1 in Volume 14, Ms. McCann, if you want to look at a hard copy in front of you.

MR. MARRI NAN I hope to go through this as quickly as possible, Ms. McCann. And if there is any matter in the statements that I'm excluding that you think might be important, please stop me and I will certain7y highlight it on your behalf.
"Four of $\mathrm{my} \mathrm{clients} ,\mathrm{Debbie} \mathrm{McCann} ,\mathrm{Al} \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Bracken}$, Jenni fer Bray and Al i son O Reilly recently recei ved correspondence fromyou on behal f of the Tribunal. I am afraid that for personal reasons l have been unable to reply until now. I apol ogi se for this."

Then it goes on to say:
"While your letter requests that reporters in question di scl ose inf ormation which falls within the terns of reference of the Tribunal it focuses upon cont act bet ween them and Det ective Superintendent David Tayl or and upon any communi cations of an open ki nd they have had with him Wile l have only a limited opportunity in the time available to take instructions frommy cli ents, it appears clear that none of the open communi cations that the journal ists in question had with Detective Superintendent Tayl or rel ate to matters falling within the terns of reference of the Tribunal."

Now, just in relation to that, had you discussed the
matter with Sebastian Hamilton?
A. No.

132 Q. Had you discussed the matter with Jennifer Bray?
A. No.

Had you discussed it with Alison O'Reilly?
A. No.
Q. Or indeed Ali Bracken?
A. No.
Q. Or Conor O'Donnell, in relation to the approach that the journalists would adopt towards the work of the Tribunal?
A. No.

136 Q. It then goes on:
"As anticipated by Mr. Justice Charlet on in his opening 11:37 statement, and as referred to in my letter of the 13th March, my clients have an obligation of confidence towards sources of information and a legally establ i shed privilege agai nst reveal ing those sources, ei ther di rectly or indi rectly."

Was that the position that you were adopting at that stage?
A. Yes. Yeah.

137 Q. And it was a position that you were adopting without 11:37 consultation with your -- with the editors in the newspaper or the other journalists who have been written to, is that what you are telling the Chairman?
A. No, it was a position that we were looking to deal with
the matter of privilege first before we did anything further.

138 Q.
No. when you say "we" I mean, were you giving individual instructions in this regard?
A. No, I would have been speaking to Michael Kealey and I would have been speaking to possibly my news editor.
Q. who is?
A. Robert Cox.
Q.

And did Robert cox convey to you the attitude of Sebastian Hamilton?
A. No, no.

141 Q. So, did Robert Cox indicate to you that he had had a conversation with Ali Bracken or Jennifer Bray or Alison o'Reilly, the other journalists who would have been written to?
A. No.

142 Q. No? So it just happens to be a coincidence that you all adopted the same stance in relation to this matter then, is that what you are saying?
A. Yeah, we were -- I guess we were getting legal advice, we were dealing with the matter of privilege first and then we were going to proceed from there.
143 Q. Well you see, how did privilege arise at all in relation to the matter? Superintendent Taylor was the Garda Press officer, isn't that right?
A. Mm -hmm, he was.

144 Q. And you would have had dealings with him as a journalist on a daily basis, isn't that right?
A. Mm-hmm. We11, yeah -- not daily, but yeah.

145
Q. We11, on a regular basis?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. And what was the problem in relation to disclosing any information or any dealings that you would have had with Superintendent Taylor?
A. Because not all of my dealings with Superintendent Taylor would have been on the record.
147 Q. We11, even off-the-record, what's the problem in relation to that?
A. Well, there's sourcing issues.

148 Q. Pardon?
A. There are sourcing issues, would be a problem.

149 Q. Yeah, well, I wonder; I mean, you are dealing with Superintendent Taylor as the Press officer --
A. Mm-hmm.

150 Q. -- and he will give you the official line and he could be quoted --
A. Mm-hmm.

151 Q. -- as such, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

152 Q. And then he speaks off the record --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

153 Q. -- and the understanding is that he won't be quoted in your newspaper, isn't that right?
A. That is essentially off the record, yeah.

154 Q. But why does that give rise to any situation of a source that needs to be protected?
A. Press officers would give on- and off-the-record briefings all the time. Did you discuss the matter with Superintendent Taylor when this issue arose?
A. No.

159 Q. why not?
A. He was no longer in the Press Office, I wasn't in

160 Q. Why wouldn't you have discussed it with him because according to you potentially he was a source?
A. And privilege lies with me, the journalist, why would I
discuss it with Superintendent Taylor?
161 Q. So is that the stance that you are taking; is that the privilege lies purely with you?
A. Absolutely.

162 Q. And the basis of the privilege being what in this particular instance?
A. Meaning?

163 Q. What is the purpose of the privilege?
A. We11, that in going forward I have a career as a journalist that I need to protect.

164 Q. Al1 right. I will return to that in due course. The Tribunal then wrote to you again, in a letter of the 21st April 2017, and this is at page 3720 of the material:
"The Tribunal looks forward to your cooper ation in its work. The Tribunal is anxi ous to ensure that it recei ves all rel evant information pertaining to its terns of reference. "

And then:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "You may know that Superintendent Tayl or has asserted } \\
& \text { that he was instructed to brief the media negativel y in } \\
& \text { rel ation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe. The solicitors } \\
& \text { acting for Superintendent Tayl or have confirmed on his } \\
& \text { behalf to the Tribunal that he does not claimprivilege } \\
& \text { in respect of communi cations the subject-matter of the } \\
& \text { term of reference to the Tribunal, with journalists in }
\end{aligned}
$$

the print, broadcasting or other media."

So that is fairly clear.
A. Mm-hmm.

165 Q. "The Tribunal has al so recei ved confirmation from both Commi ssi oner O' Sul I i van and former Commi ssi oner Callinan that do not clai many privilege should they be i dentified as the source of any information, briefing, allegation or bel ief comminicated to journalists in the print, broadcasting or other media directly or i ndi rectly rel ating to Sergeant Maurice McCabe in rel ation to the work of the Tribunal."

So that is very clear in relation to their position also.
A. Yes.

166 Q. "Ve hope this is of assi stance to you in order to provi de answers whi ch deal with the substance of the following queries which the Tribunal asked you to reply to. Please furni sh as much detail as you can.

1. Can you confirmyour mobile phone number and work phone number?"

Your answer to that subsequently was that you were refusing to do that.
A. Yeah.

167 Q. Will you advise the Chairman why you were refusing to give or confirm your phone number?
A. Because I didn't want to give rise to any investigations into my phone number and who my sources were.

168 Q. But the Tribunal weren't looking into who your sources were, there was no indication that the Tribunal was examining or interested in any of your sources.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

169 Q. Do you understand?
A. Mm-hmm.

170 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

171 Q. So as far as you were concerned, the Tribunal had been set up to look into and to investigate a protected disclosure by Superintendent Taylor?
A. Mm-hmm.

172 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

173 Q. And that made reference to Commissioner Callinan, Deputy Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan and himself in terms of his interaction with the media as the Garda Press officer --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

174 Q. -- in his official capacity?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

175 Q. And the Tribunal made it very clear by sending you the 11:44 terms of reference and setting out very clearly in the letters --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

176 Q. -- to you, that that was the business of the Tribunal.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

177 Q. Therefore, the Tribunal weren't interested and aren't interested in pursuing any sources that you have or opening up any lines of inquiry in that regard.
A. I would be very slow to hand over my mobile phone number.

178 Q. Sure you called up to Ms. D and you gave her a card with your phone number on it, isn't that right?
A. That is a very different scenario.

179 Q. Sorry?
A. That is a very different scenario.

180 Q. The Garda Press Office --
A. I didn't give Ms. D my number, I gave Mrs. D my number.

181 Q. The Garda Press office have your mobile number?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

182 Q. Dave Taylor had your mobile number.
A. Yeah.

183 Q. I mean, it's not a state secret.
A. No, absolutely not. I didn't want to give to any further investigation into my mobile phone number.
184 Q. Do you realise the importance of the work of the Tribunal?
A. I do of course.

185 Q. You know how it was established?
A. I do.

186 Q. And you know the reason that it was established?
A. Yeah, absolutely.

187 Q. And it is to get to the truth of a protected disclosure that was made by Superintendent Taylor.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

188 Q. And here we have a simple question being asked by the Tribunal to confirm your telephone number --
A. Yeah.

189 Q. -- which is freely available --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

190 Q. -- to anybody --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- who wishes to find out --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

192 Q. -- and yet your immediate response is that you say no.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

193 Q. Do you think that is cooperating with the work of the Tribunal?
A. We11, I have tried my best to assist the Tribunal in $\quad$ 11:46 any way that I can.

194 Q. No, this is -- 1et's focus on this issue.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. This is a very simple issue, asking you to confirm your telephone number?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

196 Q. And even when the Tribunal were in possession of it later on they asked you to confirm your telephone number?
A. Yes.

197 Q. And you refused to do so?
A. The Tribunal got possession of my mobile phone number and asked me a number of questions in relation to it and I answered those questions.
Q. But Ms. McCann, you will familiar with the workings of the Tribunal up to now and the interaction with journalists, are you?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. You refused to identify your own telephone number, is that right?
A. I answered the questions in relation to my phone number.
Q. You refused to answer and identify your own telephone 11:47 number, isn't that right?
A. I have a very difficult -- I am in a very difficult position in the sense that I'm balancing what $I$ have to try and preserve, which is source protection, and assisting the Tribunal, $I$ have tried to do that as best 11:47 as I could.
Q. And you will be aware of the fact that the Tribunal in fact hasn't intruded or sought to intrude on any sources that journalists may or may not have outside the specific matters dealt with in the terms of reference, you will be aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you will be aware, for instance, the manner in which Conor Lally, the last witness, gave evidence to the Tribunal and cooperated with the Tribunal to a limited extent while still preserving the fundamental 11:48 rights that he believes that he has in relation to journalistic privilege?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. You will be aware of that?
A. Yeah, absolutely.
Q. And you'11 also be aware of the evidence of Mr. O'Toole, as well?
A. I am, and he also --
Q. A similar position was adopted by the Tribunal --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in total respect for the rights of journalists?
A. Absolutely. And he also refused to give his phone number.
Q. This is a very clearly defined and limited inquiry that 11:48 is being made.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. You appreciate that?
A. Absolutely, yeah.

209 Q. And we will come back to the limited inquiry that was being made of you at this juncture; namely, for you to identify your telephone number.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is it just a matter of a blanket refusal to cooperate with the work of the Tribunal that led you not to disclose your telephone number?
A. It wasn't a blanket refusa1. I refused to hand over my phone number at the first juncture. I was then subsequently asked by the investigators in relation to a series of text messages and I answered those questions. I didn't blanketly refuse.

211 Q. In any event, I will go on with the questions.

[^0]fromJuly 2012 until February 2017?"

I think you answered again that you weren't going to answer that.
"Were you bri ef ed negativel y about Ser geant McCabe by anyone? And if so, by whom
4. Have you any inf ormati on or evi dence about an or chestrated campaign to di rected by seni or officers of the Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Ser geant Maurice McCabe by spreadi ng rumours about his professional or personal life?
5. Were you contacted by Superintendent Dave Tayl or in 11:49 rel ation to Ser geant Mauri ce McCabe?
6. Were you bri ef ed negativel y by Superintendent Tayl or in rel ation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
7. Were you briefed negativel y by Superintendent Tayl or in rel ation to Sergeant Mauri ce McCabe to the effect that his compl ai nts had no substance?
8. Were you bri ef ed negativel y by Superintendent

Tayl or in rel ation to Sergeant MECabe to the effect that the Gardaí had fully investi gated compl ai nts and had found no substance to his all egations and that he was dri ven by agendas?
9. Was your attention drawn by Superintendent Tayl or to an allegation or suggestion of criminal misconduct made agai nst Sergeant McCabe in any respect?
10. Was your attention drawn by Superintendent Tayl or to an allegation that the root cause of Sergeant Maurice McCabe' s agenda was revenge agai nst An Garda Sí ochána?
11. Were you informed by Superintendent Tayl or that he was instructed/ di rected by former Commi ssi oner Callinan and/ or Deputy Commi ssi oner Nói rín Ơ Sul livan to cont act the media to brief the media negativel y agai nst Sergeant Mauri ce MkCabe?
12. Are you aware and have you any evi dence of any attempt made by former Commissioner Callinan or Commi ssi oner O Sullivan or any ot her member of An Gar da Sí ochána to di scredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct made agai nst hi m"

I'11 just stop and pause there for the moment. You refused to answer any of those questions, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I did subsequently in the same statement provide more detail, though.
212 Q. So I'11 repeat the question asked at that stage: Are
you aware or have you any evidence of any attempt made by former Commissioner Callinan or Commissioner O'Sullivan or any other senior member of An Garda Síochána to discredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal conduct made against him?
A. I have no evidence of any orchestrated campaign by senior Garda management.
I'11 ask the question again: Are you aware and have you any evidence of any attempt made by former

Commissioner Callinan or Commissioner O'Sullivan or any other senior member of An Garda Síochána to discredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against him?
A. I have no evidence of any orchestrated campaign and no --
Q. I am not talking an orchestrated campaign.
A. I have no evidence of any campaign to malign Sergeant McCabe. I wasn't briefed negatively by any member of An Garda Síochána in relation to Sergeant McCabe.

215 Q. We then go on:
" Were you informed by a journalist or any ot her person of any matters referred to in questions above?
14. Have you any know edge, i nf or mati on or evi dence rel ating to any of the ot her matters above?

Have you any know edge, inf ormation or evi dence
rel ating to any matters within the terms of reference of the Tribunal?

Have you any records of commini cations fromor with Superi nt endent Tayl or or former Commi ssi oner Callinnn, Commi ssi oner Ó Sul Ii van or any ot her seni or gar da rel ating to any of the above natters?"

The contents of this letter are confidential to the Tri bunal."

And then a reminder I think was sent on 2nd May. And the response came and it's at page 3724 on your behalf, on the 5th May of 2017, from Michae1 Kealey, and it reads:
"I have been asked to reply on my clients' behal f to your letters of the 21st April to each of the reporters in question. My clients are unable to answer the questions in your letters of the 21st April, they are
concerned that if they do so they would breach their obl i gations of confidence towards sources of information or at the very least allow for the opening up for lines of inquiry that would lead to the identification of those sources."

Are you now happy that the Tribunal isn't anxious to open up any avenues in relation to other sources that you may or may not have had?
A. Yes, I have expanded on my answers since those letters were sent.
Q. Sorry?
A. I have expanded on my answers since those letters were sent when I met with your --

217 Q. Yeah, you have in evidence today and that is very welcome and the Tribunal welcomes that.
A. But I did when I met with your investigators as well, I expanded on those questions.

218 Q Not to the extent that you have today and I think that you are aware of that.

MR. KEALEY: Sorry to interrupt - Michae1 Kealey - I don't believe that is correct assertion by Mr. Marrinan. If Mr. Marrinan wishes to go through the original statement you wil1 see that the original statement to the Tribunal of Debbie McCann said precisely the things she is saying today; namely, that she was not negatively briefed by the Gardaí and was unaware of any orchestrated campaign.
CHA RMAN Maybe you would be so kind as to point out the relevant passage, then, Mr. Kealey.

MR. KEALEY: Debbie McCann's initial statement to the Tribunal you will find, I am afraid I don't have the volume number, you will find at page 3729 and so forth. I think it's Volume 14. Apologies, Volume 19.
CHA RMAN Just the page will do, Mr. Kealey. You say 3729?

MR. KEALEY: That is where the statement begins. CHA RMAN And if you want to get this out yourself,

Ms. McCann, please do. The volumes are all there and if you need any help Ms. Ní Gabhann will give you a hand. So is it volume 14? It is?

MR. KEALEY: Yes. And I think perhaps the best way to commence that if you commence it at page 3739. Commencing on line 169.

MR. MARRI NAN Well, that is an entirely different matter and I was very careful in that regard. what it says is:
"I wasn't i nvol ved in any or chestrated campai gn to mal i gn Sergeant McCabe. I have no evi dence of an or chestrated campai gn to mal ign Ser geant McCabe. The allegations that we were looking at, at the time, were di scussed in the of fice."

If you then would go back, if we could have page 3735 up on the screen. In the middle, line 98:
"I have been asked if I have any evi dence or
inf ormation about an or chestrated campai gn di rected by seni or officers of An Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Ser geant McCabe by spreading rumburs about his professional and personal life. For the reasons outlined in my solicitor's correspondence to the Di scl osures Tribunal of the 5/5/2017 I am unable to answer this question."

So there is actually a contradiction inherent in it.

Page 3734, line 79:
"I have been asked to provide details of the role that any members of An Garda Sí ochána may have had in the above. Agai $n$, for source protection reasons, I don't feel I can answer the question."

But look, the reality is that if you believed that that was an answer to the question that $I$ have now asked you --
A. Yes.

219 Q. -- in relation not -- not just in relation to an orchestrated --
CHA RMAN If we can just stop for just a moment, Mr. Marrinan. Mr. Kealey, your objection is completely 11:58 wrong. It's completely wrong. I mean, the text bears that out. This is the first time $I$ have heard, and believe me I do follow these things, from Ms. McCann that no member of An Garda Síochána ever briefed her negatively in relation to sergeant McCabe. This is the 11:58 first time I've heard that no senior management in An Garda Síochána ever attempted to malign Sergeant McCabe to her. That is the first time $I$ have heard it. So your objection is wrong. It's totally wrong.
MR. KEALEY: May it please you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. MARRI NAN Ms. McCann, we are just anxious to get the information, right, and this isn't -- I don't wish to be in any way harsh on you or abrupt with you, do you understand?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

221 Q. It is very helpful that you have given us that information today because it advances our inquiries to a large extent. And if I could just turn then to Superintendent Taylor and your interactions with Superintendent Taylor in 2013 and 2014. Volume 19 of the material, page 5257. These are a list of your telephone contacts with Superintendent Taylor over a period of time from the 16th November of 2012, there are six pages, and they go up until the 17 th June of 2014. I think that you had gone on maternity leave in March, or thereabouts, of 2014, is that right?
A. I did, yeah.

222 Q. And that would show that you were obviously in contact with Superintendent Taylor and there is nothing untoward in relation to that?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

223 Q. And there is no suggestion that there was. But you would have had cause to contact him whenever any issues arose, any queries that you may have had of the Press officer, and you would contact him directly on his own mobile phone, is that right?
A. Yes.

224 Q. If we could just then have volume 26, please, and if we could have 6984 up on the screen. These are a list of telephone contacts between Superintendent Taylor and yourself, Commissioner O'Sullivan or -- Commissioner Callinan and also journalist Eavan Murray, and that is over a relevant period of time that we are just going
to turn to now. You told the Tribunal investigators that in or around about February of 2014, that you heard murmurings, is the way that you put it.
A. Mm-hmm.

And you refer in your statement "we heard murmurings about Maurice McCabe". Would you just tell the Chairman about that, please.
A. Yeah, I'm not sure how -- for how long, but I certainly -- there were murmurings going around that there was something in relation to Sergeant McCabe, in his past. I didn't know the specifics at that point. I didn't know very much about it at al1, really, and I didn't pay too much heed to it at that point. Well, can you tell us what were the murmurings, what were the specific things about Maurice McCabe's past that you were hearing?
A. I can't remember exactly, but it was something -- I think it was that I -- there was an allegation there. I didn't know what had happened with the allegation, what the allegation was about, I didn't know any of the 12:04 details in relation to the allegation, but just that there had been an allegation in the past.

227 Q. Did you contact Superintendent Taylor about that to find out what it was?
A. I don't fee1 I can answer that question for source member of An Garda Síochána has ever maligned Sergeant McCabe to me.

228 Q. Yes. Well, would it not have been entirely legitimate
for you to contact him, as he was the Garda Press officer, to find out about whether or not there was something in Sergeant McCabe's past of a disciplinary nature, of a criminal nature? Would that not have been an entirely legitimate inquiry?
A. In relation to a matter like that, you wouldn't really expect the Garda Press officer to confirm details like that. I would have my own sources that I would go to. CHA RMAN I don't think, Ms. McCann, I really want to make this very clear, I have no interest in inquiring into any sources that you have. We are only interested in inquiring in relation to Superintendent Taylor or Nóirín O'Sullivan or indeed Martin Callinan, and that's a11. I don't expect you to answer that, and I don't -I don't wish you to. I appreciate -- I don't want to know.
A. Okay.
Q. MR. MARRI NAN So --

CHA RMAN So Mr. Marrinan's question is about Superintendent Taylor.
230 Q. MR. MARR NAN And what you are looking for is something that might be factual and might -- there might be a legitimate inquiry of the Garda Press Officer or indeed the Garda Press office; did you ever think of contacting the Garda Press Office directly?
A. No, not in relation to that allegation. I wouldn't have looked --

231 Q. Did you think of contacting Superintendent Taylor about it?
A. I don't know if I can answer that question, in the sense that if I had contacted anybody in relation to this matter, it would have been purely on an off-the-record basis.
Q. You are familiar with the waiver that Superintendent Taylor has signed --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- in this regard, and it's extremely broad in its content, and the Tribunal investigators drew your attention to it, and it's in the papers. You are also familiar with the waiver of former Commissioner Callinan --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- in relation to these matters, and also Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan -- former Commissioner Nóirín o'sullivan?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. I mean, was there some -- was there in any sense any sort of prompting by Superintendent Taylor in relation to this story? Were the murmurings heard from him at that time?
A. Again, I don't feel I can answer that question for source protection reasons.
Q. Well, I mean, it's really a fairly direct question.

CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Marrinan, just, I have to stop here because, I mean, we can't sail into the realms of the ludicrous, you know; it's not going to help anybody - it's not going to help you, it's not going to help me, it's not going to help the public interest.

But, I mean, you have said clearly, and it couldn't be more clear than the fact that there was -- you have no evidence of any orchestrated campaign by Garda management to align Maurice McCabe, and secondly, I was never briefed negatively by any garda in relation to Maurice McCabe. So Mr. Marrinan asks you then the question: So there were these murmurings there about some allegation in the past, so did you ring David Taylor? Well, where is the problem? Because if you did ring David Taylor and if what you are saying is true, that you were never briefed negatively by any garda in relation to Maurice McCabe, then the answer would surely be you had some kind of a discussion but he never told me that there was anything bad in Maurice McCabe's background? I mean, you know, you can't have your cake and eat it.
A. In relation to the murmurings $I$ would have been hearing, I am not even sure who I would have been hearing them from.
CHA RMAN No, I am not asking -- I am not interested in the murmurings. So many people have spoken about murmurings, it may be one of the most used words before the Tribunal. We are talking now about, there is this rumour, and then you have contact with the Garda Press Officer, so did you say: Look, David, is there know? Or anything like that. Because if indeed your answer is correct, that you were never briefed negatively by any garda in relation to Maurice McCabe,

I have to reach the logical conclusion that he said, no, Maurice McCabe is a really nice man and these
things were investigated and they are the kind of thing that crop up from time to time, but the DPP ruled there wasn't even an offence. I have to assume that's the conversation you had.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Yes. So I don't see where source protection comes up.
A. Well, I guess we are coming up to around February 2014 when I would have been looking into the allegations a little bit more and I would have contacted my own sources in relation to that.

CHA RMAN And again, I'm not asking you about that.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Marrinan, for interrupting. And I just wanted to make it clear the field that we are on, where we are, what we are talking about, and maybe you'd talk to Mr. Marrinan about it. know that you went up to investigate an issue; presumably at that time you knew that it was an issue concerning an alleged sexual assault?
A. It was, yeah, at that point, around about that point that I would have made further -- I would have made
A. And whether or not there was any substance to it.

239 Q. And what sort of -- and again, we are not inquiring
into who your sources were at that time, but what was the level of information that you got?
A. I understood, going up there, I understood that there had been an allegation, it was historic in nature, I understood that it had been an allegation of inappropriate touching and I understood that the matter had been referred to the DPP and the DPP had ruled not to prosecute.
240 Q. And obviously you had the names?
A. I did.

And did you also know that it was a -- it concerned the daughter of a colleague of Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes, I'm pretty sure I did know that at that point.

243 Q. And we've already heard evidence in relation to this, that you ran it by your news editor?
A. I did, I did, I contacted --

244 Q. That was Robert Cox at the time, was it?
A. Yes, yes.

245 Q. And you brought that information to the table, did you, that you had?
A. I did. I think I suggested that we look at the allegation a little bit in more detail, which I did. I then told him that I had gotten more specific information in relation to it, and at that point then he told me to travel up and knock on her door.
Q. Did you share that with Alison O'Reilly at the time?
A. In advance, I -- possibly. I don't believe so. I think this was all very quick, in the sense that $I$ had been speaking to Robert cox about going up, the evening before, and I went up the following morning.
Q. I'11 come to what Alison O'Reilly says in relation to this, I have to put her side of that particular aspect of it. But before we broach that topic, Superintendent Taylor says that he -- that you phoned him before you went up --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- to speak with Ms. D. Is that right?
A. Again, there are a variety of sources on this matter, and I don't feel comfortable answering that question.
Q. Well, I'm not asking you to identify any sources whatsoever, do you understand? You're excluding Superintendent Taylor as being a source for this, are you?
A. I'm simply not answering the question. I don't feet comfortable answering that question in relation to source protection.
Q. We11, Superintendent Taylor is asserting that you phoned him before you went up. I can't really understand why you have a difficulty --
A. I really wish that I could help you further on this.

It would probably make my life easier if I could help you further on this, but $I$ have a career as a journalist that $I$ am very keen to protect in all of this, as well as assist your work, obvious7y.

251 Q. We11 -- and you will appreciate that the Tribunal respects that as well.
A. $M m-h m m$.

252 Q. But here we have Superintendent Taylor, forget about what -- the content of the actual discussion that you had with him, I'm merely pointing out to you that he says that you phoned him before you went up to see Ms. D. He is not saying that he was a source of any information, I'm not suggesting to you at this juncture that he was the source of any information; I am just asking you to confirm whether or not you did, in fact, phone him before you went up to visit Ms. D?
A. I would be in conversation with David Taylor on a weekly basis, so there was a good possibility that I was speaking to him in advance of going up, but whether 12:14 or not this was discussed, I don't feel comfortable revealing that at this juncture.
253 Q. But, I mean, in the context of what you have now, earlier on, revealed to the Tribunal in terms of not having evidence in relation to being -- anybody seeking 12:15 to influence you in any sort of smear campaign, but in that context, I mean, would it not -- would it be usual enough that you might ring him and say, look, you know, there is actually another -- there is another story here and I am going down to interview Ms. D?
A. I didn't tell Dave Taylor of everything that $I$ did in my day-to-day job.

254 Q. No, and I appreciate that, but did you tell -- he is saying that you told him about this.
A. I don't feel I can help you on that question, again for source protection reasons. I wish I could --
CHA RMAN I mean, unfortunately, Ms. McCann, the inference that might logically be taken out of that is that he was your source.
A. There were -- again, I am not saying --

CHA RMAK And I am saying 'might'. I am not saying that I am saying that, I'm saying 'might'. And could I say one other thing, because it has occurred to me really very forcibly and it's necessary to say it; the statement you made to the Tribunal was one which carries certain consequences if it's not correct, but the obligation on citizens taking an oath or otherwise is to actually tell the full truth. It's not a question of saying, and I refer to the famous example, 'I did not have sexual relations with that woman', the definition didn't include, so $I$ am not actually telling you. I am not interested in that kind of thing. That is nonsensical. One has to tell actually what happened, the actual truth, and not use forms of words such as, for instance, 'orchestrated', or whatever, and that, somehow, seems to escape from the obligation to tell the truth. It doesn't. The obligation here is to actually tell the truth.
A. And I'm --

CHA RMAN And it applies to everybody, not just to you. I'm not giving this long lecture for the purpose of annoying you, or anything else like that, but it is actually a fundamental patriotic obligation to tell the
truth, and there is -- you have sworn an oath to that effect, not to pick and choose words.
A. Yeah, absolutely, and I would take that very serious7y. I am telling that you I know of no evidence of any smear campaign against Sergeant McCabe. I sought out this information and I went up and I spoke to Mrs. D at the door.

CHA RMAN Now, I think I need to te11 you as well how serious this matter is, because, you know, we have and it doesn't matter whether they sit high or sit low, 12:17 the law is still above them - we have two commissioners of An Garda Síochána against whom appalling things have been said by a person with whom you were in contact. They actually have rights as we11. And the purpose of this Tribunal is to attempt to see what actually
happened. And in the event that you did indeed ring David Taylor and said, look, I am going up there, and he said to you something to the effect of, well, you know, Maurice McCabe is a really decent and honourable man, I wouldn't bother, it's all in the past and the DPP has ruled on it, I don't know why you are wasting your time, I actually would need to know that, and I don't believe that is anything to do with source protection. It's to do with actually answering the questions that the people of Ireland have entrusted to me to come up with some kind of an answer to. You might like to think about this, and, in that regard, I'm actually going to break for lunch now for an hour.

## THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLONS, AFTER LUNCH

MR. MARI NAN Debbie McCann, please.
If we just turn now to the statement that Alison O'Reilly made in relation to these matters.
A. Yeah.

256 Q. It's at page 3830, if you want it there, in volume 15. Have you got it?
A. I can read it here.

257 oh, you have it on the screen. All right. Clearly, you're at odds with Ms. O'Reilly in relation to a lot of what is contained in her statement?
A. Yes.
Q. And her own counsel can take up some of the issues, but I am concerned about some aspects of it --
A. Okay.

259 Q. -- that I am going to bring you through.
A. Yeah.

260 Q. But if you want to refer to other aspects of it that you think might be important --
A. Okay, yeah.
Q. -- please free feel to say so.
A. Yeah.

262 Q. It starts off in paragraph A towards the end, that change to mid-2013 and early 2014 :
"My colleague with the Irish Mail on Sunday, Debbie MECann, told me that the Garda whi stlebl ower, Sergeant Maurice McCabe, who had lifted the lid on the penalty
poi nts scandal, was a child abuser."

```
        Do you recal1 saying that to her?
```

A. No, absolutely not.

263 Q. Pardon?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. But you'd heard, as you put it, mutterings to that effect?
A. Absolutely. I had heard an allegation, yeah.
Q. And Alison O'Reilly was a colleague, isn't that right?
A. She was. She was a colleague and a friend, at that point.
Q. I mean, it mightn't be unusual during the course of conversations to refer to rumours that you had heard about Sergeant McCabe and to take a view in relation to 13:31 him. I mean, it may well have been that you didn't approve of the manner in which he was bringing his complaints in relation to the penalty points into the public domain. Did you feel that way at the time?
A. No. It wasn't that I didn't approve of what he was doing; it was that $I$ had heard an allegation in relation to him. But it's a bit of a leap to go from hearing an allegation and to calling him a child abuser.
267 Q. "She told me Sergeant McCabe and John WI son had caused 13:32 a l ot of trouble within the Gardaí for doing what they di d. "
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

268 Q. Would that have been discussed?
A. No, not that -- no. Not -- No. You don't seem a hundred percent sure about that? I mean --
A. We11, you know, there would have been discussions, obviously, you know, that this was causing a huge amount of controversy. You know, whether I would have said that they are bringing a lot of trouble.
Q. Well, you know, people are perfectly entitled to have their views --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
-- and nobody is criticising you for that.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

273 Q. But what Alison O'Reilly is suggesting in the statement here is that perhaps she was on one side of the fence and you were on the other insofar as the Sergeant McCabe issues were concerned?
A. In that sense, I was possibly a little bit more skeptical at the time in the sense that $I$ had heard this allegation, but it was no more or less than that.

274 Q. She then goes on to say that:
"Debbi e sai d all the Gardaí knew he was i nvol ved in abusing a girl who is now an adult and that there had been a bi $g$ cover-up within the Gardaí."

Well, you did know that much at the time?
A. No, I didn't. I knew nothing about any cover-up or anything like that.
Q. But you'd heard an allegation that he was -- that Sergeant McCabe had abused a gir1, is that right?
A. I did. But again, I didn't get the specifics on that allegation until just before visiting the home of Ms. D.
Q. I understand. And you then go on, she says -- claims, to say:
"... the Gardaí because he was a sergeant and a friend of the girl's father, who was al so a garda."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

277 Q. Subsequently, that was something that you did find out --
A. I did.
Q. -- in 2014, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yes.

279 Q. I mean, is it possible that you gave her this information and discussed this with her?
A. That there was a cover-up?

280 Q. Well, that it was a cover-up, that the girl was a daughter of a colleague?
A. There was no mention of a cover-up. I knew nothing of any cover-up, and still don't. Whether or not I would have discussed afterwards when we got more specific information about the girl's father being a colleague of Sergeant McCabe, I possibly did discuss that afterwards.
Q. "She tol d ne he was hated withi n the Gardaí and that there were no scandal ous behavi our contai ned in his compl ai nt. "
A. That's not true, in the sense that there were plenty of

Gardaí who were very much on his side on this.
Well, it may not be true, but you may have said it to back up your position in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
A. I don't think I would have said that.
Q. "She said that he was only doing it to get back at the Gardaí because he had fallen out with his superiors."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Is there a possibility that you might have said that?
A. No, I think that we would have discussed the allegation, but I don't think I would have drawn conclusions from that.
Q. I mean, it would be a fairly -- it wouldn't be a very robust debate to have with her perhaps over coffee if you were agreeing to everything. I mean, is it a position, because she has supplied texts to the Tribunal that might suggest, you know, that you were
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. But is it a position that she held very strong views in relation to Sergeant McCabe and you held strong views that perhaps he was causing some damage within An Garda 13:36 Síochána?
A. There was a little bit of that between us.
Q. There was a little bit.
A. There wasn't -- the sense is given that there was an
awful lot of discussion about this.
288 Q. Yes.
A. There wasn't.

289 Q. A11 right. But, I mean, I'm just trying to see what's between the two of you in relation to these matters?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. "She said that there was no scandal and that all anyone had to do when they got penalty points was to write a letter to their local superintendent, tell themit's a mistake and there was a good chance the points would be 13:37 quashed. "

Well, in fact, you did discuss that with her, didn't you, at some stage?
A. We11 I discussed that in the matter of a conference.
A. On one of our Tuesday conferences, I raised that issue, yes. I didn't say that there was a good chance that everybody could just get their points quashed. I just raised the legitimate process that there is in place for that.
Q. And that was in the context of penalty points that you had written in to a superintendent about, isn't that correct?
A. Yeah, yeah.

293 Q. "I asked her if you" -- yes. Then she says:
"I asked her if you told the Gardaí when they stopped you that you were friends with the Garda or you knew
someone in the Gardaí, would they let you go there and then, and she said probably. At some stage around the time of the penalty points scandal names appeared in one or two newspapers of sone people who had thei $r$ penalty points quashed."

We11, that's so, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, yeah.
"Debbie told me that she was worried her name was going to be printed."
were you worried?
A. I don't remember having this conversation with her, but obviously I wouldn't like to have my name printed in a newspaper in relation to this.
Q. Well, nobody would like to have their name printed.
A. No.
Q. Particularly if you hadn't done anything wrong.
A. Yes, absolutely.

297 Q. "I asked her if she had her penalty points quashed and she said yes. She said she didn't want her name in the paper because her father was a garda. As far as l recall, her name was not made public."
A. Well, you see, that conversation didn't happen in the sense that she asked me were the penalty points conference and pointed out that there was a legitimate process where you could, if you felt that the discretion could have been used if you were a couple of
kilometres over the speed limit, write to the local superintendent in the area.
Q. Well, I mean, for instance, did you say that you didn't want your name in the paper because your father was a garda; I mean, your father was a superintendent?
A. He was, yeah, absolutely, yeah.
Q. And it might have caused him a little bit of embarrassment?
A. It would. It would have caused him and me embarrassment.

300 Q. Yes, indeed. Then at paragraph C she says:
"The story of the penalty points controversy continued for a few weeks or months and Debbie told me she had got the name and address of the girl who was allegedly abused by Maurice MECabe, fromthe Gardaí."
A. Mm-hmm.

301 Q. Well, you had got the name and address of the girl, isn't that right?
A. I had gotten the name and address of the girl, yes.

302 Q. "I asked her where she got her information and she said fromsomeone hi gh up in the Gardaí."

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

303 Q. "She tol d me she was goi ng to Cavan."

And that's where the address was, in Cavan, isn't that right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}, \mathrm{mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. "And she was going to get the girl to talk."
A. Well, I didn't say that. We don't generally go on doorsteps with a view of getting somebody to talk.
It's very much a knock on the door and see what
happens. It's the person on the other side of the door's prerogative, not mine.
Q. But your intention was to go up and to try and get a story from Ms. D, isn't that right?
A. We were -- at the time of investigating the allegation, I had got some of the information confirmed, and, on that basis, we went up to see if we could get more of the information.
306 Q. She then says:
"I sai d, are you sure he was a child abuser? Debbie sai d he was and all of the Gardaí hate hi $m$ She said her father, John McCann, who was then a seni or member of the Garda Sexual Assault and Domestic Vi ol ence Unit, had confirmed the story."
A. I completely refute that, and I reject the assertion. My father knew nothing of this.

307 Q. We11, first of all, I have to ask you, I mean, did you discuss the issue with your father?
A. Myself and my father would discuss issues that were topical. We still do discuss issues that are topical all of the time. But we both are very clear on the fact that he is a garda, or was a serving garda, and I was a journalist, and there obviously is a conflict and
we were very conscious of that, whenever we discussed matters.

308 Q. Yes, I can understand that. But at any time did you mention Sergeant McCabe to him?
A. I am sure we did discuss Sergeant McCabe. He was very big news in the -- at the time.

309 Q. Yes.
A. And I'm sure we would have discussed what was happening in terms of the penalty points and all of the different controversies.

310 Q. Did you at any time say that you were pursuing a story in relation to an alleged sexual assault case against him?
A. My information is my information. I do not share what I am doing with my father, and vice versa.

311 Q. Is there -- the third possibility, I suppose, that maybe that you were saying this to Alison O'Reilly to 1end some credence to the story?
A. Absolutely not. And anybody that knows me knows that I would not do something like that. I am certainly not a bragard and I don't go about making up things to people.

312 Q. "She sai d on several occasi ons Ser geant McCabe was a paedophile. Debbie said she had heard from Dave Tayl or that the girl was in a bad way."
A. That is not true.

313 Q. We11, first of all, had you heard from Dave Taylor that the girl was in a bad way?
A. I didn't tell her -- I didn't tell her that $I$ had heard
from Dave Taylor. And in relation to that question, I am still very much of the view that I cannot discuss matters because of source privilege -- because of my position on sourcing.
Well, I mean, you had no difficulty telling us about your father and your conversation with your father?
A. He is my father.
Q. I know. But there's no difficulty telling us about that. And you had no difficulty telling us about your conversations with Nóirín O'Sullivan and the content of them and the fact that Sergeant McCabe wasn't mentioned, isn't that right?
A. That was a very specific allegation --

316 Q. Yes.
A. -- in relation to Nóirín O'Sullivan. And we assisted the Tribunal in pointing out that the allegation had been that $I$ was in contact with her over the phone, and we pointed out that if you were to go back over her telephone records, that it would back up my assertion that there was no communication between us. I was trying to help the Tribunal in the best way that $I$ could.

317 Q. But, you see, I mean, you have got to see it from everybody's perspective, not just your own.
A. Of course.

318 Q. Superintendent Taylor has rights as well.
A. Of course. But I had --

319 Q. He is asserting a particular set of facts as being truthful.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$. I know, but just let me finish. She is saying: I was told this by Debbie McCann.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

323 Q. And then the first question you would ask in those circumstances: We11, was that something that Debbie McCann was told by Superintendent Taylor? You see that, that is the first question you'd ask --
A. Mm-hmm.

324 Q. -- if you had wanted to resolve that issue?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$, mm-hmm.
Q. So, therefore, I am asking the first question: Did Superintendent Taylor mention to you that Ms. D was in a bad way?
A. And again, I can't answer that question. He has waived 13:45 privilege. I am the journalist and I believe that that decision lies with me. I have a career to think about, going forward. I can't go there. I would love to go there, but I honestly cannot do that.

326 Q. Yes. I'm not going to press you on these issues, because, you know, it's matter for the lawyers to debate in relation to privilege.
A. $M m-h m m, m m-h m m$.

327 Q. And we may have to embark on that. But for the moment, we are just trying to get what information that we can in the circumstances.
"Debbi e called Mr. McCabe sever al names. She said he was a paedo, a child abuser and --"

I mean, this isn't really important. It shows the extent to which she says that you were opposed to Sergeant McCabe and the view that you took on him, but you deny that that is so, is that right?
A. Absolutely. We very much discussed the allegation. But that's, for one, not language that I would use, and secondly, in terms of discussing an allegation, it is a very big jump to go from me -- discussing an allegation, and we discuss allegations all the time, we 13:46 hear allegations all the time, some of them are legitimate, some of them are not, we discuss it, I certainly don't go around calling people that $I$ am hearing allegations about paedophiles and child abusers and --
328 Q. "I remenber standing at the back of the of fice with Debbi e MECann and news editor, Robert Cox, and she told us she had the details for the woman who was allegedly abused by Maurice McCabe and she was goi ng to get her
to tal k. Robert Cox sai d he woul d check with editor Conor O' Donnell and that he might arrange for a photographer to go with her. The woman could do sil houette photos."

There seems to be some truth in that?
A. I don't know how she would have been aware of that, in the sense that that conversation took place over the phone, it took place a couple of times, I think, that week over the phone, and on the final occasion that I spoke to Robert I would have told him that I had the details, and it was the following morning that we went up.
329 Q. Well, how could she -- we know that this was so, we know from Mr. O'Donne11 there was some reference in relation to a photographer.
A. That is very much a process that we would take in our newsroom. It is pretty much the process that we would take with every single story that we cover.
Q. So you're saying it was an educated guess on her part when she put this in her statement, is that it?
A. I can't say what her thinking is, but I'm just telling you what happened that week.
Q. We11, you can, actually, because either she was privy to the information because you told her about it or she 13:48 heard it in your presence, or else it's a complete and utter invention on her part?
A. Well, she is saying that she heard it in the office and she was standing in the back of the office. That, to
my mind, did not happen.

332 Q.
Did she know that you were in fairly regular contact with Superintendent Taylor?
A. I don't know if she would have specifically known, but I'm sure she would have hazarded a guess. I was a crime correspondent, I still am, and he was the Press Office within the Gardaí.

333 Q. Would she have guessed that you were having a fairly -a contact with Superintendent Taylor where he says that you told him that you were going down to Ms. D?
A. Would she have guessed that? But you subsequently found out about it with the Paul williams article?
A. It was in an article, yes.
that I would speak to on an ongoing basis, or anything like that.
Q. Well, in particular in relation to Ms. D, were you aware of the fact that he had gone down originally on the 5th March, I think it was, the Wednesday, and then back on the Saturday, the 8th March 2014 ?
A. I didn't know that he had gone down. I knew --

339 Q. Did he te11 you that he had been there?
A. I don't know afterwards if he would have told me possibly - but I didn't know that he was there and I didn't learn about this until $I$ read it in the newspaper.
340 Q. Just come back to the question that I asked you, whether or not you discussed it with him, his visit. This is prior to the publication of the article on the 12th April.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

341 Q. Do you have any recollection of discussing it with Paul williams?
A. Of discussing him being there or --

342 Q. Yes, yes.
A. I have some recollection of talking to him around that time, but I don't know -- he certainly wasn't communicating with me when he was going to go up to the girl, or if he had been up to the girl or what was in the contents of their discussion. There was none of that.

343 Q. Are you sure about that?
A. Yes, I am.

344 Q. And what about Eavan Murray, is she a journalist that you would have been friendly with?
A. Not at that point, no.
Q. Did you become aware of the fact that she had been down to the same household a few days after you had called?
A. No.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- to see Ms. D, and I think that he is not sure in relation to you, whether you rang him after you had been there, but certainly he is sure in relation to Eavan Murray. But one might conclude from that, that Superintendent Taylor had suggested that you would go down, to you, and given you the information, that you went down and didn't get anywhere, and then he sent Eavan Murray down a few days later, do you understand?
A. Mm-hmm.

350 Q. So that might be the suggestion that would be there. what do you say --
A. Well, that would be a suggestion. Nobody guides me in my job, only my news editor, Robert Cox, and my editor. And the reason I went down at that point was because Sergeant McCabe was very much big in the media, he had been before the PAC, he been named, and that was the reason for travelling down at that point. He had been named in a very positive light?
A. He had.

The story that you were investigating would paint him in a very negative way, isn't that right?
A. We look at all aspects of a story, we come at it from various different angles. It was, we investigated it, and nothing more. We never did anything with it. I know that, but the story, if there was a story there, would have painted Sergeant McCabe in a very bad light, isn't that right?
A. Em, if there was a story there, potentially it could have painted him in a bad light, but there was no story there.
And similarly for Eavan Murray going down, it was again going to be a story that would paint him in a bad light, and you see the extraordinary coincidences that you and Eavan Murray were both in contact with Superintendent Dave Taylor in around that time?
A. But I was in contact with Superintendent Dave Taylor throughout the two-year period that you produced phone records for, and it has been a constant contact, it hasn't been up and down, you know, more on any given weeks, or anything like that. It has been a constant
contact.
355 Q. And he says that you told him that you were going down there to Ms. D.
A. Again, I can't answer that question.

And he says that Eavan Murray told him the same thing. Is there anything you want to say about that, because, you see, Alison O'Reilly is suggesting that you were getting information from Superintendent Taylor in around that time and you --
A. Alison O'Reilly wouldn't have known my sources at all. I am not in the habit of going around revealing my sources to anybody.
357 Q. She then goes on to deal with some other matters there in paragraph $D$ and then into paragraph $E$, and her dealings with Robert Cox. And then she deals in paragraph F with her interaction with Maurice McCabe. Then if we just move to paragraph G, if we could scroll down there:
"I went back into the office maybe that afternoon or the next day."

This is after she had spoken to Sergeant McCabe.
"And l told my news editor, Robert Cox, I met with Maurice McCabe and I asked hi mto do a story with it, but he sai d no. I told Robert Cox that Sergeant MkCabe had deni ed the rumours and, in my opi ni on, he was credi ble. I told Debbie MECann I met with Maurice

McCabe. "

Did she tell you at that time that she met with Maurice McCabe?
A. She told me subsequently to meeting him, as far as I can remember, yes.
358 Q. And she says that:
"I di dn't believe the rumburs. She told me to be careful, that he was mani pulating me and not to fall for it."

Did that conversation take place?
A. That who was manipulating me?

359 Q. That Maurice McCabe was manipulating her?
A. That I told her that?

360 Q. Yes.
A. No, I certainly did not.

361 Q. "I told her she should be sceptical about the allegations as Sergeant McCabe had dealt with the allegations in a very strai ghtforward manner when I asked himabout them"

Do you recall her telling you that she had confronted Sergeant McCabe with the allegations?
A. Yeah. I vaguely recall her telling me about the allegations afterwards, yeah.
362 Q. It would appear, just up until this point, leaving aside emphasis and the use of language that you didn't
approve of and her portrayal of you saying things --
A. Yeah.

363 Q. -- with a certain gusto, but the actual content of what she is saying that you said and the discussions that you had, by and large reflect what actually took place between the two of you?
A. No, absolutely not. We discussed allegations, we discussed them all the time. I was coming at them from a slightly different position, she was coming at them from her own position, and that was essentially it.
364 Q. Then she continues:
"Around the same time Debbie said she would travel to Cavan to meet the women she clai med was abused by Sergeant McCabe. I felt this was wrong because she had al ready deci ded that Sergeant MkCabe was guilty and that she did not seemwilling to gi ve himan opportunity to deny the clains. I felt that because the allegations were well-known to a reasonably large number of people, even an anonymous story could have
i mplications for Sergeant MECabe. However, she pitched the story to the news desk and she was permitted to go to Cavan. "
wel1, that's correct, isn't that right?
A. In the sense of pitching a story, we had the name of the girl and we had the allegation, and it was essentially part, another part of our investigation into that allegation.
Q. We11, insofar as pitching the story, I mean in terms of interactions with your editor --
A. $M m-h m m$.
Q. -- Robert Cox, at the time, it was necessary for you to go into the circumstances and the facts that you had then available to you, isn't that right?
A. Yes. Now, I don't believe that this was ever a realistic possibility, that we ever felt that it was a realistic possibility in printing a story.
No. I am not referring to that. I am referring to get 13:59 permission to go to Cavan --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- you have to approach your editor?
A. Oh, absolutely, yes.
Q. And you wouldn't be doing it on a whim or on the basis merely of rumour or mutterings, is that right?
A. No, I had the allegations at that point.
Q. Yes. And had you the allegations at that stage and you had gone to your source or sources --
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. -- and you had got the additional information. what Alison o'Reilly seems to be suggesting here is that that constitutes you pitching the story to the news desk and that you were then permitted to go to Cavan. I don't think she is saying that you had actually written a story at that stage, but that you had put your case to be permitted to go to Cavan, do you understand?
A. Yeah. Again, I don't know how she knows about the
lead-up to me going to Ms. D's house. I have -- I can recall all of this happening over the phone with my news editor.
372 Q.
She then goes on in paragraph I:
"I can't recall if it was the day after the intervi ew or during that same week when Debbie went to the house of the alleged victim She described in detail the state the womm was in. She told me I needed to be careful of Maurice McCabe because she was in no doubt he abused the woman she intervi ewed. She said that --"

She makes some comment in relation to John wilson, and we needn't go into that.
"I told her I was al ways on the side of a victimbut । found this story hard to believe and I feared it was malici ous because the Gardaí were spreading the runvur. Debbie said it was not a rumour. She spent around an hour with the alleged victim l felt pressurised into bel ieving her and that her behavi our was causing a rift in our friendship. She told me the women was in a terrible state."

Now, I know you deny all that, and you point to the fact that we know from Mrs. D that she merely answered the door to you and there was some --
A. And you know from my own evidence that she merely answered the door to me.
Q. Yes.
A. I gave that in my own evidence.

374 Q. Yes. So I suppose is there any possibility that -- to support your case that you were making then in your discussions with Alison O'Reilly, that you just simply invented all of this?
A. Absolutely not. I came down from that house after knocking on the door and I spoke very briefly to the mother, who, to me, appeared to be upset. I came down, I pulled over the car and I rang my news editor, almost 14:01 instantly, within about five minutes of knocking on the door, and I told him exactly what had happened at the door. There was never any -- it was word for word what had happened at the door. I spoke to another colleague, Valerie Hanley, on my way home, I told her exactly what had happened on that door. And on the Saturday when we were all back in the office - we were al1 out doing our stories during the week, and on the Saturday we would be office-bound - it was, you know, part of the conversation: what did you do this week? And I would have told -- I would have said exactly what had happened on that door.
375 Q. So the point that you're making there is that it would be a rather foolish yarn to spin to her because --
A. Absolutely. And I'm not in the habit of spinning

376 Q. Yes. But that there would be the added factor insofar as if she spoke to anybody else in the newsroom, you'd be exposed?
A. If I had done what she says and lied to her about this fictitious interview, I would have been almost instantly found out.
Q. She then goes on to say:
"She cl ai med Mr. MtCabe had abused her when she was a young child, possibly five, six or seven years old."

You had ascertained that from your own inquiries, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. I knew she was a young girl at the time. I didn't know her exact age.
Q. "Mr. McCabe was a friend of the moman's father and they fell out at some stage."

Well, that, in fact, is right. Had you discovered that from your own inquiries?
A. Yeah, I knew that they were colleagues. I don't know if I knew at that point that they had fallen out, I don't know.
379 Q. "They were having a party or a gathering in the moman's house. "

Did you establish that as part of your investigations?
A. I don't think I had that level of detail. I had that 14:03 it was an allegation of inappropriate touching. I think I knew at the time that there may have been tickling involved, but I think that's all I knew. I don't know about the party or --
Q. we11, she is saying that you imparted this information to her and that the woman was behind a couch and Maurice McCabe went behind the couch and pushed against her using his groin?
A. I don't think I had that level of detail.
A. Yeah, but it was -- we had the allegation and we had the findings of the DPP, but it was very much that. It wasn't expanded on. There was no -- it was very much what the allegation was and the findings from the DPP, to my memory.
we11, the source -- I'm not asking you to reveal who the source was, but the source obviously was somebody who was in a position to give you quite a lot of information in relation to the investigation of the offence, the nature of the alleged crime, the DPP directions. You see, this detail here that Alison o'reilly is saying that you imparted to her --
A. Mm-hmm.

384 Q. -- is, in fact, very close to what we now know --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

385 Q. -- to be what is alleged to have occurred.
A. Mm-hmm.

386 Q. Do you understand?
A. Yeah. I don't believe I knew the specifics of the allegation, going up.
Q. And then she goes on:
"Debbie said she thought he did ot her things to the woman that she was not going to go into and that the woman was very upset. She had forgotten about the abuse for a number of years and then it all cane flooding back. "

Again, is that something that you had ascertained?
A. No. I have never met Ms. D, ever, in my life.

388 Q. Is there any possibility you could have discussed this with Paul williams, who would have told you about the end of a story, as it were, or an end of an investigation that he might have been aware that you were interested in? Is there a possibility of that?
A. Well, my recollection is reading his articles, not talking to him about this.
389 Q. Just, I'm asking is it possible?
A. It's possible, but $I$ went on maternity leave very quickly afterwards, and I don't believe I was in communication with Paul williams for any -- it's very sporadic, my communication with Paul williams.

390 Q. She goes on to say that she said to you:
"I asked: Are you sure, Debbi e? And Debbi e sai d: I 14:06 know he is a paedophile and he has destroyed the woman's life, she is very messed up. Debbie toldme she told Robert Cox and Conor O Donnell about the i nt er vi ew. "

And you deny that you said any of that?
A. Yes, absolutely.

391 Q. She says:
"Debbie told me that the story was not going to make it into the paper and she was very annoyed about this. I asked her: Why not? And she said that Conor O' Donnel I wanted to put it in as an anonymous story but that editor-in-chi ef, Sebastian Hamilton, did not want the story in the paper. She said Sebastian was too cautious about the scandal and di dn't want to run it."

What do you say in answer to that?
A. That didn't happen. I wasn't annoyed that the story 14:07 didn't go in. There was no story. We went up, we knocked on the door, I spoke very briefly with the mother. That was it. I rang my news editor. He told me to come back. And that was essentially the end of my part in any of this. I didn't pursue it any further. I went on maternity leave very quickly afterwards. And that was it, that was an end of it.
392 Q. okay. If we go down to paragraph L then:
"As far as l recall, Debbie tried to get the story into 14:07 the paper on a second occasion but it was ref used agai n. "
A. That didn't happen.

393 Q. "I spoke to her in Herbert Park bef ore going to our
parked cars after a Tuesday conf erence in the office and I said to her: I don't thi nk that story is true, Debbie, I amal ways on the side of the victimbut on this occasi on I think something is wrong with the story. I had concerns that a man's life was rui ned in 14:08 error."

Do you recall a conversation of that nature with Alison o'Reilly?
A. No. Look, we would have walked back to our cars on a Tuesday, every Tuesday probably, through Herbert Park and back to where we had parked our cars, and we spoke about matters that we were dealing with. So I possibly told her, walking back on one occasion, that there was an allegation. I don't remember ever saying those words to her, or her ever saying those words to me. 394 Q. She says:
"Debbi e then tol d me agai $n$ there was no Pul se number for the case and it was a cover-up."
A. I knew none of that.
Q. Well, you subsequently became aware of it. Did it appear in the Paul williams article?
A. It was in the Paul williams article, but I knew none of that.

396 Q. Did you read the Paul williams article?
A. I did, yeah. But this was prior to that. I was on maternity leave when the Paul williams article was printed.

397 Q. that the woman was bringing it further. She said she had a meeting with Fi anna Fáil leader, M cheál Martin, and that it was going to get serious. She wanted the case revi ewed and was goi ng to submit it to M ni ster Frances Fitzgerald as a case that di d not get examined properly by the Gardaí. She told me on another" -"occasion" that should be -- "that the woman did meet with M cheál Martin and he sent her file to then- Taoi seach Enda Kenny."

Do you remember any conversations along those lines?
A. I didn't know anything of that. That was Paul williams' story. I didn't know anything of that. "I asked her how does she know the story is true. She tol d me the information she had was coming fromthe top. "

That is a quote.
A. Mm-hmm.

399 Q. "She sai d: I asked, fromyour pal Nói rín? And she sai d yes."
A. That didn't happen. First of all, because $I$ have told the Tribunal that there was no communication between myself and Nóirín during that period, and also, secondly, because I'm not in a habit again of revealing any sources.

400 Q. She then goes on, and if we could just look at o then, paragraph 0 , third line from the bottom:
"The Guerin Report spoke hi ghly of Maurice McCabe and I told Debbie about it. She described it as gross. She said everyone knew what happened, frompoliticians to journalists, and that it was a pantomime."
A. That was a series of text messages.

401 Q. Pardon?
A. That was a series of text messages.

402 Q. Yes.
A. Some of them are out of context in that, just those three lines, they're out of context. And also in relation to the "gross" and the Guerin Report, I believe that there is also a text message missing from that series.
403 Q. Well, if we just have page 3840 up on the screen there with the 9th May 2014, Alison O'Reilly sends you a message:
"A hi ghly respected officer hel din high regard" -That is a quotation.
-- "is how judge Guerin describes MECabe."

And then you answer:
"I'mfully aware and to be honest l think it is gross."

I mean, that was an opinion that you --
A. Can I just point out that there is a text message in between that deleted.

404 Q. Deleted?
A. That I have here in front of me.

CHA RMAN Well, maybe you would just be so kind as to add it into the mix then.
A. Yeah. The line is regarding, "is how judge Guerin described McCabe..."

And the following text is "'Paul Williams and the I ndo have an agenda agai nst McCabe,' says M cheál Martin to pals." And I reply: "I'mfully aware and, to be honest, l thi nk that is gross."
So I think that changes the whole context of that communication.
MR. KEALEY: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, that document is at page 6368 of the materials.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, let's look at that.
405 Q. MR. MARR NAN what we have here is:
"I'mfully aware and to be honest l think it is gross.
There is a very messed up girl at the heart of it and no one gi ves a damm about it, effectivel $y$."

I mean, that is a perfectly valid argument to have.
A. Yeah.

406 Q. To have sympathy for what you perceived at the time to be a victim.
A. Absolutely. And in that context, I was -- I did have a degree of sympathy for the alleged victim in the case.

But just to add, that that "to be honest, l thi nk it's gross", if you read the full context, that would suggest what I'm calling gross is the game-playing that's happening in relation to it and not Sergeant McCabe.

407 Q. Yes, indeed. But, I mean, I think that perhaps we could attach too much significance to messages that are sent --
A. Well, I don't -- no, I don't think so. I think that changes the whole context of that conversation.

408 Q. But in any event, I mean, I think that the text message does display that you were concerned about Ms. D?
A. I had a degree of sympathy for the girl. I didn't know her. I had met the mother, and, from meeting the mother, I found her to be upset, I found her -- I felt that she believed something had happened with her daughter and, based on that, I found that was my opinion on the matter.
409 Q. And what do you say that led you to believe that from talking to Mrs. D?
A. She was very clearly distressed when I knocked on her door, in the sense that she told me that she had been listening to the news and something about hearing McCabe -- Sergeant McCabe being referred to as a hero. It was quite clear that she was distressed and upset, and it immediately struck me and I found just from -- I found her to be credible and I found her to -- that conversation that I had with her, I found that she certainly believed something had happened.

410 Q. This evidence was given by Mrs. D in relation to her --
A. Mm-hmm.

411 Q. -- interaction with you?
A. Mm-hmm.

412 Q. You're familiar with it?
A. I am, yes.

413 Q. Yes. And you will be familiar with the fact that she doesn't suggest at all that she had any conversation with you, other than asking what you wanted?
A. We had a very brief conversation. We didn't discuss the allegation at all. We had a very brief conversation.

414 Q. And there's no suggestion from her whatsoever that she was upset at the time that you rang on the doorbell or that she had been listening to the news?
A. Well, I found her to be distressed, and I distinctly remember her telling me that she had been listening to the news and I also relayed that back to my news editor, Robert Cox, when I left the door.
415 Q. So, in any event, she then goes on in paragraph $P$ to refer to the appointment of Nóirín O'Sullivan.
A. Yeah.

416 Q. And then she goes on to talk about trying to get an exclusive story and articles that you wrote in relation to Nóirín O'Sullivan. As far as you're -- you're in a 14:16 position to confirm, in relation to Nóirín O'Sullivan, that she didn't brief you negatively about Sergeant McCabe at any time, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. I wasn't in communication with Nóirín O'Sullivan
at all during the period of time of the terms of reference.

So is there anything further you'd like to say in relation to Alison O'Reilly's version of events that she has given to the Tribunal that maybe I haven't covered there, because I have skipped some of the issues that I don't think are relevant to the work of the Tribunal?
A. No. Only to say that I have been, for the last year-and-a-half, as baffled as I have been distressed by this.

418 Q. If we could just come back then to the question that I asked you about Alison O'Reilly and her knowing that you would have been in contact or were in contact with Superintendent Taylor. There's a document in volume 26 14:17 which is put together by the Tribunal investigators, and it's all the contacts from Superintendent Taylor. If we could have it up on the screen, please, it's 6984. You see there it starts off on the 1st January and it shows there is a call there from David Taylor to 14:18 you?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

419 Q. I'm not going to go through them all, but on that page there are quite a number of calls through the early part of January, and then the following page, 6985, a number of them. And then on page 6986, at the end of January there's four calls there, five calls to you. 6987 , at the end of January there's seven calls there
on that page, going into early February, and then again early February, on 6988, there's only one call there, to you. 6989, this is the 13th February, you will see that there is a call to you - in fact, there's three calls to you, or texts to you, sorry, on that day. Then, on page 6990, which is the 15th February, there is a call of six minutes and 17 seconds there, to you; and then there's two texts later on that evening, at half nine in the evening; twenty to ten, there's another text; and then there's another call shortly after that to you, lasting a minute and 30 seconds. These are just the calls that are coming from Superintendent Taylor to you --
A. Right.

420 Q. -- obviously. So, for some reason, Superintendent
Taylor is contacting you in or around that time?
A. Mm-hmm.

421 Q. If we then go over the page, at 6991. On the 20th February of 2014, at half past six in the evening, we see a call to you of 12 minutes.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

422 Q. And then we see on the 20th February, after two cal1s to Eavan Murray -- no, sorry, the following day there is a call -- two calls to Eavan Murray, then on the $21 / 2$ there's a call to you. I think that is probably gone through to a voicemail because it was only seven seconds in duration. And then if we turn over the page at 6992, on the 26th February there are a number of calls, three text messages on the 26th. The 27th,
there's a call that appears to have gone through to your voicemail. And then there's another call at 13:59 to you, lasting two minutes and 33 seconds. And then on the 28th February there's a call to you lasting three minutes and six seconds. And another call -that's 11.13. I'm sorry if I'm going too fast, but pull me back if you are not following me. 11.57, there is another call, four minutes. And then in the afternoon there is another call of a minute 22, all on the 28th February. And then if we turn over the page, again on the same day, 6993, at 20:14 there is a call that lasts for one minute 32 . And then on the 1st February, there's a -- 1st March, I beg your pardon, there's a call lasting 56 seconds at 2000 hours. Then you will see, following on from that, there are a number of calls to Eavan Murray by Superintendent Taylor. And then there's another call to you on the 5th march of 2014 for three minutes and 50 seconds. The reason I'm pointing these out to you is that, you know, these are calls that were made by Superintendent Taylor; they weren't queries coming from you?
A. Mm-hmm.

423 Q. But they were calls made by Superintendent Taylor to you --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

424 Q. -- in or around about the time that you went to visit Ms. D.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

425 Q. Have you anything to say about, is there any
information to give us in relation to those calls and what they were about?
A. No. But I would have been speaking to Superintendent Taylor on an ongoing basis throughout that period and it would have been -- most of the communication that I would have had with Superintendent Taylor would have been towards the weekend, as I work for a Sunday newspaper, and obviously it's at that point that breaking news becomes much more on our radar. So I have no doubt that the vast, not all of the calls, are to do with us coming up towards the weekend and making calls in relation to breaking news.
426 Q. I asked you this this morning, but I will ask it again: Did you tell Superintendent Taylor that you had been to visit Ms. D?
A. Again, I can't answer that question for reasons of source protection. I had on and off the record communication with Superintendent Taylor, and I think that that would put me in a very awkward position if I were to answer that question.
427 Q. Then on the 7th March there's another communication there, we see, at $17: 42$, of two minutes and 33 seconds duration, which is followed almost immediately by a call to Commissioner Martin Callinan. Then on the 8th March, this was actually the day that paul williams recorded an interview with Ms. D --
A. Yeah.

428 Q. -- you'11 see that there's a number of calls there, starting at 20:48. There's a text from Superintendent

Taylor to Martin Callinan. And then, 20:48:31, there's another text to the Commissioner. And then there's a text sent by him at 20:50:34 to the Deputy Commissioner, followed up by a further text at 20:56 to the Deputy Commissioner, and then there's, immediately after that, a call to you that seems to have gone through to your voicemail at 6 --
A. Yeah. The $20: 50$ to $20: 51$, yeah.

So this was a Saturday night; it was at a point in time when Superintendent Taylor is suggesting that he had received a call, which is denied by Paul williams, but had received a call from Paul williams advising him that he was in the $D$ household.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

430 Q. And here we have quite a bit of activity between
Superintendent Taylor, the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner and then you?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

431 Q. So can you help us in relation to that, what he was discussing on the 8th March 2014 ?
A. No, I don't know what was happening that day. I would assume that there was some breaking news story happening, possibly, but I don't know what was happening.
432 Q. Did he tell you in conversations that you would have had with him subsequent to that, that Paul williams had visited Ms. D?
A. Again, for source protection reasons, I'm not going to answer that question.

CHA RMAN We11, you know, sometimes it can be the case that people have to claim privilege for a genuine reason.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAK And sometimes it can be the case that they claim privilege as an illegitimate shield. And unfortunately, I may be in a position where $I$ have to make a decision as to what you are doing here.
A. I am not -- I am not --

CHA RMAN You know, most people don't want to go into the witness-box, most people don't want to answer any questions, most people don't want to answer correspondence --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN -- from this Tribunal.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN And there's a very strong indication of delay and obfuscation coming, it seems, from your side. Now, I'm saying it seems. There may be another explanation.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN I wil1 get through to the end and hear submissions before making my mind up.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN But now I'm faced with a situation where you 14:27 are asked perfectly straightforward questions about what other people have told the Tribunal and you're saying to me, I can't give you an answer to that for source protection. Well, the question that is going
through my mind is, how could that possibly have anything to do with source protection? And secondly, is that actually a truthful answer or not.
A. It's --

CHA RMAN Now, I am just putting that out there to you because, unfortunately, I have to make those decisions.
A. Absolutely -- okay. It is absolutely a truthful answer. I would much prefer to be able to come in here and answer all of your questions. It puts me in a very difficult position, but it also puts me in a very difficult position if I do answer those questions, it's just going to open it up for me. And I am a journalist and, going forward, I have to protect that.
CHA RMAN This is what David Taylor has told me, and you are simply being asked is he telling the truth in telling you that.
A. He has waived his privilege. It is -- I am the journalist, and, going forward, if I start revealing the contents of conversations that I had with people, it's going to really damage me going forward. And I think that I am not in a different position to other journalists who have come before this Tribunal.
CHAN RMAN Well, you are, I'm afraid, very much, as from what I can see at the moment.
433 Q. MR. MARRI NAN It's just, Ms. McCann, one of the problems that we have is that, you know, I brought you through the letters that went between the Tribunal and you and your solicitor?
A. Yeah.

We11, you see, the only way that the Tribunal -- it's a point that has been made by Alison O'Reilly, and I'm not supporting Alison O'Reilly in this regard because we're neutral in this regard, but it may well be considered to be a valid point. She came forward at the very first instance and provided a statement to the Tribunal and in that statement this fact is disclosed,
albeit through hearsay, what she had heard from you. Superintendent Taylor didn't tell us about this either, even though, apparently, he knew.
A. The fact of the visit to Ms. D's house?

437 Q. Yes. On his own account, he knew that you had been to visit Ms. D. He also knew that Eavan Murray had been to visit Ms. D.
A. From what I know of Alison's statement, it was made about a month before I made my own to the investigators and it was made subsequent to Brendan Howlin naming her. She was very adamant that she did not want to be named in relation to that and she was only making that statement because brendan Howlin had identified her. No, you're missing the point entirely. The point is that this Tribunal would not have known about your visit to Ms. D.
A. It would have learnt of it a month later when I came to meet your investigators, I was very straightforward in relation to that matter.
Q. I think the Chairman is only too familiar with the processes that the Tribunal has engaged with, with Mr. Kealey, who is acting on your behalf, in trying to seek out information, and this claim of privilege has been put up as some sort of blanket to protect, it would seem, journalists giving any information?
A. That is not the case, that is not the case.
Q. Well, this information couldn't possibly be covered by source protection, isn't that right?
A. The privilege -- I am a journalist. I have on and off the record conversations with people all of the time. If I start to disclose the conversations, that just leaves me open, going forward.
441 Q. Are you sure you didn't discuss these matters with Superintendent Taylor since he made his protected
A. Absolutely, yes.
A. I vaguely recall speaking to him once or twice after he left the Press office, but yeah, essentially I haven't spoken to him in quite a while.

443 Q. Since he got arrested and --
A. Yeah, I haven't spoken to him since that.

444 Q. You've had no contact at all --
A. No.

445 Q. -- with him in relation to it?
A. No.

446 Q. We then just move on with the phone records and we go down through, because you went on maternity leave --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

447 Q. We see a lot of contacts between Superintendent Taylor and Paul williams.
A. Mm-hmm.

448 Q. And then we see on the 15th March of 2014, there's a contact, a call from Superintendent Taylor to Eavan Murray at 17:04, do you see that?
A. Yeah.

449 Q. It's just half a minute. But he phones you immediately afterwards and he's on the phone for a minute, and then
he phones you again, it seems to be a very short call, and then he phones Eavan Murray.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

450 Q. Was there any story that yourself and Eavan Murray were interested in and discussing with Superintendent Taylor?
A. I don't know what day of the week that was, the 15 th. I don't know what was happening that week.
Q. Again, it's a Saturday, if that helps you?
A. It was a Saturday?
A. Well, that would have been the day before that we go to print, the day that we go to print, we're a Sunday newspaper, so it was probably to do with a breaking news story that day.
453 Q. And then 21:00, nine clock that evening, he's on the phone to you again, $21: 05,21: 10,21: 13$ and then again 22:11. Presumably you've already gone to print at that stage, isn't that right?
A. Not necessarily. It would be very close to going to print.

454 Q. And then we can see contacts over at page 7000, there's three contacts there. 21st March, 12:32, a minute long, and, immediately afterwards, almost as soon as he's put down the phone he's ringing Eavan Murray. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

455 Q. 12:33.
A. But we're only seeing the communication between him and
those particular amount of people. I'm sure there was other communication as well in the middle of all this, with other people.
If we go over the page at page 7001. On the 24th March, there are two texts there, one at 15:20, and they follow on from a call, both of those are to you, 13:48 and 15:20, and they follow on from a call that Superintendent Taylor had with Eavan Murray at 13:43, do you see that?
A. Yeah.

457 Q. Then if we go over the page at --
A. The 24th March, just so you are aware, is the day my daughter was born, so I don't know what the content of the text was there.
458 Q. You were working quite late, so?
A. She was born, she had already been born, she was born at 9:40.

459 Q. Right. Okay. All right. Then if we can scroll forward to the 12th April. This is the day that Paul williams' article was published, and it's a Sunday and you're no longer working, isn't that right?
A. No.

460 Q. And we can see there in the morning time -- well, it's actually into the early hours of the morning, nine minutes past midnight, there's a text message sent from 14:37 David Taylor to Eavan Murray; and then the following morning, at $12: 52$, there's a call that appears to have gone in to voicemail; then there's a subsequent call to Eavan Murray into voicemail, it looks like; and then

11:55, again into voicemai1; and then at 12:07 there's a call to Eavan Murray lasting 30 seconds; and then there's another one at 12:27:55, again to Eavan Murray; and then there's a text sent to you at 12:38.

A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

Sorry, 15:38. There's then, at seven o'clock, there's a call to Eavan Murray; 17:20, there's a call to Eavan Murray; and then at 17:25 there's a call to Paul williams that appears to have gone into voicemail. And then later on that day there's a series of further calls to Eavan Murray and to -- text messages, and a call to Paul Williams. It's Sunday; you're no longer working?
A. No.

462 Q. David Taylor is in contact with the person who wrote
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

463 Q. On Ms. D?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

464 Q. He's in contact with you, a person who had shown an
A. There was one text.

465 Q. And he is in contact with Eavan Murray --
A. Mm-hmm.

466 Q. -- who is a person who had an interest in the story?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

467 Q. I mean, one could conclude from that that what was going on was some form of discussion by text or call about Paul williams' article on Ms. D?
A. I was on maternity leave, I had a very, very young baby at that point. It's one text to me. I don't know what was discussed in that text. But you're saying there was no such discussion, are you, or was there?
A. I'm saying -- I'm again saying that I can't -- I can't disclose my conversations with Superintendent David Taylor for reasons of source protection.
Well, he wasn't -- under no circumstances could he be considered a source at this time. I am really just asking you was -- when this appeared in the newspaper, an article that clearly was referencing Ms. D and not named but clearly a reference to anybody who knew anything about it, a reference to Sergeant McCabe, that here are four people who apparently had an interest in this, perhaps talking about Paul Williams' article. I mean, there's no protection of source in relation to that.
A. I don't remember the contents of that text message. My daughter was maybe two weeks old. But again, I can't get into the ins and outs of conversations that I would have had at that time with any source.

CHA RMAK I know, but, I mean, you keep coming back to this, and it's like as if, you know, I think, you think or somebody thinks or somebody advising you thinks that I'm not aware of the rulings of the European Court of Human Rights on journalistic privilege. Well, 1 actually am a member of the European Court of Human Rights, I'm sworn in as a member of the European Court
of Human Rights, I've sat on the European Court of Human Rights. I know about this stuff.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN And I'm not asking you to reveal any source. I'm simply asking you, and Mr. Marrinan is simply asking you, look, this is what David Taylor says, now is it true or is it untrue?
A. Superintendent --

CHA RMAN I can't see for the life of me how that is the revelation of a source.
A. Superintendent Taylor was a point of contact and also a source, and discussing my conversations with him is opening myself up to revealing sources.
CHA RMAN No, but, you see, the point is, I don't want any information. Let's suppose -- look, the Clerkin investigation, for instance, if we can just take that, and again let's not get entangled in what would be a tangent, but the Clerkin investigation clearly indicated that when David Taylor left the Press Office he was in contact with a number of journalists and was giving them information which he shouldn't. Now, the Gardaí obviously had a problem with that. And the reason that there would be a problem with that is, as you know, as we both know, that if details in relation to particulars - for instance, how did somebody die, were they strangled, were they stabbed as wel1, how many stab wounds, what was the nature of the weapon, if that got into the public media and then, let's say, someone who is a suspect was arrested, and all of that
was in the public media, the allegation could be that the person simply recited it because he was high up in the Gudjonsson suggestibility scale. That is the kind of thing. Now, I'm not asking about any of that, no one is asking about any of that. That, to my mind, may 14:42 well be covered by journalistic privilege. In any event, $I$ 'm not looking into it. But I'm in the very strange situation that you were left off the list of people to whom David Taylor besmirched Maurice McCabe and then at a late stage you were added on together with Eavan Murray.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN You went up to the house.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN You apparently phoned him to tell him what you'd done, that is what he tells me, and then every time you are asked any question about that, you say journalistic privilege, journalistic privilege, journalistic privilege. Well, for a start, $I$ have to know the facts and circumstances on which you are basing that, and then, secondly, I actually need to know that you are actually telling me the truth, because I can tell you, I'm not an idiot, and I have sat here for very close to 90 days, and I know, subject, of course, to hearing submissions in people haven't told me the truth.
A. I'm telling you the truth to the best of my ability. I would much prefer to be able to come in here and answer
every single question.
CHA RMAN No, I know that, but that is not answering my question.
A. But that's my position. I would much prefer to be able to come in here --

CHA RMAN It's not a question of adopting a position. If you think you have journalistic privilege, I will certain listen to that, but you have to give me the facts and circumstances upon which you claim to base it.
A. Because --

CHA RMAN And at the moment I just can't see how it arises, and unfortunately at the moment a reasonable person might see this as a complete smokescreen. I'm not saying whether I see it that way or not, but I'm here to 1isten. So 1et's carry on as best we can.

470 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Sorry, just finally, you'11 appreciate that the reason that $I$ am probing you and asking you these questions is because it's my duty to put these matters to you and, by and large, I am putting to you a 14:44 scenario that may support the statement made by Superintendent Taylor, and he is the one who has appealed to people and journalists to come forward.
A. Mm-hmm.

471 Q. That he doesn't need any protection, that he's calling 14:45 on journalists that he says that he was briefing negatively to tell the truth.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

472 Q. That's his position.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

473 Q. Do you know, I mean, that is not something that we put together. I mean, could it ever be right that a source could be left in jeopardy by a journalist exposed to being condemned as a liar when you know that that's not 14:45 so and that the truth is that he was in contact with you? Could that be in any way healthy for journalism, for the truth or anything else?
A. I am in a position where I am trying my best to defend not only my own career as a journalist but also assist to the Tribunal. It is a very difficult position to be in. By revealing the contents of my communication and conversations with a source, is leaving me very much open as a journalist to not be trusted when $I$ continue my career as I intend to do.

474 Q. We11, I mean, it would naturally follow that the sources may not trust you in the future for the very reason that you abandoned them in their hour of need?
A. Well, certainly not for source protection reasons.

475 Q. But, you see, that point could be advanced. I mean, if 14:46 Superintendent Taylor is telling the truth and there's a wall of silence from journalists who he says he was briefing negatively, if he is telling the truth but is condemned as a liar because there's no evidence to support him, that would be incredibly unjust to him, wouldn't it?
A. He had every right to waive his privilege in relation to this matter. But I, as a journalist, feel, like, that doesn't release me from my own obligations in my
profession as a journalist.
Q. As a general statement of principle, but in terms of the particular facts of this case, I am suggesting to you that his waiver does release you because, by claiming privilege, you're actually placing him in jeopardy?
A. Privilege on this -- privilege and source protection is a matter that is very important to journalists and it's very important to me. I have to go back to being a journalist when this is over and I have to try and maintain that level of source protection in relation to my profession.
477 Q. If we just have page 218 up on the screen, please. This is what Superintendent Taylor said in his statement to the Tribunal.
CHAN RMAN Just let's hang on a moment, Mr. Marrinan, if you wouldn't mind, please. I'm just wondering, I'm sorry for interrupting you and $I$ know this is important, but a question there that Mr. Marrinan asked you about leaving the source out to hang out to dry, if
it were a case that in the Central Criminal Court somebody said, you know, I'm accused of murder but I happen to know that I am not guilty because at the particular time when I'm alleged to have been committing this murder, I was having a meeting with Alison O'Reilly and we were discussing the following, which was a matter off the record, would you just say, I'm not giving evidence in the Central Criminal Court with a view to exonerating that person, I'm going to
leave that person out to dry and if they can get convicted of murder even though I have evidence which can suggest that they are, in fact, telling the truth about that, well that's a matter for them, and I have my career to think about, and also privilege is mine, not the person with whom I am speaking, would you really do that?
A. It's very extreme.

CHAl RMAN well, it's not. This is very extreme, you know, this is really very extreme.
A. I have been thinking --

CHA RMAN Just think about it. I mean, there is a man who was the Garda Press Officer who is saying the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner, in various ways and with various degrees of responsibility, decided, because they didn't like Maurice McCabe, to 1iterally destroy his character by spreading around allegations of sexual abuse. Now, if you know anything that is more serious than that, that's fine. But that is not extreme, that is not an extreme example. This is what we are talking about here.
A. I have been very clear on the fact that no member of An Garda Síochána ever maligned Sergeant McCabe to me. I have been clear on that.

CHA RMAN But, you see, I don't know in what context you are actually using that kind of language. Like, 'orchestration', for instance, doesn't appear --
A. That was in response to a particular question. CHA RMAN Hang on a minute. 'Orchestration' doesn't
appear anywhere in the terms of reference. Malign, malign means speaking badly about something. If necessary, we can define all the terms. And you are saying today - and I am hearing it for the very first time, by the way; you never said it to the investigators beforehand, you never said any such thing - I was never briefed negatively by any garda in relation to Maurice McCabe. Can I tell you what I think that actually means.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN That they never said -- that no member of the Garda ever said to you that he was accused of sex abuse in the past, no member of the Garda ever said to you that there is a person who lives up in Cavan who may tell you more about this, no member of the Garda ever said to you that he was a child abuser, no member of the Garda ever said to you that he was embittered against the force by reason of an investigation, no member of the Garda ever said that he was driven by agendas against the Gardaí, no member of the Garda ever said to you that he was a person who was liable to make things up or was, in fact, so obsessed by whatever cause he was pushing forward that he couldn't be trusted. Now, that is what I understand that to mean. You may not understand the same thing, but that is actually what you are telling me.
A. I sought out the information in relation to -CHAL RMAN we11, again, please, you know, I am saying one thing and then you answer, and I'm sorry for
cutting you off, but you give me a pre-prepared --
A. It's not --

CHA RMAN No, a pre-thought-out speech. Maybe you would address what I have put to you.
A. I am addressing that, in the sense that I made my own inquiries in relation to the Ms. D allegation. Nothing was handed to me on a plate, or anything like that. I went out of my way to try and, as best I could, firm up the allegations, and they were with confidential sources of mine that I did that.

CHA RMAN But not David Taylor?
A. I'm not saying -- I can't answer that question.

CHA RMAN All right. Well, that is fine. We11, then I will reach whatever conclusion $I$ have to reach. Not David Taylor. Because, you know, David Taylor is a member of An Garda Síochána, even now he's a member of An Garda Síochána, he was actually a superintendent, he was head of the Press office, and you are refusing to te11 me whether it was him who gave you any detail as to Ms. D or where Ms. D lived and you are refusing to
te11 me as to whether, having visited Ms. D, you ever spoke to him on the telephone, and, at the same time, you're saying to me that, $I$ have no evidence of any orchestrated campaign by Garda management to malign Maurice McCabe. And he is part of Garda management, he 14:52 is a superintendent.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN And furthermore, you're also saying to me, I was never briefed negatively by any garda in relation
to Maurice McCabe.
A. I'm trying my best to answer, to assist the Tribunal in its work, in the best way that I can possibly can, whilst still maintaining my own source protection. CHAL RMAN well, you know, other people have had trouble in relation to this thing, Ms. McCann, and other people have had difficulties as well, and, you know, there it is. I think the truth is the most important value that actually exists in life, but there it is.
A. And so do I.

CHA RMAN I am glad to hear it.
478 Q. MR. MARRINN Just page 218 Ms. McCann, thanks. This is just an answer from Superintendent Taylor, it's from his statement. This is a reference to yourself and Eavan Murray from the Irish Sun going up to visit Ms. D. His answer is:
"I was aware that they were going up there. I did not di scourage it. I don't know if I knew ME. D's name. I 14:53 knew that ME. D lived up in Cavan. I don't know if । knew thei $r$ address. I don't thi nk so. I do remenber Debbi e MECann and Eavan Murray contacting me separately and telling me at the time that they were going to do a story before each of them went up to Cavan. I never had the whole details of the ME. D allegations."

Is any part of that the truth?
A. I can't answer that question.

479 Q. "I never had the mutiae of the exact allegations by Ms. D agai nst Ser geant McCabe."

From your discussions with Superintendent Taylor, is that the truthful statement?
A. I can't answer that question.

480 Q. "I never saw the investigation file."

Is that a truthful statement from your discussions that you had with Superintendent Taylor?
A. I can't answer that question.

481 Q. "I did not know that it was M. D's daughter that made the allegations agai nst Sergeant McCabe" -- or "I did know', sorry.
"I don't think l gave these journal ists any inf ormation about the address of ME. D. "
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

482 Q. Is that the truth?
A. I can't answer that question.

483 Q. "I recall they had a fair amount of information thensel ves."

That appears to be correct?
A. I had sources on the issue.

484 Q. Pardon?
A. I had many sources on the issue, or a variety of sources on the issue.
Q. "I was aware that they were going to go to the house.

Yes. I di d not di scour age them attendi ng Cavan. I would have encour aged them"

Is that the truth?
A. I can't answer that question.

MR. MARRI NAN Thank you. Would you answer any other questions.
CHA RMAN A11 right. Look, before we go on, there is just two things. No one is going to be rude to you, and I'm going to make sure that happens, all right. And then, secondly, I really want an estimate from counsel, and I'm actually going to stick you to this, do you know that, as to how long people are going to be with you, because I think you need to know when you're going to be finished here. And, you know, whether you are right or you are wrong in relation to anything you have done, you are absolutely entitled to respect, so I am not looking at anybody in saying this, by the way.

MR. MEDONELL: Not more than 15 minutes.
CHA RMAN 15 minutes. Right. Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Erring on the side of caution, Judge, half an hour, but $I$ will be aiming for 20 minutes.

CHAN RMAN A11 right. Thank you.
MR. G LLANE: Chairman, I have no questions.

MR. HOGAR Chairman, I just wanted to clarify a few matters. Less than a minute.
CHAL RMAN Yes, Mr. Hogan.

MR. DOYLE: Doing my best, Chairman, I suppose I'11 certainly be 30 minutes, maybe 45.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. WFELAN I wil1 be, at most, ten minutes, Judge.
CHA RMAN That adds up to about an hour-and-a-half. Would you prefer to try and do it now or would you prefer to get away?
A. I would prefer to do it now.

CHA RMAN You would prefer to do it now, all right. Well, I know some people have to travel, etcetera, etcetera, but I'm sorry, that's -- if people are actually going to do this, and I'm going to put on a stopwatch, and if that's how it's going to be done, well then let's do it. Right. Mr. McDowe11.

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

486 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Ms. McCann, my 15 minutes has started now, so I'd better be brief. I'm appearing for Sergeant McCabe, as you know. Could I ask you this: We know in this Tribunal that Paul williams has informed us that, having visited Ms. D, he inquired of Superintendent Taylor and received confirmation that Sergeant McCabe had been investigated, that a file had been sent to the DPP for a sexual assault, that a file had been sent to the DPP and the DPP had confirmed and decided that there should be no prosecution. Right. We know that paul williams told us this.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

487 Q. And those three things are true, aren't they, to the

```
    best of your knowledge now?
    A. Mm-hmm, yes.
    Q. Do you think that Superintendent Taylor was maligning
        Sergeant McCabe by imparting those facts to Paul
        williams?
A. I think that there was an allegation and it was a matter of fact.
Q. Yes.
A. I don't think that the allegation and the fact that an allegation had happened is maligning somebody.
Q. Yes, that is the point I'm coming to. You see, I think you -- I am putting this to you now fairly and squarely.
A. Mm-hmm.
491 Q. And we're going to be brief.
A. \(\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}\).
492 Q. That you have been very, very careful in your language, and that, as an old English poet said, there is the well-measured truth that tells the blacker lie. And on this occasion, \(I\) am suggesting to you that, in saying that there was no orchestrated campaign or smear by any member of An Garda Síochána, you are carefully distinguishing that from a situation which a guard te11s you a fact about Sergeant McCabe. Do you understand me?
A. I had a variety of sources in relation to this issue.
493 Q. Yes. Would you answer the question I'm putting to you?
A. Yeah.
494 Q. Do you understand?
```

A. I do understand the question, yeah.
Q. Sorry. I didn't ask you whether you were handing it or not. I'm asking you, are you distinguishing between a smear, on the one hand, and somebody telling you a fact which is true, on the other?
A. I'm distinguishing it in the sense that it wasn't given -- this information wasn't given to me in the sense to try and smear somebody. I went out and sought it.

497 Q. Yes. And Paul williams claims that he went and asked Superintendent Taylor for this information and was given it, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you regard that as a smear; if you ask Superintendent Taylor was this man accused of abusing a 15:00 young girl, was there an investigation, was a file sent to DPP and did the DPP direct no prosecution, that is not a smear in your mind if he answered those questions truthfully, is that right?
A. If Paul williams went out and David Taylor was a source on the matter and he looked for the information and he got a factual response --
499 Q. Yes. Is that a smear? would you answer the question, yes or no.
A. Well, I don't feel like the sources that I got this information from were smearing Maurice McCabe.
Q. Sorry, I just asked you about that scenario with Mr. Williams --

CHA RMAN I am just going to intervene. I'm sorry, 15:00 Ms. McCann, we actually will be here all night. There is a specific question.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAK And I will repeat it, and again, I'm sorry for interrupting Mr. McDowell and yourself in relation to your dialogue.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN But the question is this: If a garda officer, and every garda is an officer --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN -- tells a journalist a particular person had an allegation against them and they were investigated --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAK -- is that maligning that person? That is the question you're being asked.
A. No. In the context of my job, no, I ask questions al1 the time, and I don't consider the person responding to my question as maligning a person, no.

501 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: So that if Superintendent Taylor tells the truth --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

502 Q. -- to Paul williams, he's not maligning Sergeant McCabe or smearing him, is that your point of view?
A. If Paul williams asked questions, specific questions in relation to the allegation, and he got a truthful answer from David Taylor, then, in my opinion, no, that is not a smear. In the sense that $I$ am a journalist and I ask questions all the time of Gardaí, and, by me getting those answers back in return, I don't consider them maligning the character of all the people that I am referring to.
503 Q. Fair enough. We're agreed on that.
A. Yeah.

504 Q. So when you tell this Tribunal, on your oath, that you were never aware of any Garda smear campaign --
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. -- you aren't saying that the telling of a truthful answer to a question about Sergeant McCabe could be part of a smear campaign?
A. I am not saying that David Taylor was a source on this or not.
Q. No, I am not asking you that. I am just asking you to face up to what your evidence actually means, because words have meaning on occasion. And I am putting it to you that you are very carefully distinguishing between factual statements about Sergeant McCabe made by any Garda source and a smear, on the basis that they are
true or untrue or whether they were asked for by a journalist or volunteered, is that your frame of mind?
A. Yes. well, that would suggest that I -- if I were to go out and ask questions of any individual in the course of my work, that I would be maligning the person 15:03 who is responding to me as maligning and smearing people across the board. That is not how it works. So that if any member of An Garda Síochána said to you Ms. D has made an allegation many years ago against Sergeant McCabe and a file was sent to the DPP after an investigation and it was -- the DPP directed no prosecution, that is not a smear?
A. I had -- no, I had a variety of sources on this matter, some were Gardaí and some were not.
508 Q. Yes.
A. And by me asking them that question and getting back a factual answer, I don't believe that they were smearing him.

509 Q. You see, that is the whole point. We won't push it much further on this point because my 15 minutes is rapidly eroding. But I want to put it to you that you have come here, using formulaic evidence, to effectively mislead this Tribunal as to the source of your information?
A. I absolutely have not. I have been answering the questions to the best of my ability in this matter.
510 Q. I see. Now, the second point I just want to ask you is: You said that before you asked Mr. Cox on the day before you travelled up to Ms. D's home, you said, you
had the details and you elaborated on that and you said that you understood what the allegation was and that you had the DPP's directions?
A. I didn't have the DPP's directions. I understood that the DPP had directed no prosecution in the case.
A. I didn't know the full content of the DPP --

512 Q. You didn't know the terms of the DPP's directions?
A. No.

513 Q. I see. But you had the details. What did you have by details in terms of the allegation of abuse?
A. It was an allegation of inappropriate touching, is what I can recall having at that time.
514 Q. So somebody with knowledge of the facts had said that her allegation was inappropriate touching. Did you know anything about a couch or playing hide and seek?
A. I don't believe I did at that time, no.

515 Q. Have you any idea how Alison o'reilly could imagine that you told her about this after your visit?
A. I have no idea how Alison o'reilly learned about a couch.

516 Q. But she couldn't have just imagined it, because it does seem to coincide with the facts, isn't that right? That's the allegation that was made?
A. Yeah.

517 Q. Isn't that right?
A. I don't know if that was subsequently written in articles, I don't know.
518 Q. I see. Well, in any event, you said that you had the
details and that you knew the DPP's direction before you confronted Mrs. D on her doorstep?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

519 Q. So what you were looking for was confirmation of the inappropriate touching allegation and the fact that no prosecution was directed against Sergeant McCabe, that is why you went up there, isn't that right?
A. I was looking to expand on the information that I had at the time, yes.
520 Q.
And, you see, I've got to suggest to you that the account you have given of your meeting with Mrs. D, you've now said that she seemed upset?
A. Yeah.

521 Q. And you've implied that she was upset by reason of the abuse that she was alleging had taken place against her daughter?
A. No. I said that what -- no, she didn't go into the specifics of the allegation at all with me. What $I$ said was that she came out and she -- when I said who I was, she mentioned that she had been listening to the news and she didn't -- she couldn't -- she had to turn it off because she couldn't listen to Sergeant McCabe being referred to as a hero.

522 Q. I see. You see, the point is that Mrs. D never said anything of the kind when she gave evidence to this
A. Okay. She said she had a very vivid recollection and she said she did not make any remarks of that kind to you.
A. Well, that is my recollection of it. And I also, within five minutes of leaving the house, rang my news editor and relayed that information to him precisely.
524 Q. And I have got to suggest to you that -- who is that, to Mr. Cox, who is not giving evidence, is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

525 Q. And who hadn't told the Tribunal -- hasn't assisted the Tribunal by making a statement, is that right? You know he hasn't given a statement in, don't you?
A. Yeah, I'm aware, yeah -- well, I think he is giving -- 15:07 he is --

526 Q. You know he didn't respond to the Chairman's appeal for information, don't you? Now, could I ask you, what was the date of your visit to the D household?
A. We have gone back over records to try and establish that, and I don't know. It was sometime in and around the end of February, start of March time.
527 Q. And did you get mileage allowance, or anything like that?
A. Yeah, and we have gone back through all of that.

528 Q. And does the mileage show that trip?
A. I'm pretty poor at putting in my mileage at the best of times, but, no, there is nothing that we can find documentary-wise to suggest when I was up in Cavan.
529 Q. You see, we know that, according to Mr. D --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

530 Q. -- that it was only after your trip --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

531 Q. -- and after Eavan Murray's visit --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

532 Q. -- and after he was contacted on Facebook, he alleged, by Mick O'Toole --
A. Okay.

533 Q. -- Michael O'Toole --
A. Yeah.

534 Q. -- that he decided to confide in Chief Superintendent Reilly and make an arrangement with Mr. Williams.
A. Okay.
Q. And did Mrs. D say that you mentioned that you were going to be induced?
A. No, I was never going to be induced.

537 Q. She said you were.
A. Well, that's not -- I was never going to be induced. In fact, I had my daughter early.

CHA RMAN Honestly, I really don't want to go into that.

MR. MEDOWELL: I don't want to go into your -- the private matters of your pregnancy.
CHA RMAN I mean, people say these things, and

538 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: We11, I've got to suggest to you that we are talking about a very narrow window of time between 1ate February and the 8th March when Mr. Williams goes
up and makes contact with the D family.
A. Yes.

539 Q. And I've got to suggest to you that you must have been aware, having had what looked like an important story, you must have been aware when Mr. Williams published a similar story a month later, isn't that right?
A. I was aware, yeah.
Q. And were you disappointed?
A. I can't say I would use the word 'disappointed', no. Like, every journalist who knocks on a door hopes to get as much as information as they can out of that doorstep. I get knocked back all the time when I knock on doors. I don't think it would have been playing on my mind or I would have been particularly disappointed over it, no.
541 Q. I see. And you said that you -- I think you've conceded to Mr. Marrinan that you had ongoing discussions with Alison O'Reilly about the allegation against Sergeant McCabe, is that right?
A. We would have discussed the allegation, yes.

542 Q. And you said that she had a slightly different position from yours. would you just tell the Tribunal now in a couple of short sentences what was her position and what was your position on this issue?
A. Em, I guess I was a little bit more sceptical in relation to Sergeant McCabe at the time, only purely based on the fact that I knew of this allegation and probably based on me having met with Mrs. D at the door. And Alison o'reilly was not. She was probably
more of the view that what was -- that, you know -- I don't really know -- I can't really explain what her position of it was. But certainly I would have been coming from it as, you know, I had met Mrs. D, I'd learned of the allegation and I probably would have had 15:11 an opinion based on that.

You see, I'm suggesting to you, Ms. McCann, that the pair of you had radically different views of this matter; Alison O'Reilly took Sergeant McCabe at his word, and you were of the view that --
A. You see --

544 Q. Sorry, just let me finish.
A. Sorry.

545 Q. -- you were of the view that Ms. D was very serious7y damaged as a result of sexual abuse at the hands of Sergeant McCabe, that was your position.
A. I was of that -- and I probably was putting two and two together and coming up with I don't know what, but I was of that view based purely on the fact that I knew of the allegation and I had met Mrs. D at the door.
So, yeah. But in terms of having --
546 Q. And what did Mrs. D say at the door about her daughter?
A. She didn't say anything about her daughter at the door.

547 Q. So how could you possibly come to a view, based on a non-imparting of information, about whether the
allegation was true or untrue?
A. I just saw that she was upset at the door, she was quite clearly upset at the door.

548 Q. She was upset at the door, that you arrived.
A. It wasn't --

549 Q. And she gave evidence here of that.
A. Her distress was not -- I would knock on people's doors on a weekly basis as part of my job. I would try my very best to be as polite and sensitive as I possibly can. She wasn't upset by my being there. She was -- I was of the opinion that she was upset at listening to the news. That is what was relayed to me.
550 Q. So let's boil this down.
A. Yeah.

551 Q. You, on the basis of a complete hunch --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

552 Q. -- took the view that the allegation which you'd heard in outline --
A. Yeah.

553 Q. -- and which you can't even give us any detail of now --
A. Yeah.

554 Q. -- was likely to be true because you'd heard the allegation itself and because Mrs. D looked upset on the door when you arrived, but didn't discuss the allegation with you, is that your evidence?
A. Yeah. It was very much sort of a -- yeah. And as I said, I probably --
555 Q. Is that your evidence?
A. It is my evidence, yeah.

556 Q. Do you want to add anything to that?
A. No. I probably came away with a bit of, kind of a gut reaction to how I found her at the door. I found her
to be credible. I put two and two together and I came up with --
557 Q. And you got 22?
A. I have never met Ms. D, I don't know anything about her state of mind.
Q. That is the whole point. And I'm suggesting to you that Alison O'Connor's [sic] evidence is correct and that you were radically of the view that Sergeant McCabe was a perpetrator of child abuse and that this was done -- this conclusion you arrived at was totally on intuition or hunch --
A. That's absolutely --

559 Q. -- once somebody somewhere told you that such an allegation had been made?
A. That is absolutely not true. To suggest that her evidence --
Q. We11, let's deconstruct that, please. First of all, did you have any further information, other than the allegation that you had been told about, about your source or sources and your meeting with Ms. D and her being -- her looking upset?
A. No.

561 Q. Well, then, how could you possibly say there is a very messed-up girl at the heart of it and nobody gives an eff, how could you possibly say that?
A. Because, again, I had -- I had come to that opinion based on hearing the allegation and based on meeting a mother at the door.

562 Q. But listen, the DPP heard the allegation.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

563 Q. Superintendent Cunningham heard the allegation.
A. Yes.

564 Q. He investigated it.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

565 Q. And the DPP, we now know, said that there was no offence disclosed at all.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. So how could you come to the view that this girl had been seriously effed up by abuse in these circumstances?
A. No, I didn't come to the view that she had been abused in any way; I came to the view that she was messed up, yes, I came to that view.
567 Q. By what? By what?
A. Based on the fact that her -- on meeting her mother, her mother clearly believed something had happened.
MR. MEDONELL: I think my 15 minutes is up now.
CHA RMAN If you want to ask a couple more questions, please. And again, I'm trying to make sure that you don't have to be here for longer than you need to.

568 Q. MR. MEDONELL: There's just one or two points. As I understand your claim of privilege here - and I'm going to leave it to other people to argue about it because Sergeant McCabe is not going to be making substantial submissions on privilege as a point - but as I understand your claim of privilege, is that it's in respect of off-the-record remarks that may or may not have been made to you by Superintendent Taylor, is that
right?
A. Yes.

569 Q. And obviously you're not claiming it in respect of on-the-record remarks, because that would be absurd, isn't that right?
A. Yes, of course, yeah.
Q. And, you see, surely, and I put it this way to you, surely the McCabe family are entitled to a little bit of the truth here today?
A. Absolutely, yes.

571 Q. And surely former Commissioner callinan and Commissioner o'sullivan are entitled to a little bit of the truth --
A. Yeah, absolutely.

572 Q. -- from your mouth?
A. Absolutely, yes.

573 Q. And if it were the case that Superintendent Taylor had never imparted any information to you in relation to sergeant McCabe of a factual kind --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

574 Q. -- concerning these allegations, surely you would not damage your reputation or future as a journalist by simply confirming that on oath to the Tribunal now?
A. Sorry, I don't --

CHA RMAN Maybe if you look at the question again.
So, if Superintendent Taylor had never imparted any information to you --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN -- of a factual variety --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN -- about Sergeant McCabe --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN -- would you simply confirm that now on oath to the Tribunal?
A. Would I confirm that he has disclosed information of a factual --
Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Concerning allegations of sexual abuse against Sergeant McCabe?
A. Again --
Q. Surely you can answer that question, truthfully and on oath?
A. Well, again, I'm getting into -- I'm going back into the same situation $I$ have been in, in the sense that you are asking me to disclose conversations that I had with a -- on an off-the-record basis.

577 Q. One last point to make to you. Just for your own information --
A. Yeah.

578 Q. -- I will be making a submission at the end of this
module --
A. Okay.

579 Q. -- that your failure to give a straight answer to that last question $I$ put to you, strongly implies that Superintendent Taylor did impart information to you

CHA RMAN In other words, do you want to say anything about that? what Mr. McDowell is saying to me, that I ought to draw an inference from --
A. Again, I --

CHA RMAN Just hang on a -- listen, I know it's easy to rush into things. Sorry, what Mr. McDowe11 is saying to me on behalf of Sergeant McCabe is that he's going to say to me - well, he's saying it to me now that I would be justified in drawing an inference that you're not telling the truth and that you're concealing the truth in relation to matters because of the nature of what Superintendent Taylor, in fact, told you, which you're unwilling to impart to the Tribunal. That is what he is saying. Do you want to say anything about that?
A. Well, I'm not -- like, I absolutely don't want that inference to be taken from what $I$ am saying. I am saying it because I am being asked to disclose conversations that were off the record from a source at 15:19 the time. That is what $I$ am being asked to disclose. And I don't feel $I$ can do that.
CHA RMAN So, Mr. O'Higgins, it is twenty past three.

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

## O H GG NS:

581 Q. MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Thank you. Can I ask that page 5258 be put up on the screen, please. Just while we're waiting, Ms. McCann, I appear for Superintendent Taylor
and I am going to get through the material as quickly as I can. I am aiming for 20 minutes. 5258 is on the screen now. This is Superintendent Taylor's contact with you.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

15: 20
582 Q. I just want to draw to your attention, going through from the bottom of the page there's calls from the 12th June, and following on to page 5262, up to the 12 th April the following year --
A. Mm-hmm.

583 Q. -- there are approximately, by my calculation, about 164 contacts between him and you?
A. Okay.

584 Q. And they are spread fairly evenly over the months - 21 , 9, 15, $8,15,25,10,21$ in January, 23 in February, 17
in March and 1 in April. Now, it seems a fair
observation to make that in all of that contact, and his contact with you is just a snapshot of him returning calls, perhaps, or ringing up to find out something, it seems inconceivable, with that level of communication between the two of you, that Sergeant McCabe wasn't discussed by you, isn't that so?
A. We would have been in communication on a weekly basis throughout each week and we would have -- there was ongoing communication between us.
585 Q. In fairness, you've just summarised my emphasis on the fact of communication, but the question $I$ was asking you was: The volume of communication seems to me to reach an inconceivable -- it is otherwise than
inconceivable that you didn't talk to my client about Sergeant McCabe?
A. I think the volume of communication is broken down to about three or four communications per week, so it's not -- do you know, for a Garda Press officer it's not -- it's probably the same amount as any other crime journalist, do you know, if not maybe a little bit less for some and more for others.
Q. Well, let's put the records aside. I'm saying that during that period, it is inconceivable you didn't have 15:22 discussions with Superintendent Taylor about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, it was during a period of when the penalty points scandal was very much big in the news, so I'm sure Sergeant McCabe's name would have been mentioned.
Q. We11, you're doing that by process of elimination. I'm asking you to look into your memory, your recollection of the exchanges you had with him, and tell me whether you had discussions with him about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Again, I'm not going to answer that question because

I'm not going to -- I'm not going to tell you conversations that I had with somebody that were off the record.

588 Q. We11, I'm inferring, first of all in neutral terms, that you did have discussions with him, do you follow me?
A. Okay.

589 Q. And you're accepting that without saying the word 'yes'?
A. I am accepting that I had discussions with him?

You can't answer?
15:23
A. -- about the contents of our communication.

We11, could I just give you one of the reasons why I'm asking that, because notwithstanding there has been a Tribunal of Inquiry which has been sitting now for quite a while, it seems to me that the conversations that you could have been having with them about Sergeant McCabe, are very limited, do you understand what I mean by that?
A. Sorry, can you say that again.

CHA RMAN I think you should explain 'very limited', 15:23 what do you mean by that, Mr. O'Higgins?
593 Q. MR. MCHEL O HGG NS: we11, what I am saying is, first of all, as a working brief, I'm taking it, yourself and Superintendent Taylor discussed Sergeant McCabe, and I'm taking, as a corollary of that, that, at the end of the day, whatever these discussions were, there could only actually have been a small number of areas that were discussed between you and actually a small number of things that could have been said about him. Do you follow me?
A. Yes.

594 Q. And what I am anxious to ascertain is, simply, what was said between you about Sergeant McCabe, because it seems to me you could only have had conversations along
the following lines: totally officious and official exchanges which were neutral, instances where Superintendent Taylor was speaking well of sergeant McCabe or instances where he was speaking badly of him, and I would want to know what you say happened so I can 15:24 test your response against what the client says.
A. I can't answer -- I can't answer questions that relate to communications that I had with an off-the-record source.
595 Q.
Did you have similar discussions, any type of similar discussions with Commissioner Callinan?
A. I can't answer that question.
Q. Did you have any similar discussions with Commissioner o'sullivan?
A. I can't answer that question. But at the time I wasn't ${ }_{15: 25}$ in communication with either Commissioner Callinan or then-Deputy-Commissioner O'Sullivan.
597 Q. Well, is that not answering the question?
A. In a roundabout way.

CHA RMAN Well, it does answer the question,
Mr. O'Higgins, it does answer the question. If you're not talking to someone, they can't tell you something. So if you weren't talking to either of them, so that's fine. And you're saying throughout the 23 -month period I'm concerned with --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- no, you weren't talking to them.
A. I possibly met the Commissioner at a press -CHA RMAN No, that's fine. Yes, you meet them over

A. I did, yes.

601 Q. Was that after the period?
A. It was.

602 Q. It was?
A. Yeah.

603 Q. A11 right. So --
CHA RMAN He complained that Gardaí attending book launches are very well known not to buy the book. I don't know if you had any such conversation with him? I am sure that is not true, by the way.
A. I'm sure that is a complaint for every author.

604 Q. MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Do you see, Ms. McCann, what our difficulty is? I have to put my client's case.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

605 Q. Even if you are maintaining that, yes, we had
discussions about Sergeant McCabe but the discussions were benign in nature or at least didn't do Sergeant McCabe down in any way, I would be entitled to ask questions about that to test your answers, do you follow me?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see the disadvantage I am under?
A. Yes.

You do take note of the fact, and I know I'm being repetitive here because it's been said already many times, that my client has said he doesn't object to you saying to the Tribunal what the discussions were about?
A. Yes. But I don't feel that releases me from my obligations.
608 Q. Do you accept that you had a conversation with him before you went up to Ms. D's house?
A. Again, I can't answer that question.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- and that's only him ringing you or texting you, presumably there's more on your side.
A. we were speaking --

CHAI RMAN So you did have a conversation?
A. -- multiple times each week, so yes.

610 Q. MR. MCHAEL OHGGN: I mean, I am --
"Specifically in the context of being asked whet her you provi ded any informati on to Debbie McCann whi ch I ed her to attend at the home of ME. D?"
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

611 Q. And he says that he remembers you contacting him and telling him at the time that you were going to do a story and you were going up to Cavan. Did that happen?
A. I can't answer that question, again for source protection reasons. But to tell somebody, anybody, that I was going to do a story, is just not true, it's not the case. I went --
612 Q. Sorry?
A. That I was going to do a story, that's just simply not true. I didn't tell anybody that because I didn't know what was going to happen on that door. And we
actually -- to the best of my knowledge of what
happened that week when I did knock on Ms. D's door, it was very much on a let's go up and see what happens, and that was it.
613 Q. okay.
A. There was nothing more to it than that.

614 Q. We11, okay, on a tentative basis, did you disclose to him that you were going to go up tentatively and probe it?
A. Again, I'm not going to answer that question.

615 Q. And he says -- now, the statement is a little bit unsatisfactory because he's answering the question with respect to yourself and Eavan Murray at the same time, he's applying his mind to both, but even making
allowance for that, he says that you had a fair amount of information yourself. Can you comment on that?
A. I'm not going to comment on the details of the conversations that I had with Superintendent Taylor.
"I was aware you were going to the house. I di dn't di scourage you, I would have encouraged you."

Did that happen?
A. Again, I'm not going to comment on the details of any communication that I had with Superintendent Taylor.
617 Q. I should put to you, because it has been put to you by Mr. Marrinan, and I don't want any unnecessary ambivalence about this, I am in the unusual position, Ms. McCann, that I'm probably the only person in the room who is, in advancing their client's case, has to advance that they did very inappropriate things, do you understand me?
A. $M m-h m m$.

618 Q. But I cannot advance the theory put by Mr. Marrinan that he directed you to go to the house.
A. Mm-hmm.

619 Q. And I'm just, in the interests of clarity and on my client's instructions, I am putting it to you that he didn't direct you to go to the house?
A. Excuse me?

620 Q. I am putting it to you that he didn't direct you to go to the house?
A. We11, nobody directs me to do anything, other than my news editor.

621 Q. And nor did he conceive of the idea that you would go to the house.
A. I'm not going to answer that question.

CHA RMAN In other words, the question really at the bottom, the bottom line of the question is: Did he assist in terms of giving any information as to where the house was, as to who the persons involved were, as to whether people might be willing to talk, or anything 15:31 like that, to you? That is really Mr. O'Higgins' question. I'm not asking you; he's asking you that. And your answer is?
A. Again, $I$ can't disclose confidential conversations that I would have had.

622 Q. MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: And similarly on that front, he didn't give you any of those details because he didn't have them, and any conversation he had with you was after you had told him you were going up there. Can you confirm or deny that?
A. I'm not going to disclose the details of any conversations we had.
CHA RMAN We11, there was certain7y a conversation afterwards because you were in contact regularly, but what you're saying is you're not going to say --
A. We were in contact on an ongoing basis.

CHA RMAN -- what anybody said or what you said to him after being in the house?
A. That's my position, yes.

CHA RMAN Yes. And you're not even going to go so far as to say, yes, I did tell him I was in the house and the following happened, like you've told me?
A. Yeah, well, you know --

CHA RMAN You met Mrs. D at the door, she remarked on you being pregnant, she was upset that she'd just heard something about maurice McCabe on the radio in a hero context and had turned off the radio?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN You're saying you can't tell the Tribunal that you said that, for instance, to David Taylor, if you did?
A. Well, no, because again we're getting into me communicating with a contact of mine that was at times off the record, and I don't want to get into the communications that we had. I can't disclose the details of those conversations.

623 Q. MR. MCHAEL O HGG NS: And again, although I'm not a party to and I'm not going to get involved in any difference or conflict between your account and Ms. O'Reilly's account --
A. Mm -hmm.

624 Q. -- there is just one point I do want to make; insofar as Ms. O'Reilly quotes you as saying that my client told you that this young girl was in a terrible state, or words to that effect --
A. Mm-hmm.

625 Q. -- my instructions are Superintendent Taylor never said that to you and indeed was not privy and did not have
any information as to the young girl's state of mind.
A. Again, I'm not going to comment on that.
Q. Just finishing up, you mentioned murmurings.
A. Mm-hmm.

627 Q. Can I just ask you in just the most thumbnail sketch, what were the murmurings, what were they saying, when did you hear them, who said them?
A. I don't know when I heard them. They were very vague, from what I remember at the time, and it wasn't until I went to actively firm up the information that I became aware of what the allegation really was.
628 Q. We11, we can take it that, however vague they were, they were sufficiently credible to take them to the next level?
A. Yes.

629 Q. Now, do you have any idea who told you this?
A. No. Sorry, do I have any idea who told me what?

630 Q. Who was the first person that said there's a question-mark over Sergeant McCabe about sexually assaulting a minor, or words to that effect?
A. I don't know if I knew that level of detail before actively seeking it out, a minor and all of that. I don't remember -- I can't remember the person who told me.
631 Q. Well, take it to the next level then. There was some -- enough tittle-tattle to make a few calls. Do you remember who told you that?
A. That specific allegation?

632 Q. Yeah.
A. I do remember the person who told me that, but I'm not going to disclose that here.
633 Q. Can you tell us whether it was a guard or a civilian?
A. There were multiple sources that $I$ was speaking to in relation to this at the time. Some were Gardaí, some were not.

634 Q. And were they confirming across a broad spectrum?
A. Not all confirming, no.
Q. Was there sufficient to amount to a broad spectrum, sufficient confirmation that is?
A. Yes, that we felt that we could go and knock on the door, yes.
Q. So does that suggest then that this information was in circulation and available to journalists?
A. Well, no, I had to actively seek it out. I had to make --

637 Q. I appreciate that.
A. -- my own inquiries.
Q. It didn't come in the envelope, but it was available, the broad spectrum of information was out there and readily available if you knew the right persons to ask?
A. Well, that is the same with every story that we would look at.

CHA RMAK We11, I mean, that could be important. So is the allegation in relation to the matter, the DPP's direction, etcetera, you said it was from a source and that is what I wrote down; you're now saying it was from multiple sources, both Garda and civilian?
A. Yeah, I don't think $I$ have ever -- I don't know where I
have said 'source', but I think I've always said there were a variety of sources.

CHA RMAN We11, I could have written you down wrong now this morning, but that is what I wrote down. So it is multiple sources, Garda and civilian?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

639 Q. MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: And was my client one of those sources?
A. Again, I'm not going to comment on that. I can't answer that question.
640 Q. Finally, could I ask you to go, please, to page 5264.
This is a letter that was written by the in-house solicitor to the Tribunal. I will direct your attention to -- this is page 5264 and the penultimate paragraph beginning with the sentence "That said". Do you see there it says in three or four lines -CHA RMAK Oh, sorry, this is a letter written by the in-house solicitor of --
MR. MCHAEL OHGGN: Yes, to the Tribunal.
CHAL RMAN what is the name of the company? Is it
Irish --
MR. MCHAEL O HGGNS: DMG Media Ireland.
CHA RMAN what does that stand for?
MR. MEDONELL: Daily Mirror Group.
A. Mail.

CHA RMAN A11 right. So that is written to the
Tribunal?
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: It is.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, I thought you said the
solicitor to the Tribunal.
MR M CHAEL O H GG NS: Sorry, to --
CHA RMAN No, it's fine. Anyway, sorry, you were at a point, yes.
MR. MCHAEL OHGGN: 2nd March this year.
"That said, the fact that any person in the Press Office, or otherwise, had open communication with a journalist does not mean that he or she cannot be a confidential source of information. Such interactions happen all the time. Thus, government or party political press officers can speak on the record to a journalist, they can then separately or indeed as part of the same conversation speak on condition of confidentiality and the press are obliged to respect that confi dence. "

## Isn't that right?

A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

641 Q. And then it goes on in the next paragraph:
"For the avoi dance of any doubt, however, I can confirm that none of the open communi cations that ME. MECann had with Detective Superintendent Taylor rel ate to matters falling within the terns of reference of the Tri bunal."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

642 Q. Does that seem to follow that the ones that are not open communications do fall within the terms of
reference?
A. No, I'm just not commenting on them, full stop. I'm not saying that they do and I'm not saying that they don't.

Well, is that not a slightly different question to what 15:38 you were saying, what was said? I mean, I'm asking it in a much more broad format.

CHA RMAK We11, you know, this language, I mean, if somebody says to somebody, do you eat ice-cream and broccoli? And the person says, well, I certain7y eat-ice cream but I am saying absolutely nothing about broccoli. I mean, what's the answer to the question?
A. Well, I'm being asked to comment on my off-the-record communications with Superintendent Taylor.
CHA RMAN I mean, on-the-record communications I presume we know about, because it's utterly futile. They'11 get into the newspaper and saying: Today Superintendent Taylor disclosed that.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN And it would be the front page of whatever newspaper you care to think of.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN The Irish Daily Mail.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$, mm-hmm.

CHA RMAN With his name there and maybe a nice
photograph as we11. So these on-the-record communications --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- and then off-the-record communications.
A. $M m$-hmm. But the off-the-record, that is where the source issue comes into it.
MR. MCHAEL O HGGN: Yes, but can you -- I'm not trying to prise an answer from you, but can you clarify for me, is it the case that you're not willing to say whether the off-the-record address issues raised in the terms of reference?
A. I'm telling you that $I$ can't say that they did and I can't say that they didn't.
And I think I probably know the answer to this, and this is my final question, but $I$ notice in the statement Ms. O'Reilly refers you as referring to John wilson as a lunatic.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

646 Q. And that's sort of a phrase that -- or a phraseology that has come up in evidence in the case. what's the source for that, can you tell us?
A. I don't remember saying that. I don't remember knowing a huge amount about Garda wilson at the time. To my mind, that didn't happen, so there's no source.
MR. MCHAEL O HGG NS: A11 right. Thank you very much Ms. McCann.

CHA RMAN Did you have any questions?
MR. G LLANE: No, Chairman.
CHA RMAN So, Mr. Hogan, you're appearing on behalf of?

MR. HOGAN I just have a few short questions. CHAN RMAN But you're appearing on behalf of the witness?

MR. HOGAN Sorry, Chairman?
CHA RMAN You're appearing on behalf of Daily Mirror Group, no?
MR. HOGAN No, I am appearing on behalf of Ms. D and the D family.
CHA RMAN Oh, right. Well, if there is any question to be asked, yes. Do you want to clarify something?
MR. HOGAN I just want to clarify a couple of things. CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Kealey, I will certainly come to you, but I think the right place for you to be is at the end.

## THE WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR HOGAN

647 Q. MR. HOGAN So, Ms. McCann, I just wanted to confirm a number of things with you. One is that I don't think you received any invitation from the D family, either Ms. D or Mr. or Mrs. D to visit the house when you did?
A. No, no.

648 Q. You did it on your own initiative?
A. We11, I did it after getting guidance from my news editor, yes.

649 Q. And you never had any meeting or discussion with Ms. D, isn't that correct?
A. No, never.

650 Q. You never interviewed her?
A. No, never.

651 Q. And just in relation to some of the evidence that you have given today in relation to what you took away from the conversation, the brief conversation that you had
with Mrs. D --
A. Mm-hmm.

652 Q. -- and the suggestion that Mrs. D led you to believe that -- or led you to form the opinion that she had been through a hard time or that Ms. D had been through 15:42 a hard time --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

653 Q. -- I have to suggest to you that no conversation was had between you and Mrs. D that you could have formed that opinion from?
A. That is my recollection of it, and I immediately relayed that information back to my news editor at the time.

And I have to suggest to you, Ms. McCann, that, in fact, Mrs. D was upset and she was upset because you had arrived on her doorstep unannounced, seeking to ask her questions?
A. I didn't get that sense from her. I got the sense that she was upset from listening to the radio, and that is what I relayed back to my news editor. It was all very 15:42 polite and nice. There was no animosity, or anything, there at a11.

655 Q. In her own words in her evidence, she said she was horrified when you turned up on her doorstep --
A. Mm-hmm.

656 Q. -- asking her questions. And, in fact, she said in evidence that it was you who suggested to her that she must have been through a hard time. You said that to her, that was her evidence.
A. I remember introducing myself and telling her why I was there.

CHA RMAN You might have said something like that, is that the idea?
A. I possibly did, I don't --

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Yeah.

657 Q. MR. HOGAN she said in her evidence:
"She sai d she --"

That is you, Ms. McCann.
"-- said something to me like, l know you have been going through a hard time. There's a bit of rumours.
She said somet hing about the whi stlebl ower and I just looked. She wasn't directly in front of me, she was al most to the side of me. I just looked to the side of her and that was all I said, we're not speaking to anybody. And that was all the deal ings I had with her."

And she had no conversation of any substance with you.
A. Well, I recollect having a conversation, a very brief conversation, where she mentioned listening to the news, and I am fairly certain it was the News at One that she had been listening to.

MR. HOGAN I have no more questions. Thank you. CHA RMAN Yes. A11 right.

MR. M CHAEL O H GG NS: Sorry, Chairman, I wonder should I just put one question formally. CHAN RMAN Yes, well, if you wish, please. THE WTNESS WAS FURTHER CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M CHAEL 15:44 O H GG NS:

658 Q. MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Sorry, Ms. McCann, the Chairman has been understandably vigilant as we put our cases.
A. Yeah.

659 Q. And I just want to put to you that my client, Superintendent Taylor, did brief you about Sergeant McCabe's background, the investigation in 2006, and indicated to you that that was part of his motivation and agenda in bringing forward other complaints.
A. Again, $I$ can't comment on that.

CHA RMAN I took that as implied in the questions already. A11 right. So, Mr. Doyle, and it's now quarter to four.
MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR DOYLE:

660 Q. MR. DOYLE: Declan Doyle is my name, Ms. McCann, and I appear for Ms. Alison O'Reilly. Mr. Marrinan, on behalf of the Tribunal, and Mr. McDowe11, have put certain things to you; forgive me if I trespass upon them again.
A. Yes.

661 Q. I'm very conscious of the time constraints and the desire to get this finished this afternoon.
A. Yes.

662 Q. So I want to put to you in a general way --
A. Okay.

663 Q. -- that the statement made by Ms. Alison O'Reilly to the Tribunal on the 7th June 2017 is true?
A. It's not.

664 Q. Al1 right. Now, I will try and deal as quickly as I can with the specifics, but a lot of them have already been covered by counsel for the Tribunal and indeed Mr. McDowe11. So I will very quickly go through them, 15:45 I suppose.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

665 Q. Do you quibble with the statement that:

Towards the end of 2013 and early 2014, my colleague, 15:45 Debbie McCann, told me the Garda whistleblower, Maurice McCabe, who had lifted the lid, and so on, was a child abuser?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

666 Q. You utterly refute that, do you?
A. I refute using that language yes.

CHA RMAN And it's important in answering Mr. Doyle that if you have, for instance, a different version of the conversation, such as, we discussed child abuse and Maurice McCabe and an allegation but I did not say that 15:46 in categorical terms, that you should say that to him.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN I just want to make that clear, Mr. Doyle.
A. It was around that time that we would have been
discussing the allegation. Now, when we say 'discussing the allegation', it wasn't an ongoing discussion that we were having. It was, there were a few conversations around that time. It wasn't something that I was particularly focused on at that point.

MR. DOYLE: We11, again, could I put it to you this way, adopting something that Mr. McDowell said: Is it not fair to say, and I'm putting it to you that these are Ms. O'Reilly's instruction, that you were very invested in the anti-Garda-McCabe side of the debate, if you like, that was your strong view?
A. No, I wasn't very invested in the story at all. I had heard an allegation and $I$ was investigating that allegation.
668 Q. You gave evidence to Mr. McDowe11 there a short time ago that the basis of your position on the McCabe question, if 1 can term it like that --
A. Yeah.

669 Q. -- was, you accept that you had an opposite position from that of Ms. O'Reilly?
A. Yeah, to an extent, yes.
Q. Well, more than to an extent, I'm suggesting to you. I'm suggesting to you that you had a strong position on the credibility, or otherwise, of Maurice McCabe's allegations, and that that position was against Maurice McCabe?
A. No. The position was different in the sense that I knew -- I had heard of an allegation and I had
confirmed the existence of an allegation where she had met with Sergeant McCabe. That's where the difference came.

671 Q. You said to Mr. McDowe11 that, and this is at page 147 of the transcript of today's evidence, it's only about 15 or 20 minutes ago, perhaps a little more, that your position such as it was on McCabe was based on two things: one, that you knew of an allegation; and, two, your visit to Mrs. D?
A. Yes.

672 Q. And I'm suggesting to you that your position on Maurice McCabe was long established before your visit to Ms. D?
A. I don't think it was long established, no. I don't remember when I first heard any discussion in relation to the allegation, but $I$ remember specifically knowing about the allegation very soon -- close to when I visited the house.

673 Q. Post when you visited the house?
A. Sorry, no.

674 Q. Close to?
A. No, I learned the specifics of the allegation in the same week that I went to visit the house.

675 Q. We11, I suggest to you that you had had many discussions about this long before your visit?
A. I don't think we had had many discussions about this.

Alison O'Reilly's statement said that I would have disclosed this information to her in late 2013/early 2014. That was probably around the time that we would have become aware of the allegations -- of an
allegation, but not the specifics. So in terms of how many conversations we had, it was over a pretty short period.
Again, I'm suggesting to you that you are seeking to portray your difference about Maurice McCabe with Alison O'Reilly as minor, matters of small nuance and degree, and I'm suggesting to you that they were a great deal more than that?
A. No, they weren't. And to suggest that it was becoming something that was getting in the way of our friendship 15:49 at that point, just simply isn't true. That is not the way it was.
Q.

You said in your statement to the Tribunal's investigators, which is at page 3739, perhaps we could get that up; now that statement was made on the 7 th Ju7y 2017, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yeah.

678 Q. And you were aware of Alison O'Reilly's statement at that time, isn't that right?
A. It was -- I think it was produced at that point when I went in to meet the investigators, yeah.

679 Q. Yes. And in answer to a question down at the bottom, you said:
"I wasn't i nvol ved in any or chestrated campai gn to mal i gn Sergeant Mauri ce McCabe. I have no evi dence of any or chestrated campai gn to malign. The allegations we were looking at at the time were di scussed in the of fice. I certainly di dn't negatively brief Al ison

O' Reilly. We certai nl y would have di scussed the allegations. As journalists we become aware of the allegations all the time. Our job is to investigate them see if we can substantiate and publish themif they are in the public interest, but, until proven, they are onl y allegations. The allegations were di scussed in a private capacity and they were never going to be ai red and shared with anybody el se."

And that was your position, in the full knowledge of the extent of the detail provided in Alison O'Reilly's statement, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

680 Q. So am I right in characterising your position in July 2017 as accepting that the conversations set out by Alison O'Reilly took place?
A. No, I certain7y --

681 Q. Can I just finish the question? That, as is clear from your statement to the Tribunal's investigators, you accepted that these conversations took place between you and her?
A. Yes.

682 Q. You just didn't characterise them as 'negative briefing or an orchestrated campaign'?
A. Well, in Alison O'Reilly's statement, she suggested that $I$ called him all these different types of names and I suggested that I -- and said that I had given out my sources on the issue, and I'm saying that simply didn't happen. We were discussing an allegation. We
discussed allegations all of the time.
683 Q. Her statement is very detailed.
A. It is.

684 Q. If you disagree with it as vehemently as you are portraying now --
A. Mm-hmm.

685 Q. -- why didn't you say that to the Tribunal's investigators when they came to see you in July 2017?
A. I had already given her my statement. We were produced then with this statement from Alison O'Reilly, and my statement at the time, that didn't -- her statement didn't change my position on the matter.
Q. Well, you've a statement made by Ms. o'Reilly --
A. Mm-hmm.

687 Q. -- at the risk of repeating myself, with which you 15:52 strongly and vehemently disagree?
A. Mm-hmm, mm-hmm.

688 Q. You say she's lying about these things, isn't that right?
A. There's no other -- there's no other explanation as to why on earth she would come up with some story that I had interviewed Ms. D, when that simply didn't happen and I never said it to anybody.

689 Q. I will come back to the interview with Ms. D in a moment. I am talking about these allegations and your opposite positions.
A. Mm-hmm.

690 Q. You and Ms. o'Reilly --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.


Q. I am saying that you -- let me just put it precisely to you - I beg your pardon - the last question I asked you. I'm sorry, I don't want to mischaracterise this. CHAD RMAN I will go back and find it for you. You said:
"I don't intend to bring any emotion or to suggest that this was an errotional di spute bet ween you and Ms. O Reilly. What I amsaying is that here was a big news story and that you were strongly of the vi ew that Maurice McCabe's allegations needed to be taken with a

I arge pi nch of sal t because you had inf ormation that he was a paedophile?"

That is the question you are being asked.
MR. DOYLE: And leaving out all questions of emotion, that was your position?
A. I wasn't of the position that the penalty points issue should be taken with a pinch of salt because of the allegation. The allegation was simply, because Sergeant McCabe was a man of prominence at that point, it was simply just a matter that we were investigating.

695 Q. Yes. I am, I suppose, trying to establish from you when you had the level of detail from Ms. O'Reilly with which you so strongly agree -- or, sorry, with which you so strongly disagree --
A. Yeah.

696 Q. -- I want to know why is the Tribunal only hearing about this in the last three or four days?
A. In relation to the interview and all of that, why $I$ am disputing --
697 Q. All of the conversations which Ms. O'Reilly said she had with you and which you appeared to accept that you had with her in your initial statement to the Tribunal, and in the last three or four days the Tribunal is hearing a completely different story --
A. No, because I was --

698 Q. -- and I would like to ask you why is that?
A. Because I was specifically asked to put in a statement in relation to Alison O'Reilly's claims, and I did that
and I set out my position. I have never accepted any bit of what she was saying.
Q.

We11, why didn't you do it when the Tribunal's investigators came to you in 2017?
A. Because her statement didn't change my position, it didn't change my position. And when $I$ was going to be called to give evidence, I was going to clearly set out my position.
701 Q. You provided a statement to the Tribunal --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- in the way that Ms. O'Reilly provided a statement to the Tribunal?
A. Yeah. I have provided three statements to the Tribunal so far.
Q. Yes. You provided a supplementary one in March or April of this year --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

704 Q. -- dealing with Superintendent Taylor, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. But it was on7y three quarters of the way through the cross-examination by your counsel of Ms. O'Reilly --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

706 Q. -- that we suddenly heard that, oh, no, you don't accept that any of these conversations took place --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

707 Q. -- for the first time. Would you agree with me that that is curious?
A. I think in relation to specifics, yes, it probably was the first time, but I don't think I ever said that I agreed with her statement.
CHA RMAN No, just the point being made by Mr. Doyle, just speaking in round terms, it took a year for you to 15:57 say that this never happened.
A. I think in my original statement I made clear that I didn't accept that.
708 Q. MR. DOYLE: Again, I mean, I can formally put all of the matters which have already been put by counsel for the Tribuna1. I wonder, in the interests of speed, could I adopt Mr. Marrinan's questions on behalf of my client and suggest to you and put to you formally that you did say all of these things?
A. I absolutely did not.

709 Q. The conversation over the cup of tea, are you saying that just never happened?
A. That's in relation to the penalty points?

710 Q. Yes.
A. Well, what month was that?

711 Q. It was sometime in 2013.
A. Is there a month given to that?

712 Q. Late 2013. No. Again, this was all in the statement that you had and you just never saw fit to --
A. Well, you see, the penalty points issue was much -- was prior to all of that, and $I$ had discussed that in conference at that point. That wasn't late 2013 that the penalty points issue became prominent. Well, can $I$ come then to this question about your trip to Cavan.
A. Yeah.

714 Q. I take it you accept now the evidence of everyone, and indeed your own evidence, there was no question of your ever having spoken to Ms. D?
A. There was no question of me ever having met or spoken or had any communication with Ms. D.
Q.

But you successfully persuaded your news editor, and indeed the editor of the newspaper, Mr. O'Donnell, that this was a good plan for you to go and talk to Ms. D in 15:59 Cavan?
A. 'Persuaded' is the wrong word. I would have relayed the information that $I$ had received and he would have made a call.

716 Q. And your desire to do so, I suggest to you, fits in with your take on the whole McCabe story, doesn't it, at the time?
A. In relation to any matter that we investigated, when people of prominence are in the news, we look at various different angles in relation to it. That was just one angle that we were looking at.

717 Q. What were the other angles that you were looking at?
A. I specifically did very little on the penalty points issue. It was very much driven by political
journalists.
718 Q. So is this the -- when you say 'we'?
A. As a newspaper.
719 Q. Yes, we11, you as the crime correspondent --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

720 Q. -- you were dealing with the Maurice McCabe whistleblowing allegations, isn't that right?
A. No, I wasn't, no.

721 Q. No?
A. No.

722 Q. Well, what was your interest in this?
A. My interest in it was that $I$ was able to clarify the details on the allegation.
723 Q. The allegation of inappropriate sexual conduct or sexual abuse --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

724 Q. -- by Maurice McCabe?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

725 Q. We11, how did you become interested in that in the first place?
A. Maurice McCabe was very much in the headlines at the time. The political journalists were really running the show in relation to all of that, $I$ had very little dealings with any of it, and because his name was very public at that point and there was the suggestion of a possible allegation, $I$, because of my position, I checked it out, was able to check it out.

726 Q. Yes. Your editor, Mr. O'Donne11, conceded yesterday, which it's not a secret, everybody knows it, that crime
correspondents' principal sources are members of the Gardaí, isn't that right?
A. Principally members of the Gardaí, but there's a variety of different sources.

727 Q.
Yes. And without getting into anything more specific or which would tend to identify sources than that, I suggest to you that your information about the allegations, and so on, came from sources within the Gardaí?
A. I have said that the information came from Garda sources and other sources.

728
Q. Yes. Will you accept that the principal source for this story was from within the Gardaí, your knowledge about the allegation?
A. Yeah. The principal source probably was. Yeah.

Can I also put it to you formally that you said this on occasions to Alison O'Reilly?
A. I didn't. I don't disclose any sources to individuals.
Q. You know, forgive me, Ms. McCann, this is repeated mantra-1ike by you and a lot of your colleagues, nobody 16:02 is suggesting that as a matter of practice journalists go round disclosing their sources.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. But what we are talking about, I'm struggling to believe frankly that professional journalists don't actually discuss their sources with each other.
A. Well no, I don't -- well, I don't. And I don't discuss them with my news editor. I don't discuss them with anybody. I keep them to myself. And in retrospect --

732 Q. Do you never talk to each other; that's a great story you did last week about so and so --
A. Of course --

733 Q. -- that was fantastic, you must have had great sources, yeah, I did? I'm not talking about names, I'm just saying it stretches my credibility that two professionals don't, in the way that two doctors might talk about a patient or something?
A. Why would I reveal my sources?
Q. That is not the question I'm asking you. I'm not asking you about revealing your sources in some principled way. I'm suggesting to you that you have and do have conversations with colleagues in which the type of source that got you a good story is discussed?
A. No. Absolutely not. And to suggest that I would have revealed my sources just based purely on the fact that we were colleagues and friends at the time is just not true. And if I did that, which I didn't, I would be very much wrong in the sense that here we are with a former friend and colleague of mine who is purporting to reveal my sources.
Q. I suggest to you and I'm putting it to you that you did tell her that she should be sceptical about the allegations, is that right?
A. Skeptical of which allegations?
Q. Sorry, I beg your pardon, that is probably my client to you. That you told Alison O'Reilly to be careful that Maurice McCabe is manipulating you?
A. No, I did not. I didn't say that. And I wouldn't say
that.
737 Q. But that was your view, wasn't it?
A. That he was manipulating her, no.

738 Q. That the media was being manipulated and it had all jumped on the McCabe bandwagon, that was your view, wasn't it?
A. My view was that, no, I certainly did not believe that Sergeant McCabe was manipulating the media. I certainly did not believe that. I had, I became aware of an allegation, and I investigated that allegation.

739 Q. That brings us to the text messages, Ms. McCann.
A. Yes.

740 Q. You got a text from Alison o'Reilly?
A. Mm-hmm.

741 Q. Do you want to put that up in front of you there?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

742 Q. It's at 3840 of the materials. This is in the wake of Séan Guerin's report, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

743 Q. And Alison O'Reilly texting you quoting:
"A hi ghl y respected of ficer hel d hi gh in high regard is how judge Guerin describes McCabe..."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

744 Q. The next text which has escaped from me --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAR It says "Paul Willians and I ndo have agenda agai nst McCabe says M cheál Martin to pals" and then
Q. MR. DOYLE: Yes. And I know you believe that the text in the middle changes the meaning and context of all this, that will ultimately be a matter for the Chairman if he has to make a finding of fact about this.
A. To my mind it does and I would wonder why it wasn't produced originally.
Q. We11, again to the best of my instructions it is something to do with the mystery between blue messages and green message, and if there is a suggestion from you that it was somehow inappropriately deleted by my client that is rejected very strongly --
A. Well, I don't know what happened.

747 Q. -- on my behalf of my client.
A. I don't know what happened.

748 Q. The actual meaning wil1 fall to be found by the Chairman, Judge Charleton, but if you go back to your response "I'mfully aware" now whether that is aware of an agenda or anything else, "to be honest l think it is gross, there is a very messed up girl at the heart of it and no one gi ves an eff"?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

749 Q. Doesn't that chime precisely with the line that you had been spinning to Alison O'Reilly about your trip to Cavan?
A. From my reading of that what $I$ am calling gross is the game playing that is happening.

750 Q. Sorry?
A. To my mind from reading that conversation --

So, you're saying she cooked it up in her statement to the Tribunal, using the language of the text in order to frame you, is that it?
A. I'm not -- I don't know what she did, all I'm saying is my position on the matter.
754 Q. You came back from Cavan with your tail between your legs, isn't that right?
A. I absolutely did not come back with my tail between my 1 egs.
CHA RMAN No, I don't think it is fair to say that she came back with -- she came back not having succeeded, but I would imagine that, it's the kind of thing, if you don't have a thick enough skin to get used to that, I suppose you're in the wrong kind of job, that's how I think about it anyway.
MR. DOYLE: I understand that.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. DOYLE: I'm going to suggest to the witness that firstly -- we better do it in sequence.
755 Q. I'm putting to you that you did say to my client that
Q. And I suggest to you that you also provided colour and detail about sitting on a sofa and Ms. D with her arms around herself in a very distressed manner.
A. I didn't. I never interviewed Ms. D. I never met her. I never -- I know nothing of her.
Q. You use the words "in a terrible state" can I suggest that, "the woman was in a terrible state"?
A. I didn't meet her, I don't know what state of mind she was in.
Q. You subsequently denied that Dave Taylor told me the gir1 was in a bad way?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

759 Q. Are you denying that that happened or are you saying
A. No, I'm saying I'm denying that I told her that.

760 Q. Oh, right. Did Dave Taylor say to you that this gir1 was in a bad way?
A. Again, $I$ can't answer that question.

761 Q. It's remarkably similar, isn't it, to the "there's a very messed up girl at the heart of it", is that a coincidence?
A. What is your point?

762 Q. That your concern about this very messed up gir1 --
A. Yeah.

763 Q. -- appears in your text --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

764 Q. -- and the allegation that Dave Taylor told you that
this girl is in a very bad way?
A. Well, she would have known, because we had sent texts, she would have known my feelings towards the girl, that I had a degree of sympathy for her.
Q. Again are you saying that Ms. O'Reilly's characterisation in her statement to the Tribunal is tailored in some way to accommodate your text which you know is damaging to your position, is that what you are saying?
A. I'm not saying that. I'm setting out my position as best I can.
Q. And was one of those conversations - I put it to you it was - Alison O'Reilly saying to you Debbie, I'm very concerned about this, I'm very concerned about this, I'm very concerned about your whole take on the Maurice McCabe thing, I think there's something wrong with the story, are you saying that that never happened?
A. I don't believe that conversation happened.

768 Q. I am very concerned that this man's life has been ruined, and that you responded by saying that you were still in touch with the woman?
A. I have never been in touch with Ms. D. Ever. And I wouldn't have told Alison that either. Because everybody in my newsroom knew that $I$ had never been in Ms. D.
Q. And I suggest to you that Alison o'reilly then said to you how do you know that, how do you know this story about Maurice McCabe is true? And you said we11, I have it from the top. You know, that's not disclosing necessarily your sources; I have it from the top, Dave Taylor, Nóirín O'Sullivan, that you said these things.
A. I didn't say -- we11, I don't believe I said any of these things.
And that she said is this from your pal Nóirín and you said yes?
A. I did not. I wasn't in contact with Nóirín O'Sullivan during that period of time at all.
771 Q. Does your term "your pal Nóirín" said in an ironic way by a friend, a mate, does that sound real or unreal to you?
A. What do you mean does it sound real or unreal? CHA RMAN Is it a likely kind of remark among pals discussing things casually? That is all you're being asked really.
A. It probably is, yeah, a likely comment, but I certainly wouldn't have told her that Nóirín o'sullivan gave me any information because she did not and I certainly wouldn't have told her because I'm not in the habit of revealing sources and I'm also not in the habit of being a braggart either.
CHA RMAN Mr. Doyle, it's 4:15 you've possibly done your duty, but there may be a couple of other questions you wish to put.
Q. MR. DOYLE: There is one thing you said in your
evidence, you said earlier today, and these are the last two matters, you said earlier today "। thi nk । knew at the time that there may have been tickling i nvol ved".
A. Mm-hmm.
$16: 14$
Q. How did you know that?
A. As I said, the rumours, the murmurings that I was hearing at the time are particularly vague -- sorry, this is going up to the house after confirming the -from whatever sources that I had contact with obvious7y.
Yes. It's my understanding that the only place that that appeared was in the Garda file which has now been circulated by the Tribunal this afternoon.

CHA RMAN No, I don't think the word tickling ever appeared in the Garda file.
MR. MARRI NAN It does, sir.
CHAN RMAN Does it?
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, I am not remembering it now. It wasn't only circulated, by the way, Mr. Doyle, 16:15 this afternoon. We have had this thing, the relevant parts of it discussed for a long time.
MR. DOYLE: I'm sorry, Chairman, I missed that?
CHA RMAN Necessity -- maybe just point out -- look, I
could be getting this wrong, and I apologise, I may be interrupting you in the wrong, where is the tickling bit.

MR. MARRI NAN Page 11.
MR. DOYLE: It was my understanding, Judge, that the only reference to tickling in the public domain was in the Garda investigation file into the original
allegations against Maurice McCabe.
CHA RMAN Sorry, is thi Superintendent Cunningham, is it? Yes, sorry, okay. I didn't mean in the Garda file, $I$ meant in a statement made by anybody in relation to the event. No, it never appeared in that. This is his summary and all the rest of it. But it is there. If you look at that.
"It's of interest to note that Ms. D recalls being tickled by Maurice McCabe. A natural reaction to a child being tickle is to squirm.."

So, he is saying, look, how could allegation possibly arise, if you like, innocently but incorrectly, that is what he is talking about. Yes, I am sorry, I misunderstood your point.

777 Q. Mr. Doyle: And the reason I am raising it with the witness is that as far as we know that is the only
place that there was reference to tickling, it's the first time it came into the public domain. So, I'm suggesting to you that you had the Garda file, is that right?
A. No, I don't. And I have never had sight of any Garda file.
Q. You never had sight of any Garda file?
A. No.

779 Q. Where do you think you got the information that there was tickling involved?
A. I got it from a source.
Q. A11 right. But if the only reference in the public domain to tickling was in the Garda file would it be fair to assume that that source had access to the Garda 16:17 file?
A. I don't know.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you. I don't have any more questions.
CHA RMAN Yes, thank you. Was there any questions 16:17 Mr. Whelan?

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

## FOLLOVG:

781 Q.
MR. WFELAN I have a couple of questions. I had three 16:17 but I only need to deal with one of them, in that you emphasised to -- sorry, Noel whelan is my name, I appear on behalf of An Garda Síochána and retired -for some reason there's a delay on the mic starting. CHA RMAN Just press it.
MR. WFELAN Thank you. One of the questions I don't have to ask you because you emphasised to Mr. Doyle that you never spoke to Nóirín O'Sullivan about Maurice McCabe or any of the related matters from Ms. D or

anything like that, isn't that correct?
A. Yeah, I think I made that clear in my statement.

783 Q. And you made that clear in your statement and you've made it clear now in evidence.
A. Mm-hmm.
A. John McCann.
Q. John McCann, excuse me, sorry. Your father. That where, as you said yourself, in the normal way you had father/daughter conversations about current events --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- and that after he retired in July 2013 --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

787 Q. -- as we know Maurice McCabe related issues, if I use that phrase, were current events and you discussed that, but that he never said anything negative to you and had no direct knowledge of anything in relation to Maurice McCabe, isn't that correct?
A. Absolutely, yeah.

788 Q. And he says in his statement that he did not know and still doesn't know who Ms. D was?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

789 Q. And that he never gave you any information in respect
of Ms. D or her family, isn't that correct?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Can I just deal then with the last question that Mr. Doyle put to you?

CHA RMAN I'm sorry, I'm just tending to wonder how are you able to tell me that but not tell me anything about David Taylor?
A. Well, he's my father. That is my dad, like, he's not a source.

CHAl RMAN I know he's your dad, yes.
A. He's not a source of mine. He's my father.

CHA RMAN But if he said anything to you he'd become a source, wouldn't he, despite being your father? And in which case you would be telling me I can't tell you anything.

MR WFELAN One other question and then one other point I think it is appropriate to put to you, and the question first: Arising from Mr. Doyle's last question, there is indeed at page 10 of Superintendent Cunningham's report a reference to a description by Ms. D --
A. Yes.
-- that tickling was involved.
A. Yes.

793 Q. And firstly, and the Chairman will of course know this, $16: 19$ that wasn't of itself a public document. In fact, Superintendent Cunningham was careful to emphasise the steps he took to limit its circulation even within An Garda Síochána --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. You have been shown them previously and they are extensive and comprehensive waivers of which they take a view, frees, liberates any journalist from any sense of obligation to them that arose from any privilege that might ever have existed off the record or otherwise.
A. Mm -hmm, mm-hmm.
Q. Many journalists named by Superintendent Taylor as
having been briefed by him have come forward to say they had no such conversations as you had --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

801 Q. -- with them about Sergeant McCabe. Similarly our
clients take the view, and I think it's important that I say, Mr. McDowe11 has already referred to it, as had the Chairman, but it's important that our clients emphasise that they take a similar view of Superintendent Taylor's waiver; that Superintendent Taylor's waiver should similarly liberate any journalists from any obligation touching on journalistic -- and that not only is it in the general public interest of establishing the truth, which is the function of this Tribunal, but in the specific and particular interest of our clients, given the nature of the awful and defamatory allegations made by Superintendent Taylor about his systematic, as it were, maligning of Sergeant McCabe, that it's in their interests that you would answer the questions about what information or not Superintendent Taylor did give to you in those conversations? I just need to put to you that and ask you to revisit you decision on it.
A. I think I have set out my position on that in relation to that.
CHA RMAN But she is certainly saying, look, I never spoke to Nóirín O'Sullivan or Martin Callinan in any way and to do with anything about Maurice McCabe.

MR. WFELAN Yes.
CHA RMAN It just never came up and besides, we
weren't in any way close and it was kind of meeting at a function or something.
MR. WFELAN We are just emphasising that our clients' view, similar in respect of Superintendent Taylor as such, the waiver should be interpreted as liberating this journalist.
CHA RMAN Yes. We11, perhaps we will discuss that at the end, but you appreciate that is the plea --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- on behalf of his clients and he wants to know what your answer is to that.
A. Yeah, I appreciate that is their position, but I have my own position on this.
MR. WELAN Thank you, Ms. McCann.
CHA RMAN Was there anything then, Mr. Kealey?

THE WTNESS WAS THEN EXAM NED BY MR KEALEY AS FOLLOVB:
802 Q. MR. KEALEY: Ms. McCann, I just have a couple of small questions. You know who I am. I am Michael Kealey, your solicitor before the Tribunal.
A. Mm-hmm.

803 Q. You were still working for the Irish Mail on Sunday on the 8th February 2017, you hadn't gone on maternity leave when Brendan Howlin made his remarks to the Dái1 --
A. Yeah.

804 Q. -- to the effect that he had direct knowledge that Nóirín O'Sullivan was saying effectively bad things about Sergeant McCabe --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

805 Q. -- to journalists?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

806 Q. You were aware of that at the time?
A. I was aware of that.

807 Q. It caused considerable controversy at the time?
A. It did, yes.

808 Q. Had you any idea at that time that you were the journalist who was apparently being described by Deputy Howlin?
A. Absolutely not.

809 Q. You received a letter from the Tribunal on 22nd May 2017 in which it was stated that you were in fact the journalist --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

810 Q. -- to whom Nóirín O'Sullivan made these allegations --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

811 Q. -- and that this had been told to Deputy Howlin by Alison O'Reilly?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

812 Q. Do you remember getting that letter?
A. I do, yes.

813 Q. How did you feet?
A. I felt horrified. I felt that, I felt that I was going to have to defend myself against stuff that simply wasn't true. I felt like I was in the most impossible position, because of privilege as well as everything else, but that they were complete untruths and I was then in a position to where this stuff was being put
out there, it was being written about, it was all over social media, and it very much distressed me.
814 Q. On the 20th April this year Clare Daly TD made a statement to the Tribunal of Inquiry which you subsequently received a couple of days later?
A. Yeah.

815 Q. Do you remember that?
A. I do, yeah.
Q. Do you recall that in that statement Clare Daly produced in evidence two letters to her from a gentleman called Alan Crohan?
A. Yeah.

817 Q. And do you recall that Alan Crohan in the course of that produced to Clare Daly TD for the purposes of raising this matter in the Dáil a series of text messages which had been passed between you and Alison O'Reilly?
A. Yeah.

818 Q. How did you feel whenever you saw that material?
A. We11, I felt that this was being suggested -- sorry, can you ask that again?

819 Q. How did you feel whenever you discovered that prior to Alison O'Reilly making contact with Deputy Howlin that there had previously been contact with another TD, Clare Daly, in which allegations were being made about you?
A. We11, I guess I was further distressed in the sense that there had already been an attempt to raise this with a member of the Dáil and when that failed then
once again another attempt was made and that distressed me even further.
Q. How did you feel in that context when you saw for the first time the entire of the text exchange that had passed between you and Alison O'Reilly?
A. I felt like the entire exchange was being held back for some reason, probably to show me in a bad light and I found that to be again distressing.
MR. KEALEY: I have no further questions.
CHA RMAN Was there anything else, Mr. Marrinan. MR. MARRI NAN Yes, just a couple of matters.

## WTNESS MAS RE- EXAM NED BY MR MARRI NAN AS FOLLOVS:

821 Q. MR. MARRINAN The first matter relates the Garda report that you referred to, where there was a reference to tickling in it. Just dealing with that, can you confirm to the Tribunal that first of all that you didn't speak at any time to Mr . D?
A. No, I have never met Mr. D.

822 Q. Can you also confirm to the Tribunal that no member of Tusla or the HSE was your source of information?
A. Again I don't feel like I can answer that question. CHA RMAN We11, you know Mr. Marrinan is asking you, I mean there are social workers up there -- and we're talking now, we're not talking about anything to do with names or addresses or anything like that, we're talking about the time when you had heard murmurings, the allegation, gone to the DPP, the ruling of the DPP, tickling being mentioned, and you're simply being asked
that. You said, look, the source principally was a garda but there was also garda and civilian people whom you contacted to confirm details.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN what he is simply asking you, I think, at the moment, and please correct me if I am wrong Mr. Marrinan, is: Details in relation to the allegation, actual details in relation to the allegation, the couch, the party, the tickling, the rubbing from behind, kind of humping allegation, was
that coming from within the social work community, which numbers thousands by the way in this country?
A. Well, I don't know at the time that $I$ knew of the humping or anything like that.
CHA RMAN I know, but again I'm sorry, I don't mean any disrespect, that wasn't the question I asked you.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN So at the time when you first heard the murmurings, were you getting that from your contacts in social work?
A. In social work?

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. I don't feel like $I$ can answer that question. It's probing and it's just going to, it's going to put me again in an awkward position in relation to source privilege.

823 Q. MR. MARR NAN We11, it's not identifying anybody in particular. The Tribunal obviously is concerned to exclude the possibility that a social worker was
leaking information to you in relation to Sergeant McCabe and I really do think you need to answer this question because you're familiar with the work of the Tribunal, particularly the examination of matters last July in the Tusla module?
A. What I will say is that I don't know anybody in Tusla.
he HSE?
A. Or the HSE. I think I perhaps have an aunt, but I don't know if she works in some sort of department, but I don't know.

825 Q. Could I just come back finally in relation to your claim of privilege; as I understand it there's no issue here in relation to any concerns that you would have other than David Taylor's waiver of privilege is voluntary?
A. Mm-hmm.

826 Q. You're happy that it is voluntary?
A. Yeah, absolutely.

827 Q. So there's no issue in relation to that?
A. No.

828 Q. That he might have been brought under some sort of undue pressure or anything like that?
A. No. No. Certainly not.

829 Q. So, it's a freestanding --
A. Yeah.

830 Q. -- waiver --
A. Mm-hmm.

831 Q. -- as far as you're concerned?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

832 Q. And I understood from your evidence this morning to me that you're also happy that the Tribunal isn't embarking on some sort of fishing expedition whereby we're trying to find out other sources that you may or may not have?
A. Yes.

833 Q. Are you completely satisfied that the Tribunal is not attempting to do that?
A. Yeah, I am, yes.

834 Q. Yes. So it would appear that it's purely on a point of principle --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

835 Q. -- that you've already stated?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

836 Q. Okay. We11, thank you very much. Just one final matter, just to make it clear.
A. Yeah.

837 Q. Depending -- the Tribunal will review your evidence, but depending on the matters that arose from your evidence today you may be required to come back, but we 16:30 are just not sure about the position at the moment.

WTNESS WAS THEN QUESTI ONED BY THE CHA RMAN
AS FOLLOVS:
838 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. That is correct. There was just a couple of things that I wanted to ask you. I don't know whether you actually -- it's a busy place, but I didn't realise this was circulated today, I'm talking
about this, you're probably read it?
A. Yeah, I read it, somebody just handed it to me there.

839 Q. CHA RMAN A11 right. I presume you didn't have a chance to actually read through the whole thing?
A. No, no.

840 Q. CHAN RMAN We11, Superintendent Cunningham, then inspector, it's a well written document, like conclusion:
"My concl usion, taking all matters into
consi der ation --"

I'm on page 16.
A. Yes.

841 Q. CHAN RMAN "-- incl udi ng the question of whet her the event, if anything, happened constituted a breach of the criminal lawit's felt there is no ground for a criminal prosecution."
A. Mm-hmm.

842 Q. CHA RMAN And there's a lot of things that he goes through under various headings.
A. Mm-hmm.

843 Q. CHA RMAN Including an issue in relation to a funeral, an issue in relation to Sergeant McCabe having to intervene.
A. Yeah.

844 Q. CHA RMAN He goes through the background of the young lady in question, if you go to page 5 under the heading "Soci al Wbrk Department Heal th Servi ces Executive".
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

845 Q. CHA RMAN It's nobody's business obviously except the young lady and her family.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

846 Q. CHA RMAN And then he goes through the allegation and incident. But any fair reading of that file would seem to indicate that there was no offence, there was nothing to discuss --
A. Yes, absolutely.

CHA RMAN -- there was nothing to see.
A. Yes, absolutely. Yeah.

848 Q. CHA RMAN It's it just that it seems, I may be wrong about this, the way it was being put over to you, was not to that effect?
A. No, it wasn't. It was put to me that there had been an allegation and that it had been investigated and that the DPP didn't prosecute. That's -- I didn't know the detail within the DPP's directions. I didn't know any of that at that point.
849 Q. CHA RMAN No, it's just the issue I suppose is this: 16:32 That if a fair-minded person reading that would say, look, there's the allegations, there wasn't anything in it --
A. $M m-h m m$.

850 Q. CHA RMAN -- it's very hard to know why anybody was talking about it, whether a garda or otherwise --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

851 Q. CHAN RMAN -- five, ten, fifteen years later.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

852
Q. CHAN RMAN That is the problem.
A. Yeah.
Q. CHA RMAN And it is, it is about eight years later.
A. Yeah, I guess it was just the matter that it had become so prominent and Sergeant McCabe had become very prominent and obviously we were looking at all various aspects surrounding all of that and this was just one matter of investigation that went nowhere and was probably never going to go anywhere.
CHA RMAN There is just one other matter that -- I know, but still, it's hard to know why anyone was even discussing it. It's very hard to know.
A. Mm-hmm.

855 Q. CHA RMAN There's one other matter and that's this. I want to put a hypothetical scenario to you. Let's suppose a man is accused of fraud and he has been talking about, you know, what was going on within his company and a journalist puts forward a story, and the story indicates that there's fraud within, let's say, a major building society, and he says then publicly oh, my involvement in this fraud was that I knew such and such and did a few small things, and then he says, for the sake of whatever, I'm releasing any journalist to whom I spoke any obligation in relation to privilege, well the journalist actually knows that what he was
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

856 Q. CHA RMAN -- and puts that story on the front page. I'd imagine that that would be the end of that
journalist's career vis-à-vis any source, wouldn't it?
A. Em, yeah. Well, it's a scenario I haven't really considered, to be honest.

CHAN RMAN We11, is it the scenario that is operating here in a less extreme way?
A. I feel like a waiver of somebody's privilege from -it's just not releasing me from my obligations. That's how I feel on this matter.
Q. CHA RMAN But I mean, if the evidence is $x$ but the truth is five $X$ are you saying it's five $X$ and giving all the details and the person making a waiver publicly and simply saying it was merely x , is that what is on your mind in relation to waiving privilege?
A. Well no, what I am saying is that anybody who provided me with any information in relation to this, it was factual information that $I$ was provided with. I wasn't being spun and I wasn't being, you know, given stuff that didn't actually happen.
859 Q. CHA RMAN We11, you see, unfortunately, if you read the actual file --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

860 Q. CHAN RMAN -- it really is a question of there's nothing to see here.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Anyway. Look, thank you very much for being 16:35 here and I just have to consider everything and it may be that you will be called back. I don't mean to hang that over you like the Sword of Damocles, but that is the situation that I'm in as well.

MR. DOYLE: Chairman, I'm very sorry to interrupt there's one question that $I$ think on the pressure of the clock -- I don't think it amounts to anything but in case it was suggested at a later stage that I didn't put it --
CHA RMAN well, the submission is lasting longer than the question, so please put the question.

## THE WTNESS MAS FURTHER CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. DOYLE AS

## FOLLOVG:

861 Q. MR. DOYLE: I was putting Alison O'Reilly's statement to you and the various bits of it --
A. Yeah.

862 Q. -- and one of the things that I put to you and which you denied was that you had said to her is a paedophile --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

863 Q. -- and a dirty effing B, B-A-S-T-A-R-D?
A. Mm-hmm.

864 Q. And one of the reasons you advanced for that not being
A. Mm-hmm.

865 Q. -- isn't that right?
A. Generally I don't.

866 Q. Can I just put to you two of the three texts which are before the Tribunal; "It's a farce, everyone knows, frompolitici ans to cops to journalists, it's an effing pant omi me" and then "I'mfully aware and to be honest l thi nk it's gross, there's a very messed up girl at the
heart of it and no one gi ves an eff". So to the extent that you are denying the conversation because you don't use that kind of language $I$ suggest to you that that is simply not true.
A. I generally don't use that kind of language and it's very unfortunate from my point of view that the two texts that are produced contain that language. But I generally don't.
867 Q. Thank you.
CHA RMAN A11 right. So you might like to sit down. ${ }_{16: 37}$ There's something I need to say now. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHAN RMAN We are going to go through some more evidence on Monday, as I understand it, Mr. McGuinness, we have people scheduled, isn't that right?
MR. MEGI NESS: Yes, Chairman. We have five witnesses scheduled for Monday.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGI NESS: And our intention, subject to your directions, is to maintain that list of journalists on Monday and take their evidence.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: And then should it be necessary to invite submissions with regard to their evidence it's our intention that that would be done on Tuesday morning.

CHA RMAN And then? Well, 1et's just see about that now.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHAN RMAN what are the rest of the witnesses then after that Mr. McGuinness?

MR. MEGU NESS: We11, we had three other witnesses today whose evidence we could not take --

CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGI NNESS: -- and our intention is perhaps to
list those for Tuesday afternoon, if that were possible.

CHA RMAK We11, I think we will 1ist them for Tuesday morning for the moment.

MR. MEGI NNESS: Tuesday morning.
CHA RMAN Yes. Then after that, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Well --
CHA RMAN No one has asked for anyone to be recalled and no one has brought anyone to our attention who they want called, is that correct?
MR. MEGI NNESS: As far as we understand it that is
correct.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: we do have witnesses scheduled as per our website notice for Wednesday and Thursday also.
CHAI RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: And there may possibly be a spillover into Friday as well.

CHA RMAK And again, I intend to try and get as much done as possible. At the moment $I$ might indicate that
in relation to this, it seems to me it's necessary for me to take the totality of all of the evidence into account and in the event of any issue in relation to privilege being raised beyond what is today, such as the witness being recalled and particular question put and a direction given, $I$ would need submissions in relation to the relevance of any such matter and how it will assist in terms of a final determination; whether it is necessary in terms of the Tribunal finding facts that this should be embarked upon; obviously the question of how and when the privilege may apply; I'd need submissions in relation to futility; I would need submissions as to whether I have a discretion; and then I would need a submission in relation to procedure. So that's: Application, relevance, necessity, futility, discretion and procedure. So people might like to think along those lines. But I'm here awaiting that. And people haven't been slow to say other things and just because we have got to a particular stage in a particular way now doesn't mean that things may not change. So every witness is subject to recal1, but I'd like to see what attitude the parties are taking in relation to this and why they are taking that attitude in the context of those particular points. So Monday.
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