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MS. LEADER: The first witness today, sir, is Mr. Juno McEnroe. Mr. McEnroe's interview with the Tribunal investigators is in volume 19 at page 5142 of the materials.

MR. JUNO MEENROE, HAM NG BEEN SVORN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MD. LEADER:
1 Q. MG. LEADER: Mr. MCEnroe, I think you are a journalist and you work with the Irish Examiner, is that correct?
A. That is.

2 Q. And you cover political matters at the moment, is that right?
A. I do.

3 Q. And if you could outline your career path to that position, please.
A. After finishing my primary degree in Italian and English and coediting a college newspaper $I$ then went to do a Master's in Journalism in Dublin City University. I then freelanced for Ireland on Sunday as we11 as The Sunday Times for a number of years, as wel1 as working as a news reader in Independent Network News. I then went and joint the Irish Examiner full-time I think in around the year 2003, and from therein I covered general news, went on to become a senior news reporter, that included covering foreign affairs as well as crime. I then was promoted to the
position of political reporter, by the then editor, in 2011, and joined the politics team full-time in Leinster House. I was later promoted to political correspondent in 2014 and I remain therein working in Leinster House as a political correspondent.
4 Q. Okay. Now, I think shortly after this Tribunal was set up you received a letter from the Tribunal dated 15th March 2017?
A. That's correct.

5 Q.
And if that could be brought up on screen, please, it's at page 5163 of the materials. The hard copy is in volume 19 if it suits you better. That letter set out, and I am just going to summarise it in very general terms, that the Tribunal was writing to you, how it was established and the terms of reference were enclosed with that letter. And reference was also made to the opening statement of the Chairman of the Tribunal when he called for everybody that had information in relation to the terms of reference, to pass that information on to the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

6 Q. And you are familiar with that letter and what it sets out?
A. I am in the main, yes.

7 Q. Yes. And it specifically said that if you wanted to assert any privilege over any of the information, this should be brought to the Tribunal's attention. Now, I think you replied -- or a reply was sent to that letter on your behalf on the 28th March 2017?

8 Q. That's right. And if that could be brought up, please, at page 5169 of the materials. Now, if would you first of all confirm that letter was sent to the Tribunal on your instructions?
A. It was sent on my behalf, yes.

9 Q. Yes. And it's dated the 24th March 2017, isn't that correct?
A. It is.

10 Q. And if I could read out what that letter says:
"We act on behal f of the Irish Exami ner Newspaper."

And prior to that, your name appeared in reference to that particular letter, at the very beginning of the 1etter, do you see that there?
A. Yes.

11 Q. On the screen:
"We refer to your letter dated 15th March 2017 to Juno MEEnroe of our client, in which you have asked M. MkEnroe in the event that he has certai $n$ rel evant information identified in your letter to submit a statement no later than today the 24th March 2017. Please note Mr. MKEnroe bel ieves that he does not have any inf ormation rel evant to the terms of reference of the Tribunal."
A. That's correct.

12 Q. Does that remain the situation, Mr. McEnroe?
A. Chairman, to clarify, that letter that was sent on my behalf, I sought advice at the time and I would now like to clarify it was incorrect. I should have possibly had a letter sent that would have said that I would be claiming privilege, as was sought in the opening letter from the Tribunal, and said that I would not be confirming or denying that I'd any information that was relevant to the Tribunal. Mr. McEnroe. You appreciate that is significantly different than what the letter says, what you have just said?
A. A11 I can say is that the letter is incorrect and was sent in error. I had sought advice, we were close to a deadline to send the letter in, and I regret that it was sent in that manner.

14 Q. Okay. What do you think the letter meant when it was sent:
"Please note that Mr. MEEnroe bel ieves that he does not 10:15 have any information rel evant to the terms of reference of the Tribunal."

What do you think that means?
A. Well, I've tried to think about this obviously, and one 10:15 point is to go back to that opening letter that you read there.

15 Q. Yes.
A. It does suggest that submissions in relation to
privilege may be dealt with at a later period or are heard or will be considered and it talks about any communications of an open kind should be addressed to the Tribunal. At the time in all honesty, I sought advice and a reply was drafted in my name and returned as such that I didn't believe I had any information relevant to the terms of the Tribunal. It's my position that that was incorrect at the time, Chairman.
16 Q. Right. Are you aware of what the terms of reference of the Tribunal set out?
A. I am.

17 Q. Yes. And were you aware when this letter was sent what the terms of reference of the Tribunal were?
A. I was.

18 Q. So I suppose words have meaning, and it would appear that that letter that was sent on your behalf on the 24th March, is very clear, that you have no information relevant to the terms of reference, so it would seem to be, on one interpretation of it, the direct opposite of what you're saying should have been relayed to the Tribunal?
A. At the time, and after the advice $I$ sought, it was what I believed, which is what it states. I'd like to correct the record on that, though.
19 Q. Right. We11, do you remember being interviewed by the Tribunal investigators?
A. I do, indeed, Ms. Leader.

20 Q. All right. And that was relatively recently, isn't that correct?
A. It is.

21 Q. Yes. And I think the date of that interview was the 13th April 2014, so it was almost a year after the initial letter was sent?
A. That's correct.
"I have been provi ded with a copy of correspondence sent on my behalf to the Disclosures Tribunal from Ronan Daly Jermy Sol icitors dated 24/ 3/2017, one page. A copy of this correspondence, one page in total, has been exhi bi ted as JMR, si gned and dated by all persons present."

You see that?
A. I do.
Q. And JM2 would appear to be that letter which I've already referred you to --
A. Mm-hmm.
-- which is at page 5169 of the materials. If that could be just shown, Mr. Kavanagh, please. Al1 right. So that's the letter confirming -- sorry, that's JM2, 5169. Yes. It's just, my 5169 doesn't appear to be corresponding to the one that's up on the screen. It's 10:20 the same, sorry, my screen seems to be different. So that's the letter:
"We refer to your letter dated 15th March 2017 to Juno MEEnroe and he bel ieves he has no rel evant i nf ormation. "

Is that correct?
A. That is the answer I gave, yes.

27 Q. Yes. And you have confirmed to our investigators at 5144, if we can just go back to that:
"I confirmthe content of this correspondence JMR is correct."

Do you see that?
A. I do, indeed.

28 Q. So why, if you are now saying that it's incorrect, why didn't you take the opportunity to correct it at that stage?
A. I, in all probability, should have taken the opportunity there. During the investigation I may not have looked at that letter properly, that they were showing me, the previous correspondence. I obviously
was there with the Tribunal investigators to try and answer questions. Since that initial reply, and when actually sitting with the investigators, we had received further correspondence saying they looked forward to our cooperation. At the time I suppose, and 10:21 I have looked at that statement that I gave there, to confirm the contents of this matter is correct --
29 Q. Yes.
A. -- I suppose if I was prompted and asked is that still your position, Chairman, I may probably have gone, well, actually, no. But the matter is as it is and I do regret the error of the initial reply, Chairman.
Q. okay. You appreciate that at the best of times people are entitled to rely on what has been set out in writing and confirmed in a formal interview with investigators who are appointed pursuant to statute and have certain statutory powers, that people are entitled to rely on the results of those interviews and what has been confirmed in writing?
A. I do.

31 Q. Yes. And you were legally advised to a considerable extent, and had been since the previous March 2017, isn't that right?
A. That is the case.

32 Q. Yes. And the matter of privilege had always been put
out there from the very beginning indeed by the Tribunal, isn't that correct?
A. It was.

33
Q. Yes. So I wonder, are you in any way able to assist
further and tell us how we have come to this situation whereby, today, you are saying -- and in fairness, Mr. Quinn did advocate a certain position when Superintendent Taylor was giving evidence, but how has it come to this, I'm asking you, Mr. McEnroe, as to --
A. It was a rushed judgement. At the time we were dealing with a deadline. There had been correspondence which was accidentally going to Cork. That was only clarified in November, that is a minor element of it. But I hadn't reflected back on the original first reply, and as things proceeded with the Tribunal, which included other correspondence coming in from April, and included coming to the investigators and included dealing with them, it completely slipped my mind, Chairman, that that opening statement had been sent on my behalf, which was one sentence, which at the time said $I$ believe, and $I$ do regret it and it's an error.
34 Q. All right. We11, maybe we'11 look at some other answers you gave to the Tribunal investigators. If we could look at page 5152 of the materials, please. You see at line 163:
"I have been asked whether I'maware and whether I have any evi dence of any attempt made by former Commi ssi oner Cal I i nan and/ or former Commissi oner Nói rín Ơ Sull i van or any ot her seni or menber of An Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Ser geant Maurice McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct made agai nst him and if so, l have been asked to provi de details and all
attendant circunstances."

So you were asked there about your awareness about a campaign, isn't that right?
A. Yes. And specifically the issue of criminal misconduct 10:25 or allegations of that sort.
Q. Yes, yes. By reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct, yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And your answer there is:
"No, I am not"
A. Yes.

37 Q. And I wonder if you could explain what that answer means now.
A. I was asked in relation to the Commissioner and the former Commissioner and any other senior member of an Gardaí, if there had been reference to or any knowledge of an allegation of criminal misconduct and that is my position; that $I$ have no evidence of any of those individuals spreading any information of that kind, and that's my position.

38 Q. Okay. Well, if I could ask you, so, Mr. McEnroe, what do you mean by "evidence"?
A. In relation to any allegation of criminal misconduct. 10:25

39 Q. Yes. But when you say "evidence", what do you mean by that?
A. I have no knowledge.

40 Q. You have no knowledge. A11 right. And so, you are
saying you have no knowledge of any attempt made by former Commissioner Martin Callinan, is that correct, and former Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan, okay, or any other senior member of An Garda Síochána? Do you regard a superintendent as a senior member of An Garda Síochána?
A. No. And in that particular question, to be specific, I did not regard that as relating to a position of a superintendent, $I$ regarded that to relate to the two positions that are identified.
41 Q. okay.
A. Just to be very clear on that, Chairman.

42 Q. Al1 right. So, a senior member of An Garda Síochána, as far as you are concerned, at that time, was a commissioner?
A. In that question, yes.

43 Q. On7y in that question?
A. Well, I can only answer that question --

44 Q. Well, I'm asking you now, as of now --
A. In the question that was asked there, that was being
asked about, a Commissioner or former Commissioner or any other senior member, $I$ took that question to refer to ranks of that kind.

45 Q. of commissioner rank?
A. Yes.

46 Q. Okay.
A. Or assistant commissioner.

47 Q. Or assistant commissioner?
A. Yes.

So you were reading into it assistant commissioner, you were taking it that the investigators were asking about 10:27 commissioners, and you decided yourself - I'm just trying to figure this out, Mr. McEnroe - that continue didn't refer to anybody else, is that correct?
A. I decided based on the positions that were high1ighted in that question, and I took that to refer to people of 10:27 those rank.
A. I regard it that, being the allegation that had been alleged against Sergeant Maurice McCabe.
52 Q. Okay. Were you familiar that particular allegation?
A. When?
A. Yes, I was.

54 Q. Yes. I mean, presumably you'd read the opening statement --
A. Yes.

55 Q. -- and you followed it to some extent in July of last year?
A. Yes. I was familiar with that, yes.
Q. Okay. So the Tribunal can't exclude, and I'm just
saying by reference to that answer, that you have some know7edge of some other member of the Garda Síochána, leaving out commissioners or assistant commissioners, attempting to discredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against him?
A. Can you say that again, please.

57 Q. The Tribunal, by reference to that question, can't exclude that you have some knowledge of somebody other than a commissioner or an assistant commissioner referring to an allegation of criminal misconduct?
A. I don't really understand, sorry, could you --
Q. All right. We'11 start again. Can the Tribunal exclude the possibility, by reference to that question, that you do have some information that a senior member of An Garda Síochána, leaving out commissioners or assistant commissioners from that, attempted to discredit Sergeant McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct?
A. I don't -- I mean, Ms. Leader, I don't have any information in relation to anybody of that rank.
A. Of the rank of commissioner or assistant commissioner, referring anything in relation to an allegation of criminal misconduct --

60 Q. Yes.
A. -- to me.

61 Q. So that means the Tribunal can't exclude that you have some information of an attempt made by some other
member of An Garda Síochána to discredit Sergeant McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct?
A. No, I wouldn't take that to be the case.

62 Q. But you are not telling us, is that the position?
A. It's not that I'm not telling you, it's not the position.
63 Q. We11, do you?
A. Do I?

Have any evidence of any attempt made by any senior
member of An Garda Síochána -- and I include superintendents there, all right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
-- of any attempt to discredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe
by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against him?
A. Chairman, to be clear, that question I did not regard to pertain to Superintendent Taylor.
Q. Yes. But I am now asking you, do you have any information of any attempt made by Superintendent
Taylor in particular to discredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by reference to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against him; I am now asking you that?
A. Chairman, in relation to Superintendent Taylor, I cannot -- I cannot answer questions in relation to
that, for fear of maybe disclosing information that could be relating to a source.

67 Q. And you do --
A. Or sources.

68 Q. Or sources. Well, why didn't you simply say that when you were asked by the Tribunal investigators, that you weren't including Superintendent Taylor in that answer?
A. Ms. Leader, there's a series of questions in this investigation -- or sorry, from the investigators here, 10:32 I endeavoured to answer these in as candid and clear a way as possible.
69 Q. Yes.
A. And if I didn't elaborate on some points, that's what I'm here to do.
70 Q. A11 right. So you are saying it was another mistake, omission --
A. No, I am not.

71 Q. -- oversight?
A. The answer that $I$ gave in relation to that question remains the answer.

72 Q. So you thought about that question when you were asked?
A. I thought about every question when I was asked.

73 Q. Yes. So it wasn't an error, the answer you gave?
A. No.

74 Q. Was it a calculated answer?
A. What do you mean by "calculated answer"?

75 Q. It was a thought-through answer, Mr. McEnroe, is that correct?
A. Like every answer, you would think through every answer, you would try and answer, so, yes.
76 Q. Okay. Now, the next questions you were asked were:
"Were you informed by a journal ist or any ot her person
of any matters referred to in the questions above? If so, I have been asked to provi de details and all attendant circunstances."

And you answer:
"A. I was not informed by any journal ist of any matters referred to in the question above."

That remains the position?
A. That is my position, yes.

77 Q. And I think, if we could turn to page 5161 of the materials, line 310. You were asked:
"Whet her you were ever bri efed negativel y by any
journalist or ot her media personnel in rel ation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe. If so, I have been asked to provi de all attendant circumstances and the details of what was sai d. "

And you answer:
"No, I was not"
A. That's correct.

78 Q. If I could ask you what do you mean by negative briefing when you answered that question?
A. Being briefed negatively by another journalist about an individual?

79 Q. Yes. We11, in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe
specifically?
A. Was anybody giving me -- the question I understand to be was, would any journalist or had any journalist given me information that would attack Sergeant McCabe's character, discredit his character or in relation to the allegations of sexual assault which had been levelled wrongly against the sergeant.
80 Q. okay. Thank you. And the next question you were asked was:
"I've been asked if I was ever briefed negatively by any politician, menber of Government, in rel ation to Ser geant Mauri ce MkCabe."

And you were asked to provide all attendant circumstances and the details of what was said. And you said:
"No, I was not."

That remains the position, is that correct?
A. It does.

81 Q. All right. Now, so, as matters stand, we have excluded former Commissioner Callinan, former Commissioner o'sullivan, any other journalist, any politician or members of Government, from briefing you negatively in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. If we go back to that question which you are referring to in relation to Martin Callinan, in relation to

Nóirín O'Sullivan, the question relates to in reference to an allegation of a criminal nature.
82 Q. Yes.
A. I answered no to that.

83 Q. okay.
A. You are asking me a different question now.

84 Q. All right. okay. So when you referred to an allegation of a criminal nature, do you regard an allegation of a criminal nature being one which the DPP has classified as not constituting a crime?
A. Do I regard that as not being a crime?

85 Q. Do you regard that as an allegation not as a criminal nature?
A. I regard that -- it was an allegation that was looked into by the DPP and there was nothing found there, yes. 10:36
86 Q. Okay. And do you regard that as an allegation of a criminal nature?
A. well, it was, yes, at the time.

87 Q. At what time?
A. In relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe, when that
was -- when the accusation was looked into and there was nothing found, it wasn't found to be true.
88 Q. Yes. But I'm specifically asking you about April 2018 when you were asked that question.
A. Yes.

89 Q. Okay. So what I'm asking you now is: In April 2018, did you regard the allegation made by Ms. D as an allegation of criminal misconduct?
A. of alleged criminal misconduct, yes.

90
Q. Okay.
okay. So can the Tribunal take it that former Commissioner Callinan, former Commissioner o'sullivan did not in any way draw your attention to the allegation of criminal misconduct and I am specifically referring here to the allegation made by Ms. D --
A. Yes, you can. Yes, you can.
Q. The Tribunal can take that to be the case?
A. Yes, it can be.

But insofar as any other guard in the country, except any other person who may have held the position of commissioner or assistant commissioner, you are not answering that question?
A. I would not like to answer a question that could in any way, shape or form possibly lead to questions about who was a source or not a source. But I'd like to make, just to clarify the issue because I think I know what Ms. Leader is trying to ask, and this might explain it: In relation to the allegations that were against -that were alleged against Sergeant McCabe of a sexual nature, Chairman, I was not aware of those allegations until a much later stage.
A. So, the point being, nobody could have told me these because I didn't know them.
96 Q. Okay. That's of considerable help.
A. I'm sorry, yeah, do you understand why I have been trying to -- yeah.

97
Q. Well, you -- we'11 just --
A. I wasn't asked, so -- but I'm just trying to answer your questions.
Q. When did you find out about them? when you say a much 1ater stage --
A. Yeah.

99
A. Yes.

100 Q. Okay. Al1 right. Now, you understand that Superintendent Taylor has said he briefed you negatively about Sergeant McCabe when he was Garda Press officer?
A. I understand that.
Q. And you have seen that Superintendent Taylor has waived any privilege he has in relation to providing that information to anybody, including you?
A. He has.

102 Q. Yes. And you'11 also -- I don't know if you are exactly aware of what he has said in evidence before the Tribunal in relation to people coming forward and helping the Tribunal --
A. Yes, I am aware of that.

103 Q. -- in that regard. I think he specifically said it was 10:40 his hope that people would come to the Tribunal and te11 the Tribunal about any negative briefing he may have engaged in?
A. He did.
Q. Yes. What Mr. McGuinness says is:
"Okay, Mr. MEEnroe fromthe Irish Examiner in Vol ure 19 at page 5152, Mr. MLEnroe is asked --"
A. Do you mind, sorry, until it comes up on screen.

106 Q. Sorry, I beg your pardon.
A. Yes.

107 Q. "'I have been asked whet her I have any inf or mation or evi dence about an or chestrated campai gn di rected by seni or officers of An Garda Sí ochána to di scredit Sergeant Maurice McCabe by spreading rumours about his personal, professional life. And if so, I have been asked to provide the details and all attendant circunstances and to detail from where this was emanating from' And he says 'no'. So he is referring ot her questions then back to that previ ous statement there, he seems to be saying that he has no information or evi dence about an or chestrated campai gn. "

That's counsel for the Tribunal setting out what you
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. "Are you clear that you bri ef ed hi megativel y?"

And what Superintendent Taylor said is:
"Q. Yes?
A So the question, he would not know about that part of the question, but he' d know that I had brief ed himin rel ation to the motivation of Ser geant McCabe.
Q. You are drawing that di stinction there from the answer?
A. Well, the answer suggests that he knew about this campai gn and had been or chestrated, he woul d not know about that campai gn, he would just know that I was briefing hi mon behal f of An Garda Sí ochána. The mechani cs of how that briefing came about he woul d not know or any ot her journal ist would not know. "

And what Superintendent Taylor says:
"Ah, yeah, but sure he is tal king about the Garda Press Of ficer - - "

The question is:
"Q. But he is tal king about the Garda Press Officer. A. That's right, but he woul dn't know the mechani cs of it."

But you are saying that never happened, he didn't brief you, Superintendent Taylor, when he was Garda Press officer, which was up to July 2014?
A. Chairman, I would choose not to answer the questions in relation to that.
A11 right. You are saying, I suppose, you didn't know about it?

CHA RMAN I am sorry to interrupt, Mr. McEnroe, but you know, on the one hand, you write to me on the 28th March 2018 and you say Mr. McEnroe believes he doesn't have any information relevant to the terms of reference. You met with the Tribunal investigators on the 13th April 2018 and you say: "I confirmthe contents of the correspondence as bei ng correct." You've also said to me this morning, I was never briefed negatively by a politician or a journalist or Nóirín O'Sullivan or Maurice McCabe. You've also said to me this morning, I only found out about any allegation about Maurice McCabe after July 2014. Now it follows as night indeed follows day, that that means that you were not briefed negatively by Superintendent David Taylor while he was Garda Press Officer. He left office, by the way, on 10th June 2014. You are specifically saying he couldn't have briefed me because I didn't know about it until after that time. Now, that is what you have told me this morning.
A. It's not, Chairman.

CHA RMAN what do you mean it's not?
A. What I said to Ms. Leader was in relation to the allegation of a sexual nature, $I$ did not become aware of that until after that period you have mentioned. I
did not say that Mr. Taylor did not brief me. And I did not confirm or deny anything of that nature. I was asked the question by the Tribunal investigators in relation to that allegation of a sexual misconduct. And that's the answer I gave, and that's in relation to 10:45 the timeframe that you said there. So I'm afraid I have to disagree with that.
CHA RMAN I am not sure as to what you are disagreeing with. In fact, I don't know what you are saying now. Maybe you'd actually speak plainly and maybe you'd just 10:45 tell us did you become aware of an allegation of sexual misconduct against Sergeant McCabe at any time while David Taylor was Garda Press Officer in the 23 months ending on 10th June 2014.
A. No, I did not, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Well then, he couldn't have negatively briefed you, could he?
A. I'd rather not discuss any conversations I might have had with a source or sources.
CHA RMAN And David Taylor was a source?
A. I'd rather not discuss conversations I may have had with sources, Chairman, and I am trying to answer questions but $I$ cannot go further than that.
CHA RMAN It seems to me you are not trying to answer questions at all. It seems to me that you are actually 10:46 playing games, Mr. McEnroe.
A. I reject that.

CHA RMAN Let's just be quite blunt about it. I mean, I have a letter from you saying I have no information,

I have confirmation of that letter to my investigators saying, I have no information. And now, it seems you are parsing and analysing every question and you are saying, well, because that particular word is there, I can give a particular answer. Now, you have actually sworn to tell the truth --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The whole truth means there was no such thing as mental reservations, there is no such thing as parsing and analysing, when you are asked a question you actually give the information on it. Now, I am taking you as saying, as indeed I noted you as saying when the correspondence came in, that you were never briefed because you said you had no information on the terms of reference. You are telling me this morning that you only found out about any allegation about Maurice McCabe after July 2014, that means, to me, that you couldn't have been negatively briefed by David Taylor or indeed any other garda. That is what it means. I'm taking it as meaning that. Now, if you want to tell me that it means something different well I am not prepared to sit here while you play games with me. But maybe you had just tell me what you actually do mean.
A. Chairman, I'm trying to be as helpful as I can to the tribunal. If I may answer, Chairman --

CHAN RMAN Sorry, Mr. MCEnroe, I actually don't think you are being helpful at all. Anyone who writes in a
letter to the Tribunal saying I have no information relevant to the terms of reference, and then says I parse and analyse that as meaning something different, oh by the way, it was a mistake, oh by the way, I regret it, oh by the way, I regret my answers to the investigators on the 13th April 2018, is not being helpful. So don't tell me you are being helpful. You are not. That's the blunt and plain reality of it. MR. QU N: Chairman, I do think that involves a significant pre-judgment because by describing the witness as being unhelpful you are making a judgement on the evidence he is giving today and it is, in fact, the witness's evidence that he is explaining what he had done in the past and you can take the view that what he did in the past was unhelpful and we can have a $10: 48$ row in due course about what all those letters meant, but I don't see how you can fairly conclude at this juncture that he's being unhelpful today, not least when the witness has said and apologised for a mistake and an error he made in a letter last year.
CHAN RMAN All right.
MR. QU N: Un7ess, Chair, your statement --
CHAD RMAN Mr. Quinn, you are sitting here, now maybe you'd summarise what your client has told me in evidence this morning vis-á-vis the central issue which 10:48 the Tribunal is now conducting an investigation into, which is: whether or not there was any briefing in from Garda Headquarters, any briefing from David Taylor in relation to Maurice McCabe and any allegation of
sexual abuse, up to the 10th June 2014. Maybe you'd summarise now what he has said, because you have listening to the same evidence as I have.
MR. QU N: well, chair, I am not sure it's the time to do that, but --
CHA RMAN Al1 right. You are saying you won't?
MR. QU N: No, Chairman, I am replying -CHAN RMAN Well, I think it is the time to do so, Mr. Quinn.
MR. QU N: Well, Chairman, I do think it's necessary then because we haven't been present for all of the Tribunal, I do think it is necessary, and I am conscious of what paragraph [a] of the terms of reference, is it the case that this Tribunal has decided that negative briefing has a particular limited meaning?
CHA RMAN Al1 right. We are going to continue with the cross-examination.
MR. QU N: I am sorry, Chair --
CHAN RMAN Mr. Quinn, that is not helpful at all.
MR. QU N: well, Chair, in fairness to the witness and the interventions that you have made as chair, and you did ask me for a submission, and this is partly one, it does seem to me those interventions by you, Chair -CHA RMAN I didn't. Actually, Mr. Quinn, I didn't ask 10:49 you for submissions. I asked you to summarise what your client has said this morning and you declined to do so and you said it's not the time to do it. Now, I have summarised what I think he has said, and again,
let's see whether my understanding, which is, because I didn't know about any allegation of sexual abuse, alleged by anyone against Maurice McCabe prior to July 2014, I couldn't have been negatively briefed by David Taylor. It follows as night follows day.
MR. QU N: well, he didn't say that.
A. Chairman, I did not say that.

MR. QU N: He did not say that, chair.
A. And I am happy to go back through the transcript if you want.
CHA RMAN Ms. Leader, I am going to leave it to you.
110 Q. ME. LEADER All right. Now, I think your position is that you did not know anything about an allegation of sexual misconduct made against Sergeant Maurice McCabe prior to July 2014?
A. That's correct, Ms. Leader, yes.

111 Q. Al1 right. And if I could just go back to what Superintendent Taylor is saying he briefed you about when he gave evidence to the Tribunal. All right? Now, it's at page 144 of the transcript of day 74 , if that could be -- and if we could go to line 13 of that. The Chairman asks Superintendent Taylor:
"Can you remenber what you did say to Juno MEEnroe?" And this is what David Taylor says:
"J ust in rel ation to that, the notivation, that Sergeant MECabe had been investigated back in 2006 in
rel ation to a sexual matter, that it had gone to the DPP, di rected no prosecution and this was the motivation of his revenge in bringing all these matters to the public arena."
okay. what do you say in relation to what Superintendent Taylor is saying there?
A. I'm not willing to discuss a conversation with sources.

112 Q. Okay. Was Superintendent Taylor a source of yours?
A. I'm not willing to confirm or deny that.

113 Q. Okay. Now, what Superintendent Taylor continues to say in relation to your reaction to him saying that to you is:
"They don't give a reaction, di dn't gi ve a reaction, he just took it as information that $I$ was passing on to hi m"

Now, if we could just leave Superintendent Taylor out of this for a minute.
A. Sure.

114 Q. If anybody had said that to you prior to July 2014, anybody at all, would you have not reacted to it?
A. No, I would have reacted to it.

115 Q. What would you have done if anybody had said that?
A. I would have been shocked and I would have probably sought to check up on the issue or to question the matter.

116 Q. okay. And when you say you would have sought to
question the matter, would you have questioned it there and then or would you have let it sit for a while and questioned it amongst other people?
A. What do you mean "there and then", sorry?

117 Q. Immediately, on the spot.
A. Well, I mean, that would be something of significance and I would have endeavoured to, you know, get
information on it, as you do as a journalist. I would have tried to seek out sources or talk to people or -I mean, the story of Sergeant McCabe and the story of penalty points was a massive story for the Irish Examiner. We were leading the coverage and that's what I would have done. I would have done the standard thing I suppose journalists would have done.
118 Q. All right. Now, if we could turn to the next page, page 145, and in your position, in your particular case, Superintendent Taylor nails down an approximate time as to when --
A. Sorry, what line is this?

119 Q. It's from, I think if we start at line 16 at page 145.
A. Thank you.
Q. And Superintendent Taylor's answer, but he actually provides an approximate time for when he says he told you of the allegation of sexual misconduct against Sergeant McCabe. So he says, about you in particular:
"Mr. MCEnroe, unlike the other journalist, is a political journalist, had been formally a crime journalist so his contact with me in relation to that
briefing would be around the time of the Commissioner's appearance before a Dáil -- before a Dái l Committee."

He bases you in Dublin. And what Superintendent Taylor says at line 29, he said:
"I don't recall meeting him l remenber tal king to him on the phone."

And the line 6 he says:
"Well, as I said, he is a political reporter so the correl ation with my briefing would correspond with when the Commissioner and seni or officers would be appearing bef ore the Dáil committee or entering into the political world."

So on your case, Superintendent Taylor says he negatively briefed you in the sense that he drew your attention to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against Sergeant McCabe around the time the
Commissioner and senior officers were appearing before the committees, which would be January 2014, and this would have been on the phone. Do you want to say anything in response to that particular evidence given by Superintendent Taylor?
A. I'm aware of the evidence Superintendent Taylor has given and my position is, Chairman, I cannot go into discussions about sources and that remains my position.

CHA RNAN Just leaving aside any discussion in relation to sources, I mean, is it still the position that you only found out about any allegation about Maurice McCabe having been involved, allegedly, in any criminal activity, allegedly, apparently, something to do with an allegation of sexual abuse, after 10th June 2014?
A. It is. It is my position.

CHA RMAN well then, you couldn't have been negatively briefed then by Superintendent Taylor. You couldn't have been.
A. I'm not confirming or denying that, Chairman.

CHA RMAN what am I supposed to do? I am going to sit here and -- are you parsing words now or are you actually saying what I think you have said, which it seems to me is pretty clear? Given that you only found out that there was anything to do with any allegation of criminal misconduct against Sergeant Maurice McCabe after the 10th June 2014, that excludes obviously not just any commissioner, any deputy commissioner, any assistant commissioner, any chief superintendent, any superintendent, any member of the garda, but every human being on earth?
A. It's a matter of fact that I was not aware of those very serious allegations against Sergeant McCabe until a much later period.
CHA RMAN All right. We11, that's fine. And that, therefore, means you don't have any evidence relevant to the terms of reference. That therefore means that
you were not one of the people encouraged to write negatively, you were not one of the people that a chilling effect was sent out to by anybody in An Garda Síochána.
A. On that question, Chairman, I would not like to go into detail on that because it could pertain to information from sources.
CHA RMAN No, I know, but I mean, sometimes --
A. On that specific question, Chairman.

CHA RMAN But if you weren't aware of the allegation, and $I$ don't mean the nuts and bolts of the allegation, I don't mean the Garda file, I don't mean the actual statement made by the young lady in question, I mean the general allegation the same way as we hear about an allegation that someone has been arrested in relation to a particular murder or that someone is supposed to have been involved in a drug deal, I mean the general allegation; you only heard of that general allegation after 10th June 2014.
A. Yes, at a much later period.

CHA RNAN Yes. So therefore you couldn't have been negatively briefed by anybody.
A. Is that a question?

CHA RMAN It is a question, yes.
A. I am not denying or confirming that I was negatively briefed, Chairman. I am not denying on confirming that.

CHA RMAN We11, it seems to me you have denied it.
A. That's not the case.

CHA RMAN But if I'm wrong in what I'm saying, you had better tell me.
A. Chairman, it remains my position that I did not find out about the very serious and unfounded allegations against Sergeant McCabe till a much later period, as we 10:59 have discussed. In relation to specific questions about negative briefing, $I$ have said that I would not like to, and I cannot, go into detail, so I'd like to claim journalistic privilege, protection of sources for my career.

121 Q. M. LEADER: Okay. Is it the case, Mr. McEnroe, that anybody warned you off Sergeant McCabe prior to -- and I'm saying anybody here, not a guard or a journalist or a politician, is it the case that nobody warned you off Sergeant McCabe prior to July 2014?
A. I know that other journalists in the Tribunal have been asked this question in terms of when they became aware of, you know, a complaint or an allegation, and I have tried to think about this. I do specifically remember the day or I think it was an evening that Sergeant McCabe came to Leinster House, it was an unprecedented moment for the sergeant to go to that committee. And there was a lot of attention around his appearance, and I remember saying his face for the first time, from the photographs. I wasn't actually covering that period of 11:00 committee hearings. I would have been very active around the Public Accounts Committee, I would have been very active around everything in Leinster House as we always are, in the political team, but $I$ do remember at
that period and that juncture, and this was more gossip, prattle, that somebody raised a question-mark or a doubt around Sergeant McCabe.
122 Q. Okay.
A. I then endeavoured to look into that and I was satisfied as things went forward that he was a credible person. I don't know if that answers -- does that answer your question?
123 Q.
okay. I think it brings us some way, Mr. McEnroe?
A. Sorry, if I can be of help --

124 Q. So when you say that people raised a doubt about Sergeant McCabe, was that doubt about his motivation in bringing questions in relation to policing to public attention?
A. No, there was -- and it is difficult to recall, I have to be honest, you know, as a journalist, specifically as a political journalist you will hear a lot of gossip and claims, sometimes, it depends on what you are doing, though, and what you are covering, and I've tried to recall, and I don't remember specifics that might have been suggested to me or were put to me. I just remember there was a question-mark raised, you know, whether -- is he a trustworthy person, or something along those lines, and I cannot be specific. I didn't take those suggestions very seriously because 11:02 they weren't coming to me in a briefing sense, they were coming, as I say, from gossip or from tittle-tattle or something that was just put out there or a side comment. But I did actually go and speak to
people who would have met Sergeant McCabe and also people who knew Sergeant McCabe, and I satisfied myself that there didn't seem to be something to be concerned about.

So can the Tribunal take it from January 2014 to at 1east July 2014, you tried to find out whether there was anything about Sergeant McCabe that wasn't trustworthy or suggested that he wasn't trustworthy, and you heard nothing?
A. No, it wasn't an endeavour, it wasn't something that I, 11:03 you know, sought long and hard to do.
Q. Yes.
A. In the main, when $I$ was reporting on the issues, I wasn't writing about the character of Sergeant McCabe; I was writing about the process, I was writing about the Committee hearings, the fallout politically, threats of a general election, Ministers -- or a Minister resigning, you know.
127 Q. Yes.
A. And the process. I wouldn't have been looking at the character of Maurice McCabe. So, as I say, it would have been a type of checks and balance, if you want, as a journalist, but not something I went out of way. It was a few conversations $I$ had with a few people just to check in on something. Mick clifford from the Irish Examiner was taking the lead, if you want, in relation to Maurice McCabe as an individual.

128 Q. Yes.
A. The political team were dealing with the world of the

```
    House and the work of the committees and that was my focus. I very rarely wrote about anything to do with Sergeant McCabe or his character.
Well, the Tribunal has your articles during the
relevant period and that would appear to be the case, 11:04
and you are aware they have been circulated --
A. Of course, yes.
130 Q. -- in volume 24. Now, Superintendent Taylor has
identified himself as a senior garda source in two of
your articles, you'11 be aware of that from his
evidence before the Tribuna1?
A. I think so, yes.
131 Q. And they are articles on the 27th January 2014, if that be just for identification purposes brought up, 6512 of the materials. There is an article written by you, the 11:04 headline is:
"Serious flaws in legi slation for Garda whi stl ebl owers. "
You see that article, you are familiar with that?
A. I can but the text is quite blurry.
132 Q. No, no, that's correct.
A. If it's here in hard copy it might be better.
133 Q. It's Volume 24, yes.
A. Thank you. What page?
134 Q. 6512.
A. Right.
Q. Yes. And if you look at the last paragraph of that
```

article, Superintendent Taylor has said:
"He is the seni or garda source who said there does not -- "

Sorry, I am having difficulty reading it.
A. I can read it if you want.
Q. Yes.
"-- there does not -- he does not approve that the PAC
is the pl ace for Gardaí menbers to deal with wi despread allegations but there may be some wi ggle roomto deal with that."

You see that?
A. I do, yeah.

137 Q. And Superintendent Taylor has specifically nominated himself as the senior garda source for that piece of information. And if I could turn to page 6527 of the materials, which is an article written by you on the 24th February 2014 --
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. -- and you see it's an article with the heading:
"Shatter to stand over handl ing of whi stlebl owers compl ai nts. "
A. Yes.

139 Q. And in the third-1ast paragraph, it begins:
"A seni or Garda source cl ai med another letter on Decenber from Garda Commi ssi oner Martin Callinan di rected Sergeant MECabe to cooperate with the force's penal ty points inquiry. This will be used to justify Mr. Shatter's clainฐ last year that Sergeant MECabe ref used to cooperate with the inquiry."

Superintendent Taylor has identified himself as the source of that information, publicly, while giving evidence.
A. Mm-hmm.

140 Q. And he has also, as I have referred to earlier, waived any privilege he may have over anything relating to the terms of reference of the Tribunal, and publicly asked people to cooperate. So in light of all of that,
Mr. McEnroe, I wonder, can you confirm whether Superintendent Taylor in particular drew your attention to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against Sergeant MCCabe while you were covering the PAC inquiry?
A. Chairman, I cannot discuss identity of sources behind articles or anything to do with sources.
CHA RMAN Yes, no, Ms. Leader, if I could just intervene for a moment. I don't have any doubt that journalistic privilege does arise in relation to the senior garda told me the following blah-blah-blah.
A. It says sources, as far as I am aware. CHA RMAN Yes, no, fine. Excuse me if I get the
wording slightly wrong, but I think I am just trying to think in a broad picture. He has waived his privilege in relation to that, you don't want to confirm it. But it looks very much like as if it is, and even though you say you are not at liberty to confirm it, I am going to take it that in fact unless there is evidence to contradict it, that he was one of your sources in relation to that quote. Now, you don't have to confirm it or deny it, it doesn't matter, that is neither here nor there, but the question Ms. Leader put to you is premised on this. Here's two articles where a senior Garda source or senior Garda sources are quoted, and what Superintendent Taylor is saying is this: That because I was talking to you, Juno McEnroe, and because I was the source of information $I$ was a trusted person and because this was the ideal opportunity, as
Ms. Leader has put to you, the appearance before the PAC in January 2014, this was the ideal opportunity to slip this thing in and that's when I did slip it in. Now, unless I'm incorrect, you're saying, well an issue arose in consequence of a conversation with another journalist, the issue being is there something that's motivating this person beyond the public good.
A. Sorry, can you say that again?

CHA RMAN What you are saying is, in a conversation with somebody, perhaps another journalist --
A. No, I never said a journalist.

CHA RMAN okay. In a conversation with somebody --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- in around January 2014, you were the subject of a conversation where the comment was raised perhaps this man is not as genuine as he seems, and you then went and looked into that.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Now, I don't know whether that involved looking into the allegation of Ms. D or any allegation of sexual misconduct.
A. It didn't because $I$ wasn't aware of that until a much later period.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We11 that's fine. So
Ms. Leader, that seems to be the answer.
Mg. LEADER: Yes.
A. Chairman, just to be clear, and I don't mean to cut across from what you are saying, but you have said you have made up your mind in relation to David Taylor's claims to the Tribunal. I am not confirming or denying anything in relation to sources. It was also very much in the public domain the position of the Commissioner at the time in that piece.

CHA RMAN No, I get you --
A. He had maintained on the record in the Public Accounts Committee that he had in his own words directed. So that was very much in the public domain.
CHA RMAN No, I do understand. Because none of that comes as a surprise in the context of the evidence $I$ have heard.
A. I would also like to make the Tribunal aware, I am sure they are, but maybe for others as well, while that
piece does, if you want, pertain to maybe the position the Commissioner had, there is also another piece on the same day in the same newspaper that calls the former Minister Alan Shatter to apologise over those same claims of apparently non-cooperation.
CHA RMAN I am sure you took a very balanced view of all --
A. This is the point. There is a balanced -CHAI RMAN Let's be clear, Mr. McEnroe, nobody is saying you are a Garda patsy or anything like that, nobody is saying because you took a quote that puts you too close to --
A. I understand.

CHA RMAN Nobody is saying that.
A. I just wanted to put that on the record.

CHA RMAN I am not saying that either. A11 right. What you are saying to Ms. Leader is, look, I only found out about the sexual allegation later than that. So Ms. Leader, there we are.
141 Q. M. LEADER: Just in relation to, just to finish off, 11:12 Mr. McEnroe, as Superintendent Taylor says it was over the phone that this briefing occurred, I think a section of Superintendent Taylor's phone records were shown to you by the Tribunal investigators.
A. Yes.

142 Q. Which recall calls made by David Taylor to you, and I just want to show that to you at page 5186 of the materials, which should come up on screen just shortly.
A. Is it the same volume?

143 Q. No, I beg your pardon. Volume 19. But it's on screen in front of you.
A. Okay, sorry, thanks.

144 Q. So if we go to the relevant period, January 2014, we see a text on the 27 th January 2014 and a call lasting one minute 44 seconds on the 27 th January 2014, and then there are a whole series of calls in February, eight in a11. And I just want to ask you, do you think they were calls that David Taylor could have been talking to you in relation to Sergeant McCabe, the allegation of criminal misconduct and drawing your attention to it?
A. Chairman, I've tried to be helpful to the Tribunal, I confirmed my phone number when I was asked by investigators, but $I$ cannot go into discussing possible 11:13 calls from my phone or to my phone or communications, because I'd like to claim privilege on the matter. I am not willing to go into details, you know. So that's the position there.
145 Q. But I suppose, it's my duty as we11 to put what 11:14 Superintendent Taylor says.
A. Naturally.

146 Q. You understand.
A. Yes.

MS. LEADER: If you'd answer any questions.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGARRY:


147 Q.

MR. MEGARRY: Just a couple of matters. Paul McGarry is my name. I am one of the lawyers representing Sergeant McCabe. Can I ask you, you said earlier that there were issues about Sergeant McCabe in the form of gossip circulating around that time, early 2014. Were you aware of issues surrounding Sergeant McCabe, rumours we have heard mention of here before, about Sergeant McCabe and what he was up to and his motivation?
A. No, I wasn't. And I don't think I said gossip circulating, it would have been something that was said to me, and I consider prattle. You know, I do remember specifically when it happened as well and it was that night Sergeant McCabe was coming into the Dáil, there was a lot of discussion around him, and I do remember somebody dropping a question, is there a question-mark there or maybe there was something he wasn't to be trusted.

In your answers earlier you said that you weren't -you didn't become aware of the allegation of sexual misconduct until after Superintendent Taylor left the Press Office?
A. Hmm.

149 Q. Then you refused to answer questions with regard to any 11:15 other information that may have been given to you by Superintendent Taylor or other people surrounding Sergeant McCabe. Is your very specific confirmation in relation to the allegation of sexual misconduct, to be
taken as a confirmation or at least that the Tribunal can't rule out the possibility that you were given information by people in relation to other issues surrounding Sergeant McCabe?
A. Sorry, could you just repeat the last part of that?
it simply refers to briefing that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by malice and revenge, that his complaints had no substance, that they had been investigated, there was no substance to them, that he was driven by agendas. But it's not limited to the allegation of sexual or criminal misconduct. So the question I'm asking is: You seem to be limiting your confirmation of what you knew about -- or that you didn't know until after Superintendent Tay1or 1eft the Press office, to
the question of criminal misconduct, but you are not answering or not prepared to answer questions about whether there was anything else that might be comprehended by term of reference [a], for example, of which you were made aware, prior to when Superintendent 11:17 Taylor left the Press Office, is that a correct summation?
A. It's not that I am limiting, I am just being very specific about that allegation, that very serious allegation at the time.
MR MtGARR: Thank you.

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

MR. FERRY: Hello, Mr. McEnroe, my name is John Ferry and I appear for Superintendent David Taylor. And in relation to your evidence, am I right in saying that you've referred to the timeline of Sergeant McCabe's appearance before the PAC as being unprecedented?
A. I believe so, yeah. I believe it strikes my memory at the time that it was a very significant moment. In Leinster House you may have people of senior rank who would have been gardaí appearing before committee, but I don't remember somebody coming in, in a private nature or private meeting as such. It was quite a big moment.

152 Q. Yes. And prior to his attendance, had you been present for the attendance of the Commissioner?
A. No, I wasn't.

153 Q. okay. And in relation to that timeline, prior to that
period, I think was it the 30th of January that Sergeant McCabe came into the Dáil?
A. The 29th, I believe.

154 Q. Maybe I am wrong in that. But prior to that, had you a relationship with the Garda Press Officer? Were you somebody that was --
A. Superintendent Taylor?
Q. Yes.
A. I had a professional relationship with Superintendent Taylor and others in the Press office, yes.

156 Q. Yes.
A. That would have been the position for, you know, a decade or whatever beyond.
157 Q. Yes. And in relation to his evidence, his evidence is that he was given instructions by the former Commissioner Callinan and that that included to negatively brief journalists, and the essence was that Sergeant McCabe was driven by revenge and that this was his motive. So can I ask you, at that time in Dáil Éireann, were you aware of information relating to the motive of Sergeant McCabe?
A. No.

158 Q. In relation to Sergeant McCabe --
A. The alleged motive, no.

159 Q. But in relation to his motivation for bringing matters 11:20 to the public attention, so in other words --
A. I wasn't, Mr. Ferry.

160 Q. Yes. Now, Superintendent Taylor has said that the method by which he negatively briefed was that it was
done on an opportunistic basis; that if Sergeant McCabe was high profile at particular times in the media, that he would take any opportunity -- well, if an opportunity presented itself in the course of a conversation with a journalist, that he would take that 11:21 opportunity to drop it into the conversation about sergeant McCabe and that there was a back-story to him and that he was motivated by revenge against the Gardaí. And I put it to you that you are one of the journalists that he instructs me that he was providing that briefing to. Now, when I say briefing, one of the things here is the context; I mean, he is not saying that he was expressly saying I'm now briefing you on behalf of the Commissioner, he was just dropping it into conversations and this terminology of a briefing is a handle that has been given to it by Superintendent Taylor in an overall context. But I have to put it to you that he was one of the journalists that he was referring negatively in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

161 Q. And I am putting it to you now that he was doing that in relation to you, Mr. McEnroe.
A. Chairman, I cannot put the position further. I am not in a position to go into discussions with sources.
CHA RMAN Yes. Look, there may be a worry here, and I 11:22 think insofar as that is motivating things, I think I'd need to just try and dissolve any such worry. I have no interest, for instance, in relation to anything to do with the Clerkin investigation which uncovered
numerous cases where, and it is now admitted, David Taylor was passing on information to people, to the potential prejudice of several major investigations, and putting things out in public in relation to people who have had crimes committed against them for no better reason than people were well-known, I have no problems of journalists asking questions of people. Obviously those who are tasked with running a police force are sworn to uphold the law have standards themselves to maintain, so they may not be able to answer your questions. So he breached that and I have no problem, I don't want to inquire into that, $I$ have no interest in any of that.
A. I understand.

CHA RMAN I have no interest in how close you were, it's only whether or not, and the two things seem to me to be inseparable, you were being told up to the 10th June 2014 something to the effect that, look, there was an investigation into this fellow, a colleague's daughter or somebody made an allegation against him and 11:23 since then he's turned and he is bitter or any particular component of that. That is the only thing I'm interested in. Now, it seems to me you can't really separate the allegation from the investigation from what is alleged to be his bitterness or his I don't mean to cut across you, Mr. Ferry, in this respect, you only learned about that much after Superintendent Taylor had left the Press office.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So, we11, I'm reaching a conclusion on that basis.
A. Chairman, I know you have your job to do and the Tribunal and does and I am trying to be helpful but I equally have a job to do myself, and as a journalist, sources are the bread and butter of our industry. Day in, day out, we rely on the information of people from different sectors, from lawyers, to gardaí, to diplomats, to politicians and if we don't have those sources, generally speaking it's much more difficult to get stories. So I cannot answer Mr. Ferry's question. CHA RMAN We11, Mr. Ferry, your question seems to be more general than the specific question that the Tribunal is trying to look into, that is the reason I intervened. Just to make it clear that I am actually not interested in anything else.
MR. FERRY: We11, my question relates to the whole issue of negative briefing in relation to Sergeant McCabe. In other words, that I'm asking Mr. McEnroe a back-story to Sergeant McCabe and that his motivation for bringing these matters into the public attention was related to an issue in his past, that's what $I$ am referring to, Chairman. That it's not, it's not on7y 11:25 limited to the sexual allegation, that there was negative briefing in relation to him having a motivation of revenge against An Garda Síochána, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Yes. No, if you want to put a question, but it seems to me you can't separate one from the other.
MR FERRY: yes.
CHA RMAN I mean, I can't separate one from the other. ME. LEADER: I wonder is page 5 helpful to anybody?
It's the actual protected disclosure -- sorry, Chairman, protected disclosure of Superintendent Taylor.
CHAI RMAN Yes. You are absolutely right, Ms. Leader, thank you for drawing that to our attention.
Mb. LEADER: The paragraph starting "I recall..."
CHA RMAN I don't know whether you read that before, Mr. McEnroe? But that is the actual protected disclosure.
A. I have read the terms I think which referred to this, yes.

CHA RMAN If you want to just take a moment to just read that.
A. I am aware of the detail, yes.

162 Q. MR. FERRY: But in relation to that, Mr. McEnroe, my instructions are that journalists were being briefed negatively and that it was that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by revenge against the Gardaí and that was put forward as a reason for him bringing matters into the public arena. Now, at this particular time, it is an unprecedented time, and a sergeant is due to appear before the Public Accounts Committee --
A. Hmm.

163 Q. -- can I ask you, were you aware of a negative
reference of that nature in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, I wasn't.

164 Q. And at that time, in January 2014, when reference was made to Sergeant McCabe, was any other reference made in relation to an issue that he had with An Garda Síochána?
A. Can you repeat that, sorry?
Q. At that time, in January 2014 --
A. Yeah.

166 Q. -- when a reference was made to you about Sergeant McCabe, did it also include an additional piece of information relating to his motivation?
A. No.

167 Q. That he was motivated by revenge against the Gardaí? 11:28
A. Rumour or gossip, call it what you will, was very minimal, it was a question-mark.

168 Q. Yes.
A. Maybe doubts. There was no detail that was passed to me in that kind of, as $I$ have described it, prattle.

169 Q. Can I ask you, when you say question-mark --
A. Yeah.

170 Q. -- what are you referring to there? Like, did people say there is a question-mark about this guy or did they --
A. I suppose Sergeant McCabe was, you know, kind of a David and Goliath moment and he was going up against the top brass, as the term that has been used in the Tribunal. So some people were talking about, you know,
how will this pan out? And it was in the context of that that it was said to me, maybe there was -- maybe there was a question-mark about him. But I'm not a journalist who would frequent in groups that would gossip and I wouldn't particularly keep an ear out for something like that.

171 Q. Yes. But in relation to that aspect that maybe there is a question-mark about him, are you saying that was the sum total of it? Like, was there any other fleshing out by what was meant by the question-mark?
A. No. Only that he might not be trustworthy, as I have already said. And that is all that $I$ can remember.

172 Q. Yes. But nobody was saying why he wouldn't be trustworthy?
A. No.

173 Q. And as I say, Superintendent Taylor's evidence has been that he availed of opportunities to drop it into the conversation with journalists and, as I say, I put it to you that you are one of the journalists that he negatively briefed in relation to Sergeant McCabe, that 11:29 he was motivated by revenge against the Gardaí?
A. And the same answer applies, Mr. Ferry.

MR. FERRY: Thank you, Mr. McEnroe.
MR. QU N: Chair, if I can just reserve my position until the end.

CHA RMAN Of course, Mr. Quinn. Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh?

THE WTNESS MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAI GH
MR. Ó MU RCFEARTA GH Thank you, Chairman. Just one
or two questions --
CHA RMAN And maybe be so kind as to introduce yourself.
MR. Ó MI RCFEARTA GH Sorry. Fíonán Ó Muircheartaigh is my name and I am counsel for Alison o'reilly. Just one or two questions about the journalistic privilege that is being claimed here, and its implications for the information before the Tribunal. It seems you are suggesting that there is a right to professional privilege even in circumstances where the source has asked that the information he has given you should be disclosed to a tribunal set up by the Oireachtas, is that your position?
A. It may be the case that somebody who claims to be a source waives privilege, but that's not my position. As a journalist, I don't believe that that puts an onus on a reporter to waive their right to privilege.
175 Q. Now, sorry, I don't understand the phrase "claims to be a source". What David Taylor is asking, as I understand it, is not that something should be disclosed that isn't a fact; he's asking that what he told you should be disclosed to a public inquiry. Now, 11:31 on what basis do you think you can stand in the way of this man vindicating the truth or otherwise of what he claims he told you?
A. Could you put the question another way, I am not really
sure what you are asking me.
otherwise, David Taylor has simply asked, would you reveal to the Tribunal what he told you, and what I'm trying to understand is, how journalistic privilege can apply to something, say, I te11 you and I te11 you you can tell that to anybody, and now we have a statutory tribunal set up, it's been here for nearly 100 days, and I don't see on what basis you can say you shouldn't te11 the Tribunal what David Taylor told you. How does 11:32 it prejudice journalistic reporting?
A. There's sufficient debate out there to suggest why the protection of sources are important for our industry. I don't know if it's the right place for me to engage in that discussion here. I know it's a matter the Chairman will consider in the coming days. For me as a journalist on a very practical basis, and the words chilling have been used before, the chilling effect of disclosing what somebody says to you in confidence, in my belief, can have detrimental effects or at least very negative effects possibly on the future of someone's career. We engage all the time with people who want to share material with us, by phone, by letter, in person, sometimes through third parties. The point is, to answer your question, if somebody claims to be a source and waives their privilege you do not know the reasons behind why they may do that. Nonetheless, even if you did know the reasons, it is our responsibility to protect our sources and it is our
right to waive that privilege and, in my personal belief, and I do not speak for all reporters, and I do not want to, in advance of the discussion that the Chairman will have maybe, try and put some line down on this, I believe that's the most responsible position to 11:34 have as a journalist.
177 Q. I put it to you that the contrary is the case.
A. Sorry, I can't hear you.
Q. I take it -- I put it to you that the contrary, exactly the opposite is the case; if somebody gives you --
A. That may be your position, it's not mine.

179 Q. I am about to ask you a question.
A. Sorry.

180 Q. That the opposite is the case; if journalists depend on the confidentiality of off-the-record briefings or whatever --
A. Sure.

181 Q. -- it's entirely reasonable that they shouldn't be required to disclose that, but if circumstances put that person who gave you that information in a situation where he needs witness of what it was, surely you have a duty to him and surely any other off-the-record source will know that if they go to you and they find themselves in a similar bind as David Taylor, that you are not somebody they can rely on to tell the truth about what they said.
A. I cannot go further than what I have told you. That's my position.

CHA RMAN I suppose Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh is putting an
argument to you, and the argument I think runs as follows: Let's suppose, and this is a very extreme example, but just let's suppose we came to lunchtime, let's suppose you met me out in the courtyard and let's suppose I said, in answer to a question how is the Tribunal going, and I said something to the effect that well the Tribunal is going fine and we ought to be finished in a week, you can quote me on that, clearly, no problem. But if I said, well, the Tribunal may wel1 be finished in a week but I'm still worried as to whether it's ever going to finish at all, you'd better not quote me on that, but that evening I ring you up and say by the way, you can quote me on that; what's to stop you putting that quote into the newspaper for the next morning's Irish Examiner? I think that's basically what Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh is asking you.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN And I think the whole point is, that a person can withdraw a comment as being off the record and make it on the record. Here of course, if any of this ever happened, there is a big gap, it's a number of years, but in terms of the actual principle of the matter it's not really any different to the example that is given, that is the question that I think you are being asked.
A. I know, but it still is the same answer that $I$ have Chairman; that $I$ believe it is the right of the journalist to maintain that privilege above the right of the person who may waive it, even if it is
circumstances you may describe there.
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA Gt Now, one last question I'd like to ask you in that regard: would you accept that journalistic privilege is not a right that can be exercised in isolation from other rights?
A. If it upholds the public interest, the interest of the public, $I$ think it is an important right, but each case was probably decided differently, maybe.
I put it to you that this Tribunal has been set up by parliament to investigate the manner in which the
Gardaí, the thin blue line that protects the citizen from anarchy, is being run. And that the Tribunal and parliament is entitled to answers that don't prejudice your sources, that that is the kind of balance that has to be struck. Have you given any consideration to the accountability --
A. I have given a lot -Sorry, to the accountability of the agencies within the State, including journalists, to tell the truth to a tribunal set up by the Oireachtas?
A. Chairman, I have given huge amounts of consideration to the Tribunal not giving the error that I made initially, not forgetting that, but $I$ believe while the point is made, the Tribunal is here to try and find out the matters in its remit, it was set up by the parliament, $I$ equally believe important matters in this State and the arms in the State that operate, one of them that is important is the fourth estate. And the fourth estate must be protected and given rights to
carry out its duties, otherwise -- that is my position, anyway.
Q. And a final question, and it is really the final question: Looking back at what you were told and what you can't share with us --
A. Yes.

186 Q. -- do you believe or do you accept now that there was a process where Maurice McCabe was being set up in or around the beginning of 2014?
A. That's not for me to answer. And I did not have information at the time pertaining to the very serious allegation of sexual misconduct, as I have said.

187 Q. So are you telling the Tribunal that the contacts you had with whoever you had them in the Gardaí at that time, that they in no way cast any aspersions on the character or behaviour of Maurice McCabe?
A. I'm not saying that, I'm --
Q. Well, I put it to you that if you are not saying it, you are in effect colluding with whatever went on at that time.
A. I reject remarks like that.

MR. QU N: Chairman, this is the fourth final question from Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh. I had understood he was acting to for the journalist Alison O'Reilly and he is adopting a somewhat roving approach to his line of
questions. But I do think it has strayed now beyond the acceptable range of questions that would seem to arise on behalf of his client and he is engaging in somewhat of a personal debate with the witness, which
doesn't seem to me to be the way to conduct the privilege of cross-examination in these circumstances. CHA RMAN We11, in any event, Mr. McEnroe I think has rejected the situation, the premise you have put. I don't know, it's a bit like whatever a person desires to get published is advertising, whatever he wants to keep out of the newspaper is news. We all know the relevant adage. But you don't take yourself as having been taken for a patsy by anyone in the Garda Síochána up to the 10th June 2014?
A. I'm not willing to discuss sources or information that may or may not have been passed to me, but I would reject any suggestion that I colluded.
CHA RMAN All right. We11, I will try and work out the puzzle later on. So --

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

189 Q. MR. WFELAN Just a couple of brief questions. Mr. McEnroe, I think for the period 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 - Noe1 Whelan, I act for An Garda Síochána and I have some questions on behalf of former Commissioners Callinan and O'Sullivan - were you based in Leinster House?
A. I was, Mr. Whelan.

190 Q. For all of that time?
A. Yes.

191 Q. You were in the political correspondents room I think, which for some of that period was in Leinster House and is now adjacent to it or thereabouts?
A. Yes, the old offices have been knocked down but it was across the road but $I$ would have been in and out of Leinster House.

You were working beat is the corridors of Leinster House, if I put it that way?
A. Yes.

MR. WELAN Much later than -- not before July 2014, I think was --
A. Not before.

196 Q. Was the date you gave?
A. It wasn't before that period, no.

197 Q. It wasn't before that period. Okay. As the judge has pointed out, Superintendent Taylor was out of the Press

Office on the 10th June. And am I to understand it however, you have a recollection of a question-mark being planted in your mind --
A. Yes.

198 Q. -- by somebody in Leinster House on the night that Maurice McCabe appeared?
A. Yes. That is quite specific, so that is to the point, Mr. Whelan. That would be the case.
Q. And that is consistent with a characterisation given, I think, here last week by the crime correspondent Michael O'Toole, that in many ways much of this was a political story and in the political media rather than the security or policing realm?
A. It depends. I mean, some events in Leinster House are covered by both types of journalists, both types of journalists would have taken a strong interest.

200 Q. The question-mark that was in your mind, are you saying that was from a colleague?
A. No, I can't recall.
Q. You can't recall?
A. And it wasn't somebody who sat me down --
Q. Exactly.
A. -- and had a discussion. It was something quite curt, but gossipy in nature. But, and again, it's in the widest -- I don't seek to encroach upon or minimise the pool of sources, or potential sources, but am I correct in inferring then that that was somebody from the political Leinster House realm rather than An Garda Síochána?
A. I don't know. I mean, I have tried to think about this, it's an obvious question, $I$ just know it happened probably that evening when Sergeant McCabe was coming in because everybody was talking about that moment. And I do just remember crystallising it as being around 11:44 then. And I believe it was probably in and around Leinster House for obvious reasons.
Q. It's probably correct to say you spent your life living in the Leinster House world rather than any policing or Garda world at that stage, in those years?
A. Yes, I spent most of my life in Leinster House. MR. WFELAN Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. McEnroe. CHA RMAN Did you want to ask any questions, Mr. Quinn?
MR. QU N: No, Chair.

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

I am not suggesting in any way that it did. So it wasn't -- the reason I'm asking you is, what Superintendent Taylor says is he was encouraged to
brief the media to write negatively about Sergeant McCabe, that his complaints had no substance at all, so that question-mark, was it that his complaints had no substance at all?
A. No.
Q. All right. And that the Gardai had fully investigated his complaints and found no substance to his allegations, was that what the question-mark was in 2014?
A. No, there was no detail given to me like that, but I suppose, as I said to Mr. Ferry, the general thrust of things was this, that was a David and Goliath moment and if there was gossip around, a question-mark around the sergeant, it may have been to suggest, you know, what's the information he's bringing, you know, to the force or against the force, or against -- sorry, the operation of the penalty points system.
Q. And finally, what Superintendent Taylor says "In essence, I was to brief that Sergeant MkCabe was driven by agendas", so that question-mark, did it relate in any way to his motivation?
A. No, no.

MG. LEADER Al1 right. Thanks very much.

## THE WTNESS MAS THEN QUESTI ONED BY THE CHA RMAN

 just one or two things that might remain. As I understand it the remark insofar as you can remember it, somewhere in or around Leinster House or thecomplex was to the effect that he might not be trustworthy, that is about it really.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN And we are talking then about Commissioner Callinan's appearance and then later on, on the Thursday, that is to say Maurice McCabe's appearance?
A. Yes.

211 Q. CHA RMAN Now, that wasn't broadcast but I take it journalists were present for that?
A. For?

212 Q. CHA RMAN For Maurice McCabe giving evidence before the PAC?
A. Were they in Leinster House?

213 Q. CHA RMAN We11, as I understand, I have been there, I have had a look, there is a press gallery?
A. Oh yeah. I didn't cover that hearing itself but I mean the Committee rooms are only a few steps away from the general confines of Leinster House. So there was a large media presence and political presence that evening, yes.
214 Q. CHA RMAN The other thing is this: It's perfectly legitimate for you to be in contact with Superintendent Taylor and I'm not going to ask about that.
A. Yes.

215 Q
CHA RMAN And there were many occasions, as I understand it, from the time this story surfaced and became a matter of national interest, whereby the world of policing and the world of politics were in collision or potentially in collision. I take it that, in those
circumstances, it was perfectly legitimate for you to talk to him about any of those issues?
A. The contact with Superintendent David Taylor would have been probably infrequent, not very often. There would have been other press officers I would have been in contact with, it would be the case that if something arose over an incident or a protest or maybe even the process around somebody appearing before a committee like that event, like the PAC hearing, I may have been in touch with Superintendent Taylor but it was around the process, Chairman.

216 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. No, I understand. And there is absolutely nothing wrong with that and I don't want to ask you any questions about that. Now, it's just vis-á-vis the answers vis-á-vis whether there is, in fact, a mystery here, I can't leave that uncertainty there without making sure that I actually understand what you are saying. So, I don't want to you talk about your sources, I don't want to go into anything to do with Clerkin but what you are saying is that
anything to do with any serious allegation, any allegation about Maurice McCabe, you didn't hear it while he was active in the Press office, that is up to the 10th June of 2014?
A. That is my position, and it was actually much later than that. CHA RMAN And that is what I was going to ask you, was: when, in fact, are we talking about? Because I mean everybody knew about an awful lot of stuff, let's
say, from the Prime Time programme of February 2017?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN which seemed to lead directly to the setting up of this Tribunal or certainly was part of the impetus of it. Are we talking as late as that?
A. No, I don't believe so. But probably not too far shy of that and I have tried to think about when it was; I believe it could have been in around the o'Higgins Commission, when material was emerging from then, or at least after that going closer to the time around the Tusla scandal. And it may be the case of, you know, we11, why I wasn't aware of that. The reality is, things can move on very quickly in Leinster House, as can be seen from the material that $I$ wrote. In the main it was about the process, it was about the political elements around the ministers and inquiries. I very, very rarely, if at a11, wrote about Sergeant McCabe's character. And when it came to that matter, Mick Clifford from the Irish Examiner took the lead on that.

219 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. So I didn't have an interest, if you want.

220 Q. CHA RMAN No, in that context, I mean I have a list here of people who were never briefed, people who were added to the list later on, etcetera, and from the point of view of common sense, it makes it probable that the reason that Michae1 Clifford and Katie Hannon were not briefed was because they had a position on Maurice McCabe. Now, as I understand it, you had no
position on Maurice McCabe, good, bad or indifferent, save to say that in terms of writing about the political aspects of this there was something to be written about and it was perhaps going in a particular way or had gone in a particular way, is that right?
A. Not entirely. I mean, when that bit of gossip was put there to me that maybe there was a question-mark there, I did, as I have explained, go to people who knew Sergeant McCabe or who had met Sergeant McCabe, and after putting a few questions to them, I was happy that, you know, the information, that he was revealing the information that he was bringing to the attention of the Committee, the whole scandal around the penalty points, that there was credence and there was reason to take his concerns seriously. So in that instance, that ${ }_{11: 52}$ would suggest that maybe I suppose did take a position on him.

221 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. But the other end of things, the other polarity is that perhaps people become close to somebody and they trust them not to -- well, revealing a source is one thing, that is not going to happen, they trust them to take the information on board from them as being correct, because there is a degree of closeness between the person giving the information and the person receiving the information. Did you ever find yourself on close terms with Superintendent Taylor?
A. No. I would have had infrequent contact with him, as I have said, and my relationship would have been purely
professional.
222 Q. CHA RMAN Well, I am not going to blame anybody else in the Garda Press office in the event that any of this was happening but was it the case that you were closer to somebody else in the Garda Press Office, that you happened to get the same person, you happened to know a particular person in there?
A. I wouldn't have distinguished too much, Chairman, to be honest with you. I mean, I probably would have had more frequent contact obviously because Superintendent Taylor was the head of the Press Office, but I would have dealt with Jim Molloy, I would have dealt with John Ferris, I would have dealt with Damien Hogan, those are members of the Press office who preceded Superintendent Taylor. And, as I said, I was involved in crime journalism before my time in politics, so it was on1y natural those conversations continued with those individuals.

223 Q. CHA RMAN was there any talk in journalistic circles as to what kind of a Press Officer David was; like he was a breath of fresh air or that he was perhaps going too far in relation to what he might say or that if you wanted to know anything, he was the one to go to?
A. No, not that I recall.

224 Q. CHA RMAN A17 right. Thank you very much. 11:54
A. Thank you.

MS. LEADER: Subject to being recalled, you are free to go.

THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MARRI NAN The next witness, sir, is Cormac o'Keeffe, please.

MR. CORMAC O KEEFFE, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARR NAN
A. That's correct.
Q. And would you just tell the Chairman about your career to date in journalism, please?
A. In the mid-1990s I started my Master's in DCU in journalism. I would have worked in college journalism before then, and the Big Issue magazine. Graduated in 1997, after which I worked as a freelancer in RTÉ and in various newspapers and magazines, initially covering the drugs area in particular. And then in 2000 I started in the Irish Examiner. 2001, I was staff there, and gradually over time my area expanded, I suppose, from the drugs area to include crime, policing and the justice area. The area was quite broad, it wasn't just covering crime, as such; I have covered in detail the workings of Garda oversight bodies and inspection bodies, I would have covered their reports quite extensively and I would have covered all aspects of the various Garda policing controversies and crises over those years, actually the only exception being the Maurice McCabe one, my work in that was more tangential
compared to work -- it was led primarily by Mick clifford. So, my work there wouldn't have been as -- I wouldn't have done as much work in that area as the other areas.
227 Q. Now, I think that you had an interview with the Tribunal investigators on the 9th April of 2018, and the interview is at page 4978 of the material. And I think that in the first instance, you were written to by the Tribunal in a letter at page 5001, dated 21st April of 2017, isn't that right? And along with other journalists, and we are familiar with this already and I don't need to go through it with you, but you were asked a number of questions by the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

228 Q. And this is in the context of you being nominated by Superintendent Taylor as being a person who he had briefed negatively in respect of Maurice McCabe, you are aware of that?
A. I am aware of that, yes.

229 Q. A response to the Tribunal letter is at page 5005 of the material. And just:
"In order to allow us to take instructions we require cl arification in rel ation to the following.

In your correspondence to the above- nared you have stated that you have recei ved confirmation from Commi ssi oner Nói rín Ơ Sulli van and former Commi ssi oner

Martin Callinan and on behalf of Superintendent David Tayl or that they do not claimany privilege in the instance identified in your correspondence. In order that we fully understand this purported wai ver of privilege you might furni sh us with any correspondence setting out the confirmations provided."

Now, I think that that in fact was subsequently done, isn't that right, and you received the waiver of former Commissioner Martin Callinan, which is at page 5011 of the material, and then the waiver of former Commissioner Nóirín o'Sullivan, which is at 5012, and the waiver of Superintendent David Taylor, which is at 5013. In relation to all those waivers, have you any reason to believe other than that they were given voluntarily to the Tribunal?
A. You are asking me do I have any reason to believe?

230 Q. Yes. That they were given other than voluntarily to the Tribunal.
A. I don't have any reason to believe, no.

231 Q. Well, do you believe that they were given voluntarily to the Tribunal?
A. Well, I don't know.

232 Q. Hmm? Have you any reason to doubt --
A. No, I don't reason to doubt.

233 Q. -- that these are genuine waivers that are given by Nóirín o'Sullivan, Martin Callinan and David Taylor?
A. Do I have any reason to doubt, no, I don't.

234 Q. You don't. All right. I think then the position is
that you were interviewed by the Tribunal investigators, and we'11 go through that in due course, but largely you refused to answer the questions based on a claim of privilege that you have in relation to your interactions with Superintendent Taylor, is that right?
A. That's correct. anything that may or may not identify a source.
Q. And how could that possibly identify --

CHA RMAN If I could just intervene for a moment. It 12:02 seems that there is a certain fear of a trapdoor that if you are led into a particular position on the stage the trapdoor is going to open and 10 and behold you go in and you find yourself stuck or you find yourself
doing something contrary to your principles, whether the principles have validity in law is a different matter, but Mr. Marrinan is not a sneaky kind of person and he is not trying to ask you a sneaky question. Lots and lots of people have been asked what did they know about Sergeant McCabe in 2013 and 2014, what rumours were circulating and we have had a lot of answers in relation to that and a lot of people have actually said look, I actually don't know where that was coming from. But before we get to the point of saying whether you do or do not know, all mr. Marrinan was asking you about is, what was the level of your understanding in relation to whether this was a genuine fellow acting for absolutely genuine reasons or whether he was a bitter little man, to use the Jack Charlton phrase, or whether he was the kind of guy who really was just out to cause mischief. So that is what Mr. Marrinan is asking you at that point. Am I right in thinking that, Mr. Marrinan, it's nothing more than that at this particular moment? If we get to a different moment, particular moment well then let's deal with the moment when we get to that particular moment.
A. Can I just ask, Chair, are you asking me what my view was at the time, is it?
CHA RMAN No, I don't think Mr. Marrinan asked you that at all. He was asking were you hearing things about Sergeant McCabe, that is al1, in the same way as you'd hear things, for instance, about anyone who is in
the public eye. That is the height of it now, at the moment, and if it goes any further to that, well of course we will debate whatever you want to debate at that moment.
A. Sure. Anything that I may have heard, that may have come from a source, I am unable to go into because it may or may not identify a source. If you are asking me about gossip that may have been circulating, I can possibly answer the questions on that.
MR. MARR NAN well, had you heard any gossip in
relation to Sergeant McCabe and an investigation in relation to a sexual assault in 2013 or in 2014?
A. I have been trying to recollect exactly what I heard and indeed when I heard it. I don't want to mislead the Tribunal, I don't know when exactly I would have heard various things. I came to this story I think relatively late. It would have been -- I think my first story that is in the -- what was circulated, was towards the end of February 2014. So that would have been when I would have started covering it. So whatever I might have heard in terms of half snatches of conversation or bits of gossip that may have been circulating, it would have, I would imagine, have been February, March, Apri1, May of 2014.
239 Q. And what did you hear?
A. It's very hard to be certain what I heard or trying to remember what I heard because I don't remember clearly what I heard. I do remember an allegation of sexual abuse being mentioned, I think when I initially heard
that there was no reference to a child, the first reference I think was in relation to a sexual allegation generally.
And you believe this may have been as late as February 2014, from 2014 to Apri1 2014?
A. I think so. Now, it is possible that I may have heard it in 2013, but I really didn't start covering this story until February -- I think it was February 2014, after the whole PAC thing and it kind of, I suppose, came within my area a bit because, as I said, I wasn't covering the story.
241 Q. Did you hear this only once?
A. Em, no, I think I heard it more than once.

242 Q. Did you hear it from other journalists?
A. It would have been from other journalists, yes.

243 Q. Did you hear it from anybody else other than other journalists?
A. As I said, I am unable to comment on anything that may or may not identify a source.
CHAN RMAN Yes. We11, for the moment let's not go to identifying a source. Many people have said, for instance, and Mr. Marrinan please excuse me for interrupting here but I think it's necessary for me, if possible, to calm the waters. Many people have said, look, when I heard it, I contacted some sources and to tell me what sources you contacted to check it out, but maybe you'd just help insofar as you can for the moment in relation to what Mr. Marrinan is asking you
about, hearing it a number of times and what you may have done in relation to it, without mentioning sources.
A. Yeah, I was trying to recollect what I did on the back of hearing initially the allegation. As far as I can remember, my reaction initially was to be very cautious about this snatch of information that $I$ heard, and in terms of what I did afterwards, I am not actually 100 percent clear what steps I took or when I took it. But I certainly -- if not sceptical, I was certainly very cautious about this information or what on earth I could do with it.

## 244 Q.

MR. MARRI NAN Can I come back, because this really doesn't have any meaning at the moment. I asked a question in relation to, had you heard anything in relation to an allegation of sexual assault against Sergeant McCabe, and you indicated eventually that you had heard a rumour. I asked you whether you'd heard it more than once and you said that you had heard it more than once, and I asked you whether you had heard it from journalists, other journalists, and you said that you had, and then I asked you had you heard it from people other than journalists, all right? And then you made a claim of privilege in relation to answering a fairly innocuous question that $I$ don't see could lead to the identification of a source. Now, could you explain how it could possibly lead to the identification of a source to confirm to the Tribunal that you had heard this rumour from somebody other than
a journalist.
A. Well, if you say -- if you rule out a journalist then you are narrowing down what are the other possibilities as to where you heard it from. So, for example, it may lead to an obvious interpretation that you heard it from a guard, which in turn leads to an obvious interpretation that you heard it --

CHA RMAN No, I couldn't do that, I mean --
A. But that is my concern.

CHA RMAN Well, for the moment don't be concerned
because if I tell you I am going to leap to a conclusion I will tell you I am leaping to that conclusion. At the moment, $I$ am not.
A. I would like to assist you more, Chair, but I fee1, I believe that by narrowing down the other options of sources, that I may, at some stage, breach my obligation to protect sources.

CHA RMAN Al1 right. Mr. Marrinan, please forgive me for interrupting but, you know, $I$ believe there's about five million people in the country, that is to say
south and west of the border, and if you take out 12,000 of them, and there aren't 12,000 journalists, 1et's suppose there's a thousand journalists, really and truly, that is getting me nowhere. And you feel kind of we are inquiring, well, of course we are
anything close to revealing a source. Really and seriously, Mr. O'Keeffe, you are not. Unless I'm missing something totally, and I am off the wall in my
thinking. So I am going to leave it back to Mr. Marrinan, just let's see what we are going.
A.
A. It's not that I don't want to answer the question for the Tribunal. To me, the Tribunal has a very specific terms of reference, that it is trying to get to the bottom of it. My fear is that by answering the general question, $I$ will, if not directly, $I$ will indirectly be answering the more specific questions, and I can't do that.
Q.

By broadening the net, as it were, as to the source of the rumour to anybody in the Irish population who wasn't a journalist, are you seriously suggesting that to the Tribunal?
A. We11, I am not suggesting what you just said, no, I am not suggesting that.
247 Q. Al1 right. Just in relation to the source that the Tribunal is interested in, that's Superintendent Taylor. You had dealings with Superintendent Taylor in 12:11 2013, 2014?
A. Yes, he was the Garda Press Officer.

248 Q. And I think that the Tribunal investigators showed you a chart with communications between Superintendent Taylor and yourself, it's at page 5019 of the materials. And I think that you acknowledge the number that had been phoned by Superintendent Taylor as being your number, but you raised an objection in relation to the Tribunal having come into possession and the manner
which the Tribunal came into possession of that material, isn't that right?
A. You said I raised an objection, is it?

249 Q. Yes.
A. We11, I believe I confirmed my number.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. I think what we did was, it was with the rider that the legal team make a submission.
Q. Yes.
A. Is what I understand I said.

CHA RMAN We11 that's perfectly fine, yes.
252 Q. MR. MARR NAN You then went on I think at page 5983 of the material, and you said at line 84:
"I wi sh to provi de the following statement in rel ation
to the terns of reference of the Tri bunal and the questions that I may be asked here today. I am attending this meeting at the request of the solicitor to the Tribunal. My attendance is vol untary. I appreciate that it is the duty of the Tribunal to gather all evi dence and information which is rel evant to its terns of reference. I am happy to cooperate with the Tribunal and I amin attendance today to assist the Tribunal in its investigations. I have revi ewed the materials supplied to me by the Tri bunal, i ncl uding the wai vers si gned by Superintendent Davi d Tayl or, former Commi ssi oner Martin Callinan and former Commíssi oner Nói rín Ơ Sullivan. I note that the issue of what is known as journalistic privilege may well
arise for consi deration by the Tribunal in the next phase of its public hearings and 1 reserve the right to make submissions in this regard at the appropriate time. Wile I amhere to assist the Tribunal I believe that I cannot answer any questions that may reveal a confidential source or that might have the tendency to reveal a confidential source on account of the obl i gations l have towards my sources in my capacity as a journalist. I reserve the right to refer to this statement when answering any questions put to me by the 12:14 Tribunal investigators."

And I think that in relation to all the questions that are set out at page 4985, 4986 and 4987 and 4988 of the memo of interview with you, you adopted that stance, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, my screen -- it wasn't coming up on my screen but I take it as read what you said. It was coming up intermittently.
Sorry, sorry. So that is your position in relation to
it. Are you happy from observing the business of the Tribunal that the Tribunal isn't interested in trying to ascertain any other sources other than Superintendent Taylor?
A. Yes, I am. That is probably why I agreed to supplying my mobile phone number.

254 Q. Yes. So you are happy that the waiver was voluntary, you are happy that the Tribunal isn't trying to delve into any other sources that you may or may not have.

So what we are really dealing with is an assertion made by Superintendent Taylor that he briefed you negatively in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe and drew your attention to the fact that he had other motives and agendas and that historically he had a child sexual abuse allegation. You are declining to answer the question as to whether or not that is true, is that right?
A. That's correct, for reasons of journalistic privilege, yes.

255 Q. In terms of Nóirín O'Sullivan, were you ever briefed negatively about Sergeant McCabe by Nóirín O'Sullivan?
A. My same response applies.

256 Q. And by Martin Callinan?
A. The same again.

257 Q. The same response?
A. Yes.

258 Q. In terms of Superintendent Taylor, what is the basis of your claim of privilege in relation to him? what relationship did you have with him at the time?
A. Just kind of two separate questions there, I think.
Q. Well, what relationship did you have with him at the time?
A. I had a purely professional relationship with Superintendent Taylor. He was the Garda Press Officer. 12:17 We would have been in regular contact.

260 Q. As Garda Press Officer and journalist?
A. Yes, I mean -- no, not as anything else.

261 Q. Yes. So in those terms, did he speak on the record and
off the record to you?
A. I can't comment on any off-the-record conversations I have with anybody, not just with Superintendent Taylor, but with anyone. But your other part of your question is did $I$ have on the record conversations with him, yes, of course I did. A11 right. So it's not in relation to revealing the identity of a source, it's whether you are confirming that somebody is or is not a source?
A. Sorry, could you ask that question again?

Q. You are not revealing the identity of a source, what you are objecting to is confirming the identity of a source?
A. I'm not a 100 percent clear as to what exactly you are asking.
Q. Well, obviously if a journalist is pressed in relation to who their source was for particular information, a journalist is going to resist that and claim journalistic privilege, and they are going to do that in circumstances, for a variety of reasons, but primarily to protect the source against further inquiries or whatever, or perhaps prosecution, I don't know. But that's obviously one of the instances where journalistic privilege would arise. It doesn't arise in circumstances where the source has come forward and said I am the source of information, isn't that right?
A. You could have a situations where you have an alleged source.
Q. Sorry, I don't understand.
A. The source may allege he was the source, or she, for that matter.
Q. Yes.
A. It's the journalist's privilege to -- or actually, it's the -- it's an obligation on the journalist to protect the identity of who is or is not a source.
Q. So fundamentally, you regard this as being the journalist's privilege?
A. Well, it's an obligation on the journalist. The other part of privilege is to ensure that there is a free
flow of information from sources to journalists, that is another key part of what -- what is known as journalistic privilege is.
Q. So therefore, it's an absolute rule?
A. I don't think there is any absolute rules in life, as legal people know.
Q. Well, what are the exceptions then to it?
A. I think it has -- I mean, it may be dealt with in legal submissions, but it has -- when it has come up in the European Court of Human Rights and elsewhere, the judge 12:21 is tasked with balancing rights. From my understanding of it, they balance the journalistic -- the right of journalistic privilege with the right of acting in the public good or, the Chair probably knows better than I, obviously there is -- like in everything in life, there ${ }_{12: 21}$ is a balance of rights.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes, indeed, but I am coming back to the claim of privilege in the first instance. And when is it not an absolute rule? when can it be proper for a journalist to reveal the identity of a source?
A. Well, ultimately that is the Chair's --

274 Q. No, but you have to have a position in relation to it because you have adopted a position here.
A. Well, that is my position, yes.

Yes. But you have adopted that position in circumstances where the sources, if they be sources, and all three of them have given a waiver in relation to any journalistic privilege that should arise, and
you have still seen fit in those circumstances to make a claim of journalistic privilege. So I think it's reasonable for me to ask you, in what circumstances would it be permissible or proper for you not to make a claim of privilege in relation to communications that you had with the source?
A. I'm not sure what circumstances might apply for that to arise. I don't know, is my honest answer. well, can you envisage circumstances? I mean, you must have thought about it, this goes to the root of your profession.
A. I don't know what circumstances could justify it. My obligation is to protect, not just current sources, but also people who might want to come forward in the future and provide confidential information. That is an essential part of journalistic privilege; is that flow of information into the future.
277 Q. So it would appear, I mean it does appear that on your approach to it, that it is an absolute rule because you can't envisage any circumstances where you would break the rule?

MR. QU N: I think, Chair, that is an unfair question, the witness hasn't said that, and he is being asked a hypothetical question I can't see how it rises. He has said he is satisfied in this situation his position is as stated. I don't see how it's fair to explore hypotheticals that aren't relevant to this.
CHA RMAN Hypotheticals, Mr. Quinn, I think are very much relevant to this because it's attempting to tease
out where we stand and why we stand there and what are the facts and circumstances that are particular to this. And I think I need to know more. I mean, there is no circumstance on earth where people simply say privilege and the court says, fine. If you take even lawyers' privilege, there is a distinction drawn by the courts between legal assistance, such as drafting a contract on somebody, and legal advice, which is different, where you go to a lawyer and say, I murdered so-and-so, now the police are coming to talk to me or unfortunately in the course of an operation $I$ have picked the wrong medicine and the old person on the operating theatre died, and I was very tired, now the police are coming to talk to me, what is your advice in relation to cooperating? Should I say that? And what 12:25 could my potential liability be? So in the first instance, drafting a contract doesn't apply at a11, and in the second instance, it does, for the benefit of society. So that is what Mr. Marrinan is trying to tease out. And I actually think I need to know as much 12:25 as I can about this before I make a ruling so it I think it would be helpful if Mr. Marrinan continued.

278 Q. MR. MARR NAN It does appear that, on your approach to it, you are approaching this as though it was an absolute rule?
A. We11, that's your interpretation of it.

279 Q. We11, I am asking you, are you approaching this on the basis that it's an absolute rule?
A. I don't see it that way. I am putting forward -- I see
this as my obligation to protect sources and not reveal who they may or may not be. It has been a feature of the Becker and Goodwin judgments before, that the free-flow of information to journalists is fundamental to press freedom and it's fundamental to how I operate as a journalist. Any action of a journalist that is seen, that is seen to confirm the identity of a source, I think it has -- the phrase has been used, a chilling effect, it certainly has unforeseen consequences and I cannot see anything other than very serious consequences to the flow of information to journalists if they are seen in whatever the circumstances are to confirm the identity of a source.
280 Q. Well, if we apply it to this particular case with superintendent Taylor, he is making this claim, he is calling on you as being a person that he says that he had imparted information to, to confirm that he did that. He is in jeopardy, being condemned as a liar unless people support him in this regard. I mean, in that situation, would you not feel under an obligation to him, and we'11 go back to the hypothetical situation, but apply those set of circumstances to it, would you not feel under an obligation to your source or are you just happy to abandon a source in those circumstances?
A. I don't think -- I can't -- I am unable to answer the specific question --

281 Q. Yes.
A. -- in relation to the specific person.

But you see, there could be a perfectly valid argument that free-flow of information would dry up in circumstances where the word would go out to potential sources that they are going to be abandoned by the journalist, there is a possibility that that could occur.
A. You could make that argument. My belief is that if a journalist is seen, seen as confirming who a source is, that has most definitely a chilling effect, and that will have, or could have, serious implications for the flow of information.

284 Q. Even in circumstances where the journalist is calling for the -- the source is calling for the journalist to come to his aid?
A. Privilege is not that, I suppose, of the source. The source can waive their privilege, it is still the
journalist's obligation not to be seen to confirm the identity of who a source is or who a source is not.
Q. And do you explain that to a source at the outset?
A. You mean, do $I$ sit down at the beginning with a source and explain that? No, I haven't. I think it's generally understood when a course speaks to you it is in confidence.
Q. How do you know that?
A. We11, through practice, I have been a journalist for however many years, 20-odd years, that is the clear understanding when you speak to somebody in confidence and that's their understanding, that do you not breach that. You do not betray that trust. So in any event, Mr. o'keeffe, your position is that you are going to refuse to answer any questions on the basis of journalistic privilege, that I ask you in relation to former Commissioner Nóirín o'Sullivan, former Commissioner Martin Callinan and also Superintendent David Taylor, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

288 Q. And it in fact those further, because even if I ask you as to whether or not you got information from a member of An Garda Síochána, you are not going to answer that question either, is that right?
A. I feel it is the same predicament that applies. I
don't feel that I can answer those questions.
289 Q. And indeed, it extends even further because if I ask you the question about anybody other than a fellow journalist, you have refused to answer that question
also?
A. You said other than a fellow journalist, is it?

290 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, if they were a source, yes.

MR. MARR NAN I think the rest of it is for legal
argument. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

CHA RMAN Do you want to ask any questions?
MR. MEGARRY: I don't have any questions, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS WAS THEN QUESTI ONED BY THE CHAN RMAN

291 Q. CHA RMAN Look, Mr. O'Keeffe, the situation I am in is that there has been an occasion and it's in the very recent past where a submission has been made to me by a party to the effect that if someone is saying I refuse to deny that Superintendent Taylor briefed me negatively, $I$ am going to be asked in the future when this thing comes to an end, perhaps next week, perhaps the weeks after, I don't know, perhaps next year, perhaps in ten years' time, I have no idea, an inference; in other words, they will put up to me if the person refuses to answer the question that clearly means they were negatively briefly. Now, you are worried about traps, you are worried legitimately it seems to me about your profession, and I have to respect that, of course I respect that, but even when it comes to the question of did Martin Callinan personally approach you and say to you this man is a child abuser, namely Maurice McCabe, you are actually
refusing to answer that. I mean, let me ask you this question: Did you ever speak to Martin Callinan when he was Commissioner of An Garda Síochána?
A. Did I ever speak to him? I can't recollect. He -- I would have spoke to him very, very rarely.
CHA RMAN Yeah. We11, from the fact that you can hardly recollect it, it seems to me that if he did come to you and say Maurice McCabe is a serial sex abuser who has ruined the lives of several young women, that that would certainly jump out in your mind on me asking ${ }_{\text {12:33 }}$ you that question, wouldn't it?
A. But see, I have to be consistent in -CHAI RMAN I know, but there is a degree to which people are consistent, for instance, in relation to matters like ideology and religion and sometimes it is actually farcical and ludicrous, and I am not saying that you are in that position. I mean, there comes a point at which something is just plain contrary to reason and commonsense. Now, you say to me, I hardly ever spoke to Martin Callinan, and I presume that what you are saying there is that you may have met him at a function or you may have been down in Cork in relation to commemorating one of the Gardaí who died in the course of duty or something like that, and he shook your hand and said hello and you exchanged pleasantries, I take it that that is what you are saying to me? That means, by the way, he is not a source.
A. I am sorry, Chair, I just have to go back to my basic
position: I can't say anything that may or may not identify who a source is. I am not trying to be unreasonable.

CHA RMAN Look at it this way: Let's suppose it helped Martin Callinan for me to know that you, the kind of person with whom he might confide what he thought about Maurice McCabe, did not confide what he thought he knew about Maurice McCabe, that would at least be some evidence of some kind. You are saying I hardly ever spoke to him. Would I be wrong to take the 12:35 inference from that -- do you know what an inference is? In other words, you have a fact, you have another fact, and that leads you to conclude a third fact, even though the person doesn't actually explicitly say the fact. Would I be wrong to infer that Martin Callinan never said anything to you about Maurice McCabe, good, bad or indifferent?
A. But, Chair, the danger is, if you confirm somebody is not a source, okay, you are narrowing down who may be a source.

295 Q. CHA RMAN We11, I can see your point. I have referred to this on a number of occasions in the past, but $I$ am going to refer to it again, Mr. O'Keeffe, because I think it's an important that we have a dialogue, that we try and tease things out as much as position, but the submissions, whatever they may be, will ultimately remain to me. In the past in this country we have had financial scandals about people having particularly kinds of deposits, about people, for instance, having
money offshore, and when I was working as a criminal barrister, I suppose I was well-known to know kind of arcane knowledge about things like extradition, the relationship of the tax acts to criminal law, etcetera, etcetera. But I happened to hear a rumour in relation to a person that I knew, that he was someone who had one of these, let's just call it a toxic account, and on one occasion in the Law Library in the coffee room, that rumour was repeated. Now, I happened to have a list of the people who had these accounts in my room, and it happened to be a situation where $I$ was being asked to give advice in relation to, I won't say what, but it was something in relation to criminal law, applicability, taxation, extradition, that kind of very broad area, I don't think I am telling you anything now, the person in question wasn't on the list, he wasn't one of the people who had the toxic deposits, and I just said, well, I have the list in my office, by the way, and the person is not on it. The rumours then absolutely ceased. As I said before to other people, they could have got as far as the newspapers, it could have caused terrible trouble to this person. I was telling the truth. Other people have said, oh you broke professional confidence - well, I didn't because the person in question wasn't actually a client of mine, but I knew horrible things were being said about him. In the event that his name or her name was actually on the list, if I had said anything to confirm that, I would definitely have been breaching
professional confidence and I don't know personally in terms of my own conscience I would have ever got over that. So maybe you'd tell me in relation to saying to people, look, that rumour that is being spread among four or five people sitting having a cup of coffee in the morning, is actually completely incorrect, was I wrong to do that?
A. Well, I wouldn't make that judgement of you, but I suppose if another solicitor came to you and asked you the same question, and you also confirmed no, your client is not on the list, what if a third comes to you and asks you the same question, and that client is on the list, well then what do you say?
296 Q. CHAN RMAN We11, I think there is a point at which you have to say, look, enough questions have been asked. But I think the situation that was happening there was akin to a fire starting on the side of a hill which was definitely going to spread, given the weather conditions and which could have led to disastrous consequences. Now, there is no way I would have ever confirmed that somebody was on the list. Okay, maybe the people who might be well enough off to have, let us say, a toxic account or whatever in this country, might amount to 10,000 or 20,000 , I agree with you, there is a point where you say I can't give you any more information than that, but stopping the rumour in its tracks was the right thing to do. I felt it was. Was I wrong?
A. Well, in my mind you have set a precedent, you have
answered somebody's question when they asked you.
297 Q. CHA RMAN No, they didn't, I actually volunteered it.
A. Oh you volunteered it? okay.

298 Q. CHAI RMAN Absolutely.
A. Well, if you heard that the rumour was spread, okay, if 12:39 it wasn't $X$ then it could be $Y$, and the solicitor of $Y$ approaches you and said is my client on the list and the client is on the list and you don't answer that question.
CHA RMAN We11, in those circumstances my duty is absolutely and perfectly clear. I don't give anyone any information in relation to either who my clients are or what they are asking me about.
A. I am not sure if I am following you clearly. But I think you initially confirmed somebody wasn't on the list.

300 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Well then, what do you do in a situation if you were approached by the solicitor of a client or whoever, and that person is on the list, well then what do you say?
301 Q. CHA RMAN We11, I wasn't prosecuting, I was actually acting for all of these people so that would never happen. I was acting, if you like, for the alleged miscreants, so none of their solicitors were going to approach me and ask is so-and-so's name is on the list because they know whose name is on the list because they are instructing me and they are asking me whatever the legal position is about whatever it is, toxic accounts, wherever they may be.
A. Maybe I have lost the exact train of thought or what you are proposing to me.
Q. CHA RMAN what I am putting to you is this, and I am not trying to personalise this, it's not about me, it's about a situation, $I$ just thought it may be helpful, it 12:40 may not. A lot of people have said to me I am telling you for a fact that Nóirín O'Sullivan never briefed me and we never had a word at all about Maurice McCabe, a lot of people have said that. And they are journalists. You feel you can't?
A. I can't answer for other journalists.

303 Q. CHA RMAN I am entitled to ask you about questions on the record, amn't I?
A. Yes.

304 Q. CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, is it on the record that 12:41 you ever met Nóirín O'Sullivan?
A. Yes, I would have met her, yes.
Q. CHA RMAN And have you ever spoken to her on the phone?
A. On the record, I have never spoken to her on the phone. 12:41 Not that I can recall, anyway.

306 Q. CHAN RMAN We11, I mean on-the-record or off-the-record, it's a simple question, have you ever spoken to her on the phone?
A. I know, but you asked me about official dealings.

307 Q. CHA RMAN We11, you were about to say no, and if you played back the tape you said "mmm" and then you thought about it twice, and you seem to be back to your ideologic position.
A. Well, I would suggest it's a principled position. Ideological might have connotations to it. But this is a practical principled position and it's one that is recognised, as you know, in the courts. It's not
something that I am making up. CHA RMAN No, I know. And probably, I am not helping by calling it by that word. But if we go back to a situation then, let's go back to Martin Callinan, am I allowed to ask you when did you ever meet Martin Callinan?
A. When did I ever meet him?
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. I think I met him on the stairs once going up to some event, that was it. I think that was before he was Commissioner.

310 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes. And when he was Commissioner, did you ever meet him on the stairs or off the stairs or anywhere?
A. I would have met him, yes.

311 Q. CHA RMAN And I take it that that was in the context of his official duties.
A. Correct.

CHA RMAN Kind of ceremonial type duties.
A. We11, I mean, it could be an official Garda briefing about some operation, $I$ am not sure. It would be an official event, yes.

313 Q. CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, okay. That's fine. I am inferring from that that he never briefed you negatively about Maurice McCabe. I am taking that.

You can tell me if I am wrong.
A. Chair, I can't really add to what I have said. I'm not trying to be awkward.
314 Q.
CHA RMAN Similarly Nóirín O'Sullivan, did you ever meet Nóirín O'Sullivan?
A. Yes, of course $I$ have met her, yes.

CHA RMAN Yes. And were your relations with her just the ordinary relations of on the record relations?
A. They would be standard professional relations with a Commissioner, yes.
316 Q. CHA RMAN And she is not trying to slip you anything about Maurice McCabe, I take it?
A. See, you are being specific to individuals. My position regarding anyone who may, and I stress this, or may or may not be a source, I can't comment on.
317 Q. CHA RMAN A11 right. And when it comes to David Taylor, did you have interactions with him? I know you have written extensively on the whole issue of crime --
A. Yes.

318 Q
CHA RMAN -- and law reform. So presumably you would have had conversations with him?
A. He was the official Garda spokesman and I was the crime correspondent so, yes, I would have regularly have had dealings with him.
319 Q CHA RMAN Yes. We11, the number of contacts is not as great as indeed the number that many others would have had. But that's not a reflection on you and it's not in any way an indication that you weren't trying to do your job, which I am absolutely certain you are. And
then when we come then to this, it seems that anything to do with Maurice McCabe you, in accordance with what I have written down as you answering Mr. Marrinan, you came to this story very late and began to write about him perhaps in February 2014 there or thereabouts.
A. Yes, I believe so.

CHA RMAN Do you have any recollection of the date of the first article?
A. I think it was 20 something, I think it was in relation to, it could be the dossier, I'm not entirely sure.
321 Q. CHA RMAN The dossier going from Micheál Martin to the Taoiseach?
A. Yes, and getting a reaction from the Garda management.

322 Q. CHAN RMN Yes. No, I understand that. And then more than once, in or around that time, do you think it was after you published that article you heard something to the effect that there was generally a sexual allegation and then it was something to do with a child, do you think it was after that article, are we going into march, in other words?
A. I don't know for sure. Al1 I know is my coverage was started I think the 20 -odd of February, and then there was a lot of articles around then, I did a lot of articles around the Garda Inspectorate report and then a lot of articles around the Guerin Report which was I think in May, so I'm just estimating that it would be February, March, April, May time.
323 Q. CHA RMAN Yeah. We11, you know when Martin Callinan resigned, don't you?
A. I think it was March, was it?

324 Q. CHA RMAN Hmm. So if I can just try and give you an exact date. It was the 24th March 2014.
A. okay.
A. Yeah. At some level I did over a period of time, I would imagine, yes.

CHA RMAN One of the places you could have gone was, you could have asked Mr. Clifford do you know about this thing and what do you say about it? There would be nothing wrong with that. And I don't think you would be telling me anything that would come as news to me in the event that you did.
A. Yes, I actually don't know if I checked it with Mick at the time.

CHA RMAN And I am not asking you who you checked it with but do you remember who you checked it with?
A. Not clearly in terms of the various people I might have checked it with.

330 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. So you checked it with basically anyone who you thought might have information. And -A. We11, somebody that, in my trust maybe, you know.

CHA RMAK Yes, no. Did you come to a point where you said to yourself, well, there is something serious in the background or did you come to a point where you said to yourself, my reaction to be very cautious was correct and my reaction to be sceptical was correct?
A. You know, I am obviously looking back at that time but I believe my position from the start was, this is not something I am going to follow.

CHA RMAN Right. We11, I have heard reasons why journalists don't follow things and they all seem to me to be very sensible reasons, such as, for instance, look, there was an investigation, be it by social services or Gardaí, and you can't publish allegations where, at the end of the day, the DPP says look, if this happened, it didn't even amount to an assault, never mind a sexual assault.
A. I mean, it's the worst or one of the worst conceivable 12:48 allegations you could make against somebody, and what do you with it? Am I going to ring the person and put it to them? Am I going to circulate it amongst various people I might check it with, and then they go, hold on, this is Cormac o'Keeffe, he is checking out the story and this is what he said to me? So, from the get-go, you know, it's not necessarily that I sat down and made a formal decision about it, but my instinct from the start was, this is not something I am going to
pursue.
333 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. And that instinct was confirmed. How long did it take you to check things out?
A. We11, given how hectic that period was between February, March, April and May when the Guerin Report was out, I'm pretty sure that it would have been in that time period.

334 Q. CHA RMAN So are we talking about pretty much later on then? The 6th May 2014 is the Seán Guerin Report, critical of the previous Garda handling of the matter.
A. Yes.

335 Q. CHA RMAN So would it have been after that time?
A. No, I would imagine it's between that period of February and May, but I mean, I can't be absolutely sure.

336 Q. CHA RMAN Right. We11, the evidence that I have, and at the moment $I$ have no reason to doubt it, but anything that I say is subject to hearing things, I am not here making ex cathedra statements, the evidence that I have from David Taylor is that as soon as Commissioner Callinan resigned, 24th March 2014, that was the end of any campaign that he alleges that he was running. For various reasons, that was the end. One of the things he said, he was never in the Commissioner's office again. That has been contradicted; apparently he was there once, according to questions put by the Gardaí. Secondly, a new issue had arisen then which was important which was the taping of people in police stations, that blew up on
the day of his resignation. And then thirdly, basically, the Commissioner having gone, there would be no point of any kind whatsoever to the campaign. So do you think you checked it out prior to Commissioner Callinan resigning on 24th March 2014?
A. Well, that would tend to make sense, but I can't confirm that for sure, but that -- it --
337 Q. CHAL RMAN Yes, because --
A. -- seems reasonable.

CHA RMAN Yes. If I'm wrong, and I may be wrong, that ${ }_{12: 50}$ does tend to narrow the window, because you start writing about it on the 20th February 2014, you hear a rumour, and you really only have a window of -- you actually have a window of four weeks and four days within which anyone could come and brief you negatively ${ }^{12: 50}$ about Sergeant McCabe.
A. Well, that is the time period, but that is if I am accurate in when I said these --
339 Q. CHA RMAN We11, I presume you are reasonably accurate. yes, so there it is. So I take it that you are taking ${ }_{\text {12:51 }}$ a view different to what other journalists have said, that if you know a negative different to the view that I took in relation to a particular scandal, the name is on the top of my tongue and I am not going to mention it, you take the view that you can't actually confirm a $12: 51$ denial that this never happened to me?
A. Sorry, I think I followed you, but could you just repeat it?
340 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. In other words, you are taking the
view that you can't actually say this never happened to me ?
A. Well, that is -- certainly, in my evidence, I haven't said that, no.

CHA RMAN No. But, I mean, David Taylor is saying that he came to you and said, you want to be careful about this fellow because you know there is an allegation about him in the past and he is embittered in consequence of the investigation, on the phone, whether it happened face-to-face, what the surrounding details are. Can I just ask you a question: what would you have done in the event that someone said that to you? Would you have regarded it as a story worth following up, first of all - and this is hypothetical would you have regarded it as a story worth following up, such as Garda management are out to get Maurice McCabe? Or secondly, would you have actually said anything as a journalist such as, what do you mean, what are the details?
A. We11, you are asking a hypothetical situation, is it? 12:52

341 Q. CHA RMAN We11, it is very much a hypothetical situation, but it's really almost to do with instinct. You know, if --
A. I mentioned instinct earlier when I heard the half-gossip. I think I would be -- I would be sceptical from the outset, particularly given the nature of such allegations. That would be, 1 think, my starting point at least.
342 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. But as I understand it, there are some
circumstances in life where, to use the phrase, 'I was literally lost for words' might actually be appropriate. would this be a situation where you'd, you feel, be lost for words, or would you actually engage in a dialogue with a person?
A. Speaking hypothetically, of course, I think if information like that was given to you, you wouldn't be human if you weren't struck by it, I mean, given the nature of the information. And yes, given you are a journalist, even though you are sceptical, your instinct is there, but obviously your professional training is to ask questions, that is what we do, and we are told stuff all the time, and contrary to what, maybe, certain people believe, we don't necessarily go along with everything we are told.
343 Q. CHAN RMN No, I can fully understand that. And while I do understand paper doesn't refuse ink, I mean, you say something to an inquiring mind, I suspect you would get an inquiry back?
A. Well, that would be natural and that probably would be the beginning of the work that you would do.
344 Q. CHA RMAN If that had happened, and again we are speaking purely hypothetically, would it be the case that you'd speak to Mick Clifford? Would it be the case that you would have said to yourself, look, there is a story here, the story not being Maurice McCabe but the denigration of Maurice McCabe, a story worth following up, in other words a story worth pursuing, not the story is he a child abuser, is he not a child
abuser, and you were sceptical about that, but what in heaven's name is the Garda Press Office doing denigrating someone who they are, as the Garda Press office is, to represent; in other words, would you see this as a story?
A. I don't want to annoy you, but can you just ask me the question again?
345 Q. CHAL RMAN Yes. No, no, no, there is no problem asking the question again. Let's suppose we have a situation where the Garda Press office is, on the QT, telling you ${ }_{12: 55}$ something about an officer in the Garda to the effect that the person is, let's say, a serial sex abuser and a number of women have made complaints but none of them were prepared to go to court or even to a Garda discipline hearing, in those circumstances would you regard that as a story? One story, of course, is that this is true, that this person has no respect for women and is a lothario of a particularly obnoxious kind, but if he is not a lothario of a particularly obnoxious kind, why are Garda sources saying this to me? There is two potential stories there, in other words.
A. Hmm. Like, in relation to information you are given, I suppose you have to assess it. I suppose, at the end of the day, you are a journalist, so at the forefront of your mind is always: is there something that can be ${ }^{12: 56}$ published out of this? okay. So -- and you have massive demands on your time. So if -- it's hard to give a definitive answer, I suppose, to that question, but that is one aspect that would be to the forefront
of your mind: is this something that can be remotely publishable?
Q.

CHA RMAN And then the other question may be: Is this one of these great untold stories, like the wealth of the former Taoiseach, Charlie Haughey, that didn't get published until a tribunal had to look into it? In other words, the story that is floating around, why is the story floating around? would that be another?
A. We11, I mean, I can refer you back to, I mean, to the McCabe issue. My colleague, Mick Clifford, was leading 12:57 this issue and he was exploring all of these avenues and more.

CHA RMAN okay. And in the event that that had happened, would you have gone to Mick Clifford and said, look, this is worth investigating, I wonder why this may be said? And again speaking hypothetically.
A. We11, that would certainly make sense, to do that. CHA RMAN A11 right. Okay. I understand.
A. Yes.

CHAN RMAN So I'm -- I don't have any further questions, unless anyone has any questions they wish to ask? You are entitled to explore the matter if you wish. Mr. McGarry?
MR. MEGARRY: No, thank you, Chairman.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. FERRY:

348 Q. MR. FERRY: We11, just on Superintendent Taylor's behalf, I have just formally put it to you that my
instructions are that you were a journalist that was negatively briefed in early 2014 by Superintendent Taylor and that you were briefed in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe, that he was motivated by
maliciousness and revenge against the Gardaí and that he was driven by agendas, and that related to a previous allegation that had been investigated in relation to him, so I am formally putting that to you on behalf of my client.
A. Yes. I'm unable to say anything that may or may not identify a source.

MR FERRY: Thank you.
MR KENEDY: No questions.
CHA RMAN No questions, yes. Mr. Quinn, you are at the end, if you wish to ask questions at the end.
MR. FITZGERALD Sorry, Chairman. Mr. O'Keeffe, John Fitzgerald --
CHA RMAN Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, did you want to ask any questions?
MR. Ó MU RCFEARTA GH No questions, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. FI TZGERALD

349 Q. MR. FITZGERALD Sorry, Mr. o'Keeffe. You were asked earlier on by Mr. Marrinan about the potential your privilege in circumstances where, if you answered a question, it might, in fact, be to his benefit for you to answer it. I act on behalf of An Garda

Síochána. I suppose specifically for the purpose of this question, I act on behalf of former commissioner o'Sullivan and Callinan. In circumstances where you won't say one way or the other whether they briefed you negatively against Sergeant McCabe, do you understand the unfairness to them of you refusing to answer that question?
A. If I can answer it hypothetically, unfortunately. I can understand, hypothetically, that argument, but you -- if you have a position where you can't say anything that may or may not identify a source, you can't cherry-pick how you answer that question, if that makes sense, so it has to be consistent as to all the parties concerned, because you are narrowing it down otherwise if you do so.
well, Mr. O'keeffe, I am not going to debate the law with you, I think that will come perhaps with Mr. Quinn on your behalf in due course, but we seem to be back to the absolute position that you won't disclose or that you won't answer that question in any circumstances. Now, what we will be saying in our submissions is that your refusal to do so is very, very unfair to our clients, and I'm simply affording you the opportunity to respond to that.
A. I can understand what you are saying, but I am -- I feel I am unable to add to what my position is. CHAI RMAN I think it may be appropriate that I say something here. Given that what I have been told in relation to the relationship between Mr. O'Keeffe, as a
journalist, and Nóirín O'Sullivan and Martin Callinan, I regard it as not conceivable that there was any such communication on the state of evidence as it now exists in this particular instance.
MR. FI TZGERALD Thank you, Chairman. I have no further questions.
CHA RMAN Now, maybe I am wrong, maybe there will be a submission to the contrary, I don't know. Well, Mr. McGarry, would you like to make a submission to the contrary? I am not saying you should do it now. Is
that one of the things that you'd contemplate?
MR. MtGARRY: Well, we are contemplating making a submission about -- at the end of this particular module, about all of the evidence that has been given, but I am not going to make that submission just at this particular moment in time. It's not a submission necessarily limited or a submission on the issue of privilege per se, it's more a submission as to what the Tribunal should -- or what conclusions the Tribunal ought to draw from the totality of the evidence, but I'm not -- I don't think I should make a submission in relation to the specifics of this particular -- that particular answer in this particular case.
CHA RMAN We11, there was a submission made by Mr. McDowell last week that, in consequence of an answer given, that he would ask me to draw an inference. Are you asking me to draw an inference in relation to Commissioner Callinan or Commissioner o'sullivan?

MR. MtGARRY: We11, Chairman, I think where witnesses provide evidence that is very, very specific and very deliberate and carefully specific about certain things, which is categoric, which confirms certain things, such as the first witness this morning saying, in relation to a very specific thing and a specific point in time, that he became aware of or was not aware of prior to, and then refuses to answer other questions about other issues, we will be making a submission to the effect that the Tribunal is entitled to infer that it is possible, or at least it is possible on the balance of probabilities, that that witness was briefed or was in receipt of information, particularly where there is other evidence to the effect that that is the case, if that other evidence comes from Superintendent Taylor or 13:03 from other journalists or from other sources, that may well be the case, but in this particular --
CHA RMAK There isn't any other evidence. This is an instance, there is Mr. O'Keeffe and there is Superintendent Taylor. That is it. There is nothing else.

MR. MtGARRY: Yes. I accept that, in this particular case, that may well not be the case.
CHA RMAK okay. All right. So where do we stand? Is there any other questions?
MR. FI TZGERALD Sorry, no further questions.
CHA RMAN Mr. Marrinan, do you want to ask any further questions?
MR. MARRI NAN Does Mr. Quinn want to ask any
questions?
MR. QU N: No, Chair. Thank you.

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

351 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Just, this may be difficult for you to answer, I don't know, but do you believe that you have any information that would impact on the workings of the Tribunal but you fee1 constrained to assist the Tribunal because of the strictures of journalistic privilege?
A. If I understand your question correctly, I don't see how $I$ can answer that question without it contradicting my previous answers.
We11, I wonder whether you would be. I mean, this isn't going to reveal a source or tend to reveal a source. I am just talking in the round in terms of the workings of the Tribunal. You see, the problem we have is this: that a number of journalists initially claimed journalistic privilege and then abandoned that claim recently, in circumstances where it turned out that, in fact, they had no information to offer the Tribunal at all in relation to the issues before the Tribuna1. Do you understand?
A. Yes.

353 Q. So it would appear, and indeed one of them I think accepted, that the claim of privilege was made on a point of principle, do you understand? So I don't know whether you fall into that category as somebody who is
making a claim of privilege on a point of principle because you can't envisage any exceptions to the rule, or whether you are doing so in circumstances where there is a genuine reason why you are not doing it; in other words, that you don't want to give evidence to the Tribunal that might be relevant but could identify a source?
A. That is quite a lot to take in.
yes. We11, I know it is, but you'11 understand where I am coming from?
A. Of course I do. I completely appreciate the Tribunal's task in this. Yes, my position is one of principle, as I have said, and I would like to say again, I have -- I have done nothing wrong here.
Q. Yes.
A. I have written nothing wrong. I never proposed doing anything. But my overriding obligation is not to do anything that could endanger the flow of information from sources, either now or in the future, to journalists, and that -- I -- you mentioned a constraint; it's my obligation.
356 Q. Yes. But come back to the question that I asked you.
A. Sorry.

357 Q. I mean, do you believe that you have information that would impact on the workings of the Tribunal but you feel obliged to claim journalistic privilege?
A. I do feel obliged to claim journalistic privilege. 358 Q. But in circumstances where otherwise you would have information to give to the Tribunal?
A. I feel I am unable to answer that question because my obligation is to protect journalistic privilege. Well, can we exclude the possibility that you are claiming journalistic privilege just simply out of a point of principle, regardless of the circumstances in which you find yourself here giving evidence to the Tribuna1?
A. I am not crystal clear on what you are asking me. Can we exclude the possibility that you are merely, as a matter of course, claiming journalistic privilege here today?
A. I think it certainly would be fair to say that $I$ am not coming up here to do something out of a matter of course. I have considered this at some length, I have attended the Tribunal as well. This is a considered, and I would admit, it's a considered position I have taken and it's an obligation, it's an obligation on journalists to protect sources.
MR. MARR NAN Thank you very much.

THE WTNESS WAS THEN QUESTI ONED FURTHER BY THE CHAN RMAN

361 Q. CHA RMAN If I could just follow up, and I know we are way over time, Mr. Marrinan. One of the things that has been, I'd say the right word to use is disturbing me, is the whole notion that a journalist would come here and claim privilege and say, oh, I am not answering any of those questions, but are absolutely
free, tomorrow morning, in whatever newspaper you care to mention, to write an article, yes, I was approached, and then, without naming your sources, just set out the fact that various members of the Gardaí came to you and said nasty things about Maurice McCabe. I mean, it seems absurd, it seems absolutely and utterly absurd that I'm sitting here trying to find stuff out and you are absolutely and completely at liberty to write such an article in the newspaper tomorrow, if you have any information to that effect, but you are not going to tell me.
A. I have no intention of writing such an article.

362 Q. CHA RMN Well, do you have the material to write such an article?
A. Regarding revealing sources, absolutely not.

363 Q. CHA RMAN No, not revealing sources, but even saying -- look, you know, I have been reading newspapers all my life, and indeed it's what I do at my lunch hour, is I read a newspaper, and I read several at the weekend so I very much enjoy newspapers and I respect those who are writing in them. But, I mean, do you actually have any information which would enable you to write a story saying, oh, I was approached or somebody told me something about Maurice McCabe? That is what Mr. Marrinan was asking you.
A. I am unable and I would not say or write anything that I believe could and would identify sources.

364 Q. CHA RMN No, I appreciate that, and we take that as an absolute given, we take that as an absolute given,
as a bulwark which is never to be passed, taking that for the moment. But could you, in fact, write an article to the effect that people who you will not name approached you and told you things about Maurice McCabe, could you write such an article truthfully?
A. But this inquiry is set up for a very specific purpose with very specific named people in mind.
A. Well, --

CHAL RMAN You see, the problem is, you would be entitled to write that article tomorrow, or let's say the Tribunal report comes out in October and let's suppose it exonerates everybody and then you know this but you are going to say, we11, now is my chance to write this article, and then you write the article and it says that I got things wrong, and I am on7y a human being, after a11, I can't do anything more than assess what is there, $I$ am not writing a work of fiction, but in the event that it was a question of completely exonerating the Gardaí of ever wishing to undermine the messenger, namely Maurice McCabe, would you ever be in a position where you could write such an article and say, well, the messenger was undermined to me by members of the Gardaí?
A. I don't see how a situation would arise where I could do anything like that that I would see now as potentially be revealing a source. CHA RMAN Again, and this is a bit like a crossword puzzle the whole morning really, it's trying to work
out what people are actually trying to say to me. what you seem to be saying to me is that in the event that you were to write such an article, then it would be clear that the persons named in the terms of reference would somehow be implicated, is that what you --
A. Sorry, Chair, that wasn't what I meant.
Q. CHA RMAN We11, maybe you'd help me as to what you actually did mean.
A. That $I$ couldn't envisage writing any such piece that you are suggesting.
369 Q. CHA RMAN And does that mean you actually don't have any information to that effect? without revealing any sources, does it mean - that is what Mr. Marrinan asked you - that you don't actually have any information to the effect that there was any kind of attempt, anywhere, by any garda, to say that Maurice McCabe was not the person he was cracked up to be but, in fact, had an allegation against him in the past that there might be some validity to, or anything of that variety?
A. We11, I suppose that is the fundamental issue for me, is that $I$ believe that by -- that I can't say anything that may reveal who a source is or who is not. That is my position.
370 Q. CHA RMAN I know that. But, I mean, could you ever write an article to the effect that the Tribunal got it 13:14 wrong, in the event that the Tribunal exonerated the Garda?
A. I'd have to ask you to ask me that question again, sorry, Chair.

371 Q. CHA RMAN Could you ever write an article, if the Tribunal exonerated the Garda from ever trying to undermine the character of Maurice McCabe, saying, well, the Tribunal got it wrong because $I$ know to the contrary? You would be absolutely entitled, as a journalist, to write such an article, by the way. A. No, I couldn't see myself writing such an article. CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, again, I will think very carefully about everything you have said. So it's now -- what time is it? It's well after a quarter past 13:14 one, so we will take a break for an hour. Thank you.

## THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH

MS. LEADER: The next witness, sir, is Mr. Daniel McConnel1. His interview with the Tribunal investigators is in volume 19, page 5188 of the materials.

## MR. DAN EL MECONNELL, HAM NG BEEN SUDRN, MAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MS LEADER:

372 Q. MS. LEADER: Mr. McConne11, I think you're the political editor of the Irish Examiner?
A. That's correct.

373 Q. And prior to November 2015 I think you were the group political correspondent with Irish News and Media, is that correct?
A. That's one of a number of group political correspondents with INM, yes.
374 Q. And if you could, in brief, outline your career as a journalist to date.
A. Sure. I graduated from UCD with a BA in 2000, upon which I became the editor of the college newspaper. I then went on to do a journalism master's in DCU, out of which I did a placement with The Sunday Times. I then freelanced for The Sunday Times for a number of years, working on some of their major data projects, like the school league tables, the good hospitals guide, the rich list, etcetera. And then I freelanced for a year with the Irish Times, and then I subsequently moved to
the Sunday Independent, where I worked in total for about nine years, and then I moved to the Irish Examiner in late 2015.
Q. Now, I think for the relevant period that the Tribunal is looking at, you were with Irish News and Media?
A. Independent News \& Media.
Q. Independent News \& Media?
A. Yes.

And I think you wrote some articles in connection with the penalty points matter and in particular the Public Accounts Committee and the Sergeant McCabe -allegations that Sergeant McCabe was making and the cooperation issue, is that right?
A. That's correct.

378 Q. And I think those articles, as far as I can see, were written on the 2nd February 2014; the 6th February, possibly, 2014; and two articles on the 24th February?
A. They're not in front of me, but if you say so, I take your word for it.
Q. As far as I can see.
A. I take your word for it.

380 Q. You have seen them in the materials?
A. I have, I have seen them in the materials, yes.

381 Q. So you were generally interested, I think it is fair to say, in Sergeant-McCabe-related matters?
A. I would qualify that a bit.

382 Q. Yes.
A. My day job, essentially I covered the political -- or the Public Accounts Committee weekly for both the

Sunday Independent and later for the Irish Independent, so that was my bread and butter beat, if you know what I mean. It was only when Maurice McCabe became relevant to the Public Accounts Committee that I became involved in reporting on him as a figure. And then obviously the -- there was obviously a lot of controversy about the bringing of Maurice McCabe before the Public Accounts Committee, the circumstances of that, and obviously the very controversial meeting with the then-Commissioner Martin Callinan. You know, I would have reported on all of those matters.
383 Q. Now, I think in common with the last witness, your stance in relation to answering questions in relation to the terms of reference the Tribunal, which you are familiar with, I take it --
A. I am familiar, yes.

384 Q. -- is that you cannot answer any question that might reveal a confidential source or that might have the tendency to reveal a confidential source on account of the obligation that you think you have towards your sources in your capacity as a journalist?
A. That's correct.

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

386 Q. And that is what you told our investigators when you were interviewed in relation to the matter?
A. That is correct.

387 Q. And I think it is fair to say that your answers to the various questions put by the Tribunal investigators
refer back to that statement and you share them in common with the last witness?
A. Yes. Myself and Mr. O'Keeffe, you know, I think would be very -- would have very similar views in relation to the principle of journalistic privilege, the protection of sources and the protection of not only those but the gathering of information, and the statement $I$ gave to the Tribunal investigators reflected that and it's my position here today.
388 Q.
All right. Now, you've been following the Tribunal proceedings, is that correct?
A. I have, indeed.

389 Q. A11 right. And you understand that Superintendent David Taylor has named you as a journalist that he briefed negatively in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. I am aware of that, yes.

390 Q. okay. And in relation to the negative briefing, that would be drawing journalists' attention to an allegation of criminal misconduct against Sergeant McCabe?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

391 Q. You understand that?
A. I understand.

392 Q. A11 right. And in relation to what he says specifically in relation to you, if we could have page 149 of Day 74 up on the screen, please. You can be given a hard copy, if it's more convenient.
A. No, it's up on the screen now.
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Q. So what he says is:
"All right. We have statements --"

And he refers to your statement, Daniel McConne11, in relation to -- he is asked about those statements, okay?
A. Yes.
Q. And what Superintendent Taylor says:
"I have si gned my wai ver. I woul d encour age anybody to come forward. I want to assist and encourage anybody to assist in establishing the truth, Mr. Chai r."

And do you have any reason to believe that the waiver was anything but voluntary with regard to Superintendent Taylor?
A. I have no information as to that it was anything other than voluntary. okay. So do you accept that it was a voluntary waiver, so?
A. Well, on the face of it, yes, but $I$ have no information otherwise, so --
Q.

A11 right. okay. And if we could turn to page 163 of that transcript. Maybe we will start on page 162. He is referring -- Superintendent Taylor is referring to his -- at the very bottom of the page, at line 26:
"Mr. McConnell fromthe Irish Examiner, agai $n$ you were
provi ded with the record of your tel ephone and text contacts to him isn't that right?
A. Yes."

And then it transpired that he wasn't, and he is asked:
"So to be clear then, how di d you brief Mr. McConnell, or di d you brief hi megativel $y$ ?"

Superintendent Taylor is asked. And what
Superintendent Taylor says:
"I spoke to him on the landl ine and we' d have spoken when he rang re. I spoke to himby phone. Dani el McConnell is a respected journalist who deals with the political world that would have been around the PAC and in rel ation to the penalty points and how they were coming bef ore the PAC and the Dái l committees."

And then he is asked:
"Are you fairly clear then that it was over the phone? A. Yes."

And then he is asked:
"Are you placing it in or around the time of the PAC hearings?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you do this once or more than once with him Was it a concerted effort on your part?"

And Superintendent Taylor says:
"It could have been a couple of engagements."

So what it would appear that Superintendent Taylor was saying is that he briefed you negatively in relation to Sergeant McCabe, that happened around the time of the Public Accounts Committee hearings, it would have been over the phone and it would have been a couple of times. What is your response to that?
A. Well, in line with my statement, I can neither confirm nor deny that that happened, for reasons of journalistic privilege.
397 Q. All right. Now, I wonder if I turn to the beginning of Superintendent Taylor's evidence in relation to the matter. If I could turn to page 19 -- sorry, of Day 74. What he is saying is, he did this negative briefing, okay, which he says he negatively briefed you in relation to the matter, at the behest of former Commissioner Callinan. And Superintendent Taylor is asked at the time he was given the instruction by Commissioner Callinan, and if I could specifically refer to line 14 of that page of the transcript:
"Was it your view at that point in time as to any wrongdoing that the Commissioner had done or that you
had done on his behal f? Were you of the vi ew that he had done any wrong?
A. I wasn't aware of any wrongdoing by him"

So Superintendent Taylor is saying at the time of the negative briefing and at the time of the instruction, he wasn't aware of any wrongdoing in relation to the negative briefing, that he had respect for commissioner Callinan at the time. But later on when he left the guards, he realised -- and when I say left, when he was 14:28 suspended from duty - he still is a serving superintendent - he subsequently realised that it was wrong. Do you understand what Superintendent Taylor is saying?
A. I follow the -- yes, I follow the evidence.

398 Q. You will see it at page 20 , it would be at the very top of the page:
"Did you regard it as wrong?
A. At the time this was happening, no, but 1 subsequently did realise."

## Al1 right?

A. Mm-hmm.

399 Q. So what I am asking you, Mr. McConnel1, is, in view of the fact that Superintendent Taylor has waived privilege, has asked people to come forward, he said he has done something wrong in relation to the briefing of journalists negatively in relation to Sergeant McCabe,
does that in any way change your attitude to answering the question?
A. No, because I feel as compelled as Mr. O'Keeffe did in relation to our sources and protection of sources and also to the wider principle of gathering of information. I'm not in a position, I'm afraid, to either confirm or deny details in relation to that matter.

400 Q. You see what I really want to ask you, Mr. McConnel1, is: what exactly are you protecting? we know Superintendent Taylor's identity, we know that he has admitted he was doing wrong at the time, he has come out publicly and said that in his evidence to the Tribunal, and he is saying, specifically, on a number of occasions, over the phone, that he negatively briefed you in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Mm-hmm.

401 Q. So my question to you is: what are you protecting?
A. I'm protecting the principle and also the position that I have as a journalist who deals with confidential matters on a daily basis and dealing with people on a confidential basis every day, that I am just not in a position, because I'm compelled by an obligation I have to protect my own sources and to protect the people who I deal with, to get into any sort of discussion around information that either has or has not or may or may not have come my way. I'm just not in a position to do so.

402 Q. All right. So you're saying you're compelled by an
obligation you have to protect your sources, okay?
A. And also to the principle of the gathering of information.

403 Q. And the principle of gathering of information?
A. Yeah.

404 Q. So in relation to the protection of sources, we know Superintendent Taylor doesn't need protection because he has come out and said he was a source. Okay, so we can eliminate that from the equation. Do you understand what I am saying to you?
A. I understand where you are going with this, Ms Leader. My position will not change, I'm afraid.
CHA RMAN No, but if you wouldn't mind just answering the question. Do we eliminate the possibility that Superintendent Taylor actually needs any protection?
A. I'm not going to get into a discussion which may or may not narrow down people, Mr. Chairman. I just don't think that I can do that as a witness.
Q. M. LEADER: Well, could you explain to me how that would narrow anybody down?
A. Well, I mean, if you start saying, in relation to that person, can we -- do they need protection or not, and if I say no, they don't, then you move on to another person and then by a process of elimination --
406 Q. All right, we will leave Superintendent Taylor out of the equation.
A. Mm-hmm.

407 Q. Source $x$ gives you information?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

408 Q. Unnamed source in relation to something totally --
A. We are speaking hypothetically here.

409 Q. Totally unconnected to the Tribunal, hypothetical?
A. Yes.

410 Q. Source $X$ says: I was doing something wrong when I gave 14:32 you that information, I am telling you now that I was doing something wrong, I am waiving any protection, any privilege in relation to the giving of that information, all right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

411 Q. And not only that, but I am waiving it publicly and I am saying all of this publicly, which is being reported on a daily basis publicly.
A. Mm-hmm.

412 Q. So does that source need any protection then, source X, 14:32 leave Superintendent Taylor out of it?
A. Sure. But I come from a position, Ms. Leader, which is different.
413 Q. No, I'm not asking you where you come from. I'm asking you does that source need protection?
A. I'm asking from a journalist's point of view, the person as a journalist who holds the privilege, it is therefore my obligation to the principle of journalistic privilege that $I$ would not be in a position, even if a source, in my view, moved -- or a to waive that privilege, I would not be in a position, I feel, compelled by the obligation that I have to do my job, to start getting into a conversation that you

414 Q. All right. I will ask you one more time. Does source $X$ need any protection in those circumstances?
A. Yes, I think source $X$ would need protection, on the basis that there are many unintended consequences as to 14:33 how people might ask a question, where a question is coming from, and also the potential motivations of other people, that may seem irrelevant at a particular time but could become relevant at a later point in date -- or a later point in time.
415 Q. If that source is one of a group of people of 12,000 , do you think that source needs protection? There are 12,000-plus Gardaí in this country.
A. I'm just not willing to get into a position, Ms. Leader, to start talking about or getting into a process of identifying people. I would like to be helpful to the Tribuna1. I have done a lot of work in terms of meeting with investigators, providing my mobile phone number, studying the evidence at play. I would -- am genuinely, Chairman, seeking to be helpful to the Tribunal. I just, however, feel compelled to not get into a position where $I$ feel a source of mine or a root of information could therefore be identifiable, I'm afraid I feel compelled I cannot do that.
416 Q. Now, if we get into the free flow of information, all right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

417 Q. So you say, by identifying a source, it may inhibit the
free flow of information, all right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. So in the example that I've given to you, source $X$ is asking for the journalist's cooperation in aiding his evidence --
A. Mm-hmm.
-- and aiding what he is saying. In those circumstances, it would be corroborative evidence?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

420 Q. You understand that?
A. I understand.

421 Q. All right. And source X , if the journalist chooses not to give information so as to protect the free flow of information, all right --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

422 Q. -- do you think that would encourage other people to come forward and give information if they thought, when they needed the journalist's help, that they were not given that help?
A. I'm sorry, Ms. Leader, there were a number of subclauses to your question. Could you clarify it exactly, please?
423 Q. Yes, that is fine. I will repeat it.
A. Thank you.

424 Q. Source X is asking for the journalist's help.
A. Yes.

425 Q. He is publicly asking for the journalist's help. Okay. The journalist says, no, I'm not going to answer that question, good, bad indifferent, in any way at all.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

426 Q. A11 right. So, in those circumstances, source $X$ is not being helped, isn't that correct?
A. I would -- yeah.

427 Q. Yes. So how does that help the free flow of
information if people publicly think, when they need the journalist's help, all right, you follow me so far --
A. I follow you so far, yes.

428 Q. -- that help won't be forthcoming? If you could answer 14:36 that question.
A. Because I think that is balanced against what $I$ would see is a very real chilling effect, that if, say, someone gave me information two or three years ago or four years ago, and I find myself in a place like a tribunal of inquiry and I am being put under pressure to reveal where information came from, they'd never speak to me ever again, other people would never speak to me again, because the conclusion would be that Danie1 O'Conne11 is someone, when pressure is brought to bear, would sing like a canary. I, unfortunately, am not someone who will sing like a canary. I am someone who will protect my sources and someone who believes in the principle of journalistic privilege, and I do so not to frustrate the work of a tribunal of inquiry, but I do so because I think there are competing -- you know, there is a balance of rights and issues at play here.
429 Q. okay, that is your answer?
A. That is my answer.

430 Q. That is grand. So in relation to identifying sources, we have identified the source of the information, you understand that; he has given evidence here before the Tribunal?
A. Well, Superintendent Taylor claims he was the source. Yes.
A. Yes, I understand that.

432 Q. So in relation to forcing anybody to identifying any sources, the only question the Tribunal is asking is: Did Superintendent Taylor, not did any other person, give you -- any other person -- give you information in relation to a campaign with regard to Sergeant McCabe, you understand that?
A. I understand that. My answer is --

433 Q. So there is no question, I'm suggesting to you, of forcing anybody to reveal any sources except the information which is already before the Tribunal?
A. But you make it sound very simple, Ms. Leader, but from a journalist's point of view, it is far more complicated than that, and I think the obligations that I'm under as a journalist to protect my sources and also to protect the free flow of information and the information-gathering process that $I$ and my colleagues go through, I'm afraid, in my view, trumps the interest 14:38 that you are trying to pursue here, and therefore, I'm not in a position to get into a discussion as to who or who didn't brief me, or whether I was or wasn't briefed. I'm just not in a position to do that,
regrettably.
434 Q. okay. And when you say it trumps all other things, one of those things is confidence in policing in this country? A11 right.
A. Sorry, is that a question, Ms. Leader? Because I would 14:38 like to give you --

Sorry, I thought you said yes?
A. Yes. Sorry, my answer is yes on that. Thank you.

436 Q. Just, I want to ask you a few questions in relation to the allegation of criminal misconduct made against Sergeant McCabe.
A. Okay.

437 Q. Did you know about Paul williams interviewing Ms. D?
A. I didn't, no.

438 Q. And you were part of the Independent group at that
A. I was. But again, as I said to you previous7y, my attention was on political matters. And newsrooms often work in silos, that, you know, you may even be sitting beside a journalist on the desk next to you and have no idea what they are working on. And in relation to the Ms. D, the first I knew about it was when I saw it in the newspaper.

439 Q. And that was on the 12th Apri1 2014?
A. That's correct. Correct, yeah.

440 Q. A11 right. And I totally understand how you'd know one thing and another person would know another thing. But as I understand the statement from Mr. Mallon - now, I may be misinterpreting that - that it was no secret in

Independent Newspapers, the Ms. D allegation; was that post the Paul williams article?
A. That would be a matter I'm sure you'd have to ask Mr. Mallon, from my point of view, because I was primarily based in Leinster House. The sort of normal gossip that may have been prevalent around 'Talbot Towers', as it is colloquially known, I may not have been aware of, because, as I said, most of my time was up in Leinster House.
441 Q. Prior to the Paul williams article, did you know about the Ms. D allegation?
A. I had heard, particularly in the run-up to the PAC meeting, $I$ had certain7y heard, $I$ think I describe it in my statement as journalistic chatter. There was certainly a lot of chat around. And there was a conflation of issues because there was a lot of criticism of the PAC at the time for essentially going beyond its remit; you know, that it shouldn't really be bringing Maurice McCabe in before it, but there was vague, and I'm talking very low level sort of suggestions, you know, attacking the integrity of Maurice McCabe, nothing that I could ever really put my finger on, nothing that I could ever be specific about, but certain7y there were -- as I say, it was journalistic chatter.
442 Q. Okay. So prior to the Paul williams article, your knowledge of the Ms. D allegation came from journalistic chatter?
A. I'm very much in the sort of political realm, but
again, it was very low level, inconsequential, in my view, and certainly something that I never either investigated, looked at, because it wasn't within my remit to do so.
443 Q. Okay. And was that your first knowledge of the Ms. D allegation?
A. well, again, it was so vague at that stage, I had no idea, really, as to what it was.
444 Q. Okay.
A. All I can say is that my focus very much was on -there was a huge internal battle within the PAC as to whether Maurice McCabe should be brought before it.
That is where my focus was on.
445 Q. I see.
A. Not really on these extraneous matters.

446 Q. I understand, yes. So insofar as there were extraneous matters being chattered about --
A. Yes.

447 Q. -- if I can put it that way --
A. Yes.

448 Q. -- that was from other journalists, am I correct, in saying that?
A. Yeah, I mean, I characterise it as journalistic chatter, and that's certainly -- again, but trying to remember who exactly -- I've racked my brain on this, I 14:41 really just cannot remember.
449 Q. And that was January 2014.
A. I vividly remember it was in around the time of the PAC meeting, yes.
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Q. Okay. And you'd heard nothing before that?
A. No, absolutely not.
Q. Yes.
A. It was as to his bona fides, as to, you know, were the issues that he was raising credible, and that is what I 14:42 was interested in. Like, the other stuff I just didn't really pay any attention to at all.
453 Q. Did you hear it again before the Paul williams article on the 12th Apri1 2014?
A. No.

454 Q. And did you hear it up to July 2014 post-publication of the Paul williams article?
A. Not that I can remember, no.
Q. And did you know Ms. D and Sergeant McCabe? Were they relevant persons that Mr. Williams was writing about in 14:43 April 2014?
A. I think I made a natural assumption without actually checking it, without actually making a -- I never actively investigated it, but I certainly would have, when reading it, because the article itself was written 14:43 somewhat cryptically --
Q. Yes.
A. -- you know, in terms, in order to protect the identities of people. One would assume that the people
involved were -- you know, that Maurice McCabe certainly was one of the people involved.
457 Q. okay. So am I taking it that the following instances are when your attention was drawn to an allegation of criminal conduct made against Sergeant McCabe: chatterings from other journalists you think in January 2014?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

The publication of the Paul williams article in April 2014?
A. Mm-hmm.

459 Q. And no other occasion up to July 2014?
A. Not that I can remember, no. And again, as I said, it wasn't in my direct line of reporting, so it wasn't something that really I was, you know, vastly or massively interested in or following.
460 Q. Okay. In relation to your knowledge of the former commissioners, do you know former Commissioner Callinan?
A. I have never met Martin Callinan.

461 Q. In relation to former Commissioner o'sullivan?
A. I met her a small number of occasions and they were primarily walking in and walking out of Oireachtas committees, a shake of the hands, that would be it really.
462 Q. All right. Were some of those times in January 2014 going in and out of the Public Accounts Committee?
A. Possibly. I just can't be specific, but probably, yeah.

A. -- it is very hard to be specific.
Q. Okay. Beyond saying 'hello' to the former Commissioner, did you have any conversation with her?
A. I just don't want to get into that sort of into the difficulty of identifying sources about didn't stray beyond being, you know, chitchat. situations?
A. Yeah. And again, $I$ think, vividly, one instance I think with Ms. O'Sullivan, there were a number of journalists, and I think one remarked that, you know, force. She, I think, was Acting Commissioner at this stage.
467 Q. It would have been March 20 --
A. Yes, so it was post-March 2014.

468 Q. Yes.
A. And she was very much a case of 'hello, nice to meet you', sort of thing, whereas -- but that was, I think, the extent of it, really.
469 Q. Right. And in relation to Superintendent David Taylor, conversation, Ms. Leader, because, again, we're getting 14:45 conversations. Primarily, I will say, to be helpful to the Tribunal, no. I mean, like, they were not -- they
Q. Would you go so far as to say they were meet-and-greet 14:45 she was clearly trying to put best foot forward for the 14:45
do you know Superintendent David Taylor?
A. I know of him because I would have had limited dealings with him dating back to my time when I was chief reporter with the Sunday Independent. I wouldn't have just reported on politics, I would have had to do everything, pretty much. So there would have been the odd phone call to confirm a road traffic death, or something along those lines, something very perfunctory, and kind of, you know, like something very run of the mill, so to speak, in terms of Garda matters.
Q. And that is the entire context of all your dealings with Superintendent Taylor, do you think?
A. Yeah. I mean, I would have had very limited dealings with Dave Taylor, particularly when I moved into politics full-time, there would have been no real reason for me to have a conversation or have conversations with Dave Taylor.
471 Q. And in relation to -- you suggested you would have met former Commissioner o'sullivan going in and out of Leinster House to various committee meetings. Do you think at that time you would have met Superintendent David Taylor going in and out?
A. Well, he would have obviously been present. I mean, usually there's a delegation that would attend.

472 Q. Yes.
A. And as the designated Press officer, he obviously was always in attendance on such occasions.

473 Q. Okay. Do you think you said 'he11o' to him or had a
conversation with him?
A. Again, I mean, we would have known of each --

474 Q. Yes.
A. We would never have been friends, or anything like that, but we would have said -- like as you would with professional colleagues, you say 'hello', but nothing more than that.
Q. All right. Now, if I could just quickly turn to your phone contacts --
A. Yes.

476 Q. -- between Superintendent Tay7or's phone and your phone. It's at page 5226 of the materials. You see one in early February 2014, one of the second week of March 2014, one in April and two in May. Do you consider any of those being around the time of the hearings in the Dáil?
A. Well, the hearings in the Dáil were late January.

477 Q. Yes.
A. So -- but again, there was -- like, I think as Mr. O'Keeffe said, I mean, there were numerous Garda matters at play at that stage that were kind of drifting into the political realm.

478 Q. Yes.
A. Guerin Report, so on and so forth. So I would have thought -- and you look at the length of the conversations, I mean, not one of them, I think, is longer than two minutes.

479 Q. Yes. No --
A. I mean, these were, I would say, perfunctory calls to,
say, checking logistics of a -- maybe a committee hearing or, you know, I think much more of a run-of-the-mill sort of question to Mr. Taylor as the Press officer.
All right.
MS. LEADER: If you would answer any questions.

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

481 Q.
MR. MtGARRY: Mr. McConnel1, Paul McGarry is my name.
I am one of the barristers representing Sergeant McCabe, and I just have one issue for you.
A. Sure.

482 Q. Superintendent Taylor says that he spoke to you I think on a couple of occasions, provided you with negative information or negative briefing about Sergeant McCabe. In respect of that conversation or those conversations, you're the only person that can, on one view, corroborate what he says, but also you're the only person that can contradict what he says.
A. Mm-hmm.

483 Q. You're not prepared to answer the questions in that context?
A. Mr. McGarry, my position is very clear: I'm not in a position to say whether he did or didn't.
MR. MEGARRY: Thank you.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. FERRY:
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Q. MR. FERRY: Good afternoon, Mr. McConne11.
A. Afternoon.
Q. My name is John Ferry, and I'm one of the lawyers who represents Superintendent David Taylor.
A. It's very hard to hear you, Mr. Ferry. Could you speak 14:49 up, please.
Q. Sorry. My name is John Ferry, and I'm one of the lawyers who represents Superintendent David Taylor, the former Garda Press officer, and I have heard your evidence to the Tribunal. Now, my client remains a serving officer in An Garda Síochána, and what he has brought before the Tribunal are matters of the utmost gravity in relation to the issues that he has raised, and, in fairness to him, he is the man who has given a waiver and he has provided whatever assistance was asked of him in relation to the investigators, and, when it was put to him, he has waived any privilege or any restriction on that material, by issuing that waiver.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And as things stand, he is in a very vulnerable position in that he has basically put everything that he knows out there, and he named, when he was asked to do so, nine journalists, and at this stage most of them, I think, have appeared before the Tribunal, but you are one of them?
A. Mm-hmm, that's correct.

488 Q. And I have to put it to you that Superintendent Taylor spoke to you in relation to Sergeant McCabe and that
was in the course of what he has described as providing a negative briefing, and that was under the instructions of his Commissioner at the time. Now, that's the position, that's -- his evidence has been to the Tribunal, and, as I say, he is in a very vulnerable 14:51 position.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

489 Q. And I suppose, I mean, the Chairman and different people have tried to flesh this out with journalists, and we have been listening to them, but, you know, the chips are all on the table for Superintendent Taylor and he has identified nine journalists and you're one of them. And I put it to you that you were negatively briefed by him in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Mr. Ferry, I will just come back to you and restate my position. I am just not in a position to get into discussing what may or may not have happened to -- that may or may not reveal a source, because of what I see as the overriding principle of journalistic privilege.
490 Q. Yes. And just for the sake of the record, my instructions are that the negative briefing would have included and been in or around the time of the PAC hearings that have been discussed and the attendance of the Gardaí there and in particular sergeant McCabe, that would be the timeline that he is referring to in relation to speaking to you. So I am putting it to you that he was speaking to you around the time of the PAC in early 2014?
A. And again, I will just restate my position, Mr. Ferry.
Q. Yeah, we11, I can't put it any further than that. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

MR. QU NK No questions, Mr. Chairman.
MR. WFELAN No questions, Mr. Chairman.
CHA RMAN You have no questions?
MR. WFELAN No.
CHA RMAN Did you have any further questions?
ME. LEADER: No questions, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS WAS THEN QUESTI ONED BY THE CHA RMAN

492 Q. CHA RMAN I'm just wondering, Mr. McConne11, when did you first realise that David Taylor had actually nominated you as being one of the people that he --
A. When we received the first letter from the Tribunal.
Q. CHAN RMAK -- that he propagandised?
A. I was first informed by the letter we got from our legal team, or, you know, whenever the legal correspondence would have come out.
494 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. Well, he wrote us a letter and he said, look, these are people, and he listed nine people, but it may seem that, as some of them are political correspondents, it may be a bit on the unlikely side. How did you feel when you were
A. Certainly a bit taken aback, Chairman, to say the 1east.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. But, you know, that was Mr. Taylor's prerogative.

496 Q. To do what?
A. Hmm?

497 Q. CHAL RMAN It was his prerogative to do what?
A. Well, I mean, he felt he wanted to put names out there, 14:54 you know. I mean, I'm just not in a position now to either get --

CHA RMAN But it's not his prerogative to put a name out there falsely, is it?
A. Possibly, I may have misspoken, but, I mean, that was his actions, not mine, Mr. Chairman, I suppose is the point I'm making.
499 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. And this would have caused you a heap of trouble, wouldn't it?
A. Well, it certainly --

500 Q. CHA RMAN Including, if not quite sleepless nights, certainly a bit of lost sleep in thinking about the matter, what might happen?
A. Well, certainly it would have taken up a lot of time, Chairman, yes, no doubt about it.
501 Q. CHAN RMAN So how do you feet about that?
A. Well, I mean, when you get a letter seeking assistance from a tribunal, you take it seriously, and I have sought to do so and taken it seriously, and balance up the various considerations that are at play.
502 Q. CHAN RMAN But did he nominate you in the wrong?
A. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid, to answer that question, I think I'm getting in the position, and nice try, $I$ might argue, but $I$ 'm not going to get into a question
of, you know, possibly nominating or not nominating people, sources who have spoken to me.
503 Q. CHA RMAN But you heard the discussion that I had with Mr. O'Keeffe, your colleague?
A. I did, I was present, yes.

504 Q. CHA RMAN And about, you know, in the past, you're younger than me, but certainly over the course of the past 20 or 30 years, we've had any number of financial scandals.
A. Yes.

505 Q. CHA RMN And we have had statements from Taoisigh, etcetera, about, you know, anything as innocuous as -there was a time, for instance, if you invested in a building society in this country, the Revenue could never look at it, and that was defended by a particular 14:56 ex-Taoiseach who himself became the subject of two tribunals of inquiry, and you'11 be aware of that?
A. I was certainly aware of it.

506 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. And this thing about the rumour flying around and the person who actually knows the rumour is false, just scotching the rumour on the spot --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

507 Q. CHA RMAN -- is that a wrong thing or a right thing?
A. Well, again, I would be very much of the same view. You know, if you rule out person $X$ and then person $Y$ comes, or someone asks, well, is person $Y$ on the list?, and you remain stony-faced and say, I can't answer it, then there is a natural inference that that person is on the list.

508 Q. CHA RMAN We11, I suppose in the context in which I was speaking, which was a group of lawyers sitting around a table, they would know that I could never breach client confidence, they would never ask me that question, or, if they did, they would know the answer they would get, well, saying, look, whatever this rumour is, you'd better stop because the list is in my room and the person's name is not on the list, was that a wrong thing to do?
A. Mr. Chairman, I would never seek to say you erred on that.

509 Q. CHA RMAN And it's nothing to do with me. I don't want to talk about myself for the next half hour, or whatever it may be.
A. I would -- okay, put me in your shoes, would I have done the same thing? Probably not, on the basis that you naturally open the door to further inquiries that may or may not get very difficult.
510 Q. CHA RMAN Well, they can get as difficult as they want, but apart from putting me on the rack, I'm not going to say anything, that's just it.
A. And, Mr. Chairman, that's the position I find myself in. I'm just not in a position to disclose.
511 Q. CHA RMAN And if I asked you the question: were Woodward and Bernstein wrong then --
A. In terms of --

512 Q. CHA RMAN -- or do I have to wait 30 years before that can happen?
A. Well, they obviously did it for whatever reasons they
chose to do it. But, I mean, I look at each case on an individual basis, I'm just not satisfied that I would be doing right by the principle of journalistic privilege to come in here and start revealing information if $I$ had it. I'm not saying that I do.

513 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. But also, as well, that, you know, and I have listened to lot of your testimony, Chairman, a lot of your commentary in relation to this, you know, you have spoken yourself about the chilling effect. I mean, that's not an abstract academic sort of --

514 Q. CHAN RMAN I'm kind of sorry that I did, to tell you the truth, because 'chilling' must be one of the words now that has appeared most frequently in the transcript. But I didn't pick it up myself; it's actually a leading European Court of Human Rights journalist.
A. We11, I mean, there's the Channel $4 \mathbf{v}$. Ryanair case and then's there the Becker v. Norway case, which will obviously probably be examined.
515 Q. CHA RMAN And there are other cases, by the way, where the European Court of Human Rights said a journalist was wrong to withhold the information.
A. I know.

516 Q. CHAN RMAN which is where it is in relation to a
terrorist attack. I mean, if it got that bad, would you be in this position of neither confirming nor denying, simply not speaking?
A. I'm bound by that obligation, Mr. Chairman, and I would
have to make any decision in relation to that when faced with particular circumstances. But at the moment, I'm just in a position that $I$ cannot get into a place where I am going to start discussing the gathering of information or anything that may or may not --

517 Q. CHA RMAN Believe it or not, I actually don't want you to.
A. Okay.

518 Q
CHA RMAN And I would much prefer if you didn't, and I have no interest in it, how you gather your information or how you do it.
A. Okay.

519 Q. CHA RMAN I'm not inquiring into that. I'm simply inquiring into David Taylor. Now, there is a question that I have to ask you, I suppose, in terms of fairness, because if I get the thing wrong, well then I get the thing wrong, and I don't want to get the thing wrong because this is supposed to be an answer to a matter of something that has, you know, shaken the faith of the Irish people in their police force. But you said to Ms. Leader, and I just want to confirm this, please, and what it means; I am very, very well aware of the fact that asking the same question twice means, and I am going to do this now, means that the witness can change their mind or can come up with some kind of smart answer which contradicts something that was clear before, but nonetheless, $I$ have to take that risk, because this is not about adversarial
circumstances, I am actually trying to find where the truth lies in this. You told Ms. Leader, look, the first time I heard any rumour about Maurice McCabe was in the context of the PAC hearings, and what it was was journalistic chatter, and I take it it was journalistic 15:00 chatter in relation to the rumour we have all been talking about?
A. Not necessarily. I don't -- just on remembering that, to be helpful to the Tribunal on this, Chairman, I don't think at that stage it was as specific as what has subsequently emerged, but certainly there was stuff being said that would lead one to -- or, sorry, for the purpose, I gathered at the time, to attack the credibility of Maurice McCabe, to say at least put a question-mark over his bona fides as a witness. You know, the whole idea -- the whole question that I was focused on was whether the PAC was right or wrong to bring him in, whether they were acting beyond their remit or not, and the question as to his motivation and so on and so forth, but it was very vague and again it was just unsubstantiated gossip along the corridors, or so to speak.
520 Q. CHA RMN No, I understand that. So was it along the line that, I wonder are we right to take this fellow as someone whom we can completely trust, type thing?
A. Well, I remember vividly the day -- the night that the PAC met, it was downstairs in the committee rooms. I think you visited them yourself, Chairman, in Leinster House.

CHA RMAK But then there was some, I suppose, there was the negative feedback as we11, which was to the effect, can we trust this person?
A. And again at the time because this was the hot political topic at the time, so pretty much every conversation you were having along the corridors of Leinster House were somewhat related, but there was a conflation of issues, Chairman. There were government pressures at the time for the PAC not to bring Maurice McCabe in because there was a feeling they were acting beyond their remit. But also, as well, there was the side issue as to his credibility, and a part of that, as I have said, there was a sort of a kind of journalistic chatter, so to speak, around him, his standing as a person.
523 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, but was his standing as a person by reason of the fact that he had been accused of something?
A. Again, that was not something that was overt at that stage.

524

CHA RMAK And did you hear anything else about it up until the time that David Taylor left the Press Office, or Martin Callinan?
A. No, because again, as I explained to Ms. Leader, that wasn't really my line of -- area of reporting, so it wasn't something I was very much focused on.

528 Q. CHA RMAN We11, you see, by reason of all of that, I'm taking it to be the case that, as you never heard of that on these particular times, you didn't hear of it again, didn't hear of it until David Taylor left, and indeed we all heard of it after David Taylor left the Press Office and it had been the subject of extensive commentary, that it couldn't possibly be the case that David Taylor negatively briefed you, that is what I am taking out of that. Now, you may wish to say to me, you know, I can't answer or confirm that, you may wish to say that to me. But I am telling you that is what is in my head, and now is your chance to say whatever you want to say.
A. Mr. Chairman, I cannot confirm nor deny.

CHAI RMAN I know, but one, two and three adds up and it makes six. So that is what $I$ am thinking at the moment.
A. Yes.
A. Mr. Chairman, I'm just not going to get into a position where, you know, something I may say may draw you to an 15:04 inference. You're the person in charge to make the inference, and I will maybe leave that discussion for you.
531 Q. CHA RMAN A11 right. And from what you have told me as well, I'm assuming when again we may have a -- I
don't know if people have these kind of conversations outside the confines of ancient Greek philosophical discussions, but, you know, I'm inferring from what you are telling me, and you can tell me whether $I$ am wrong or not, that in the event that $I$ write an article -sorry, no, I'm not going to write an article, I beg your pardon, I have only ever done it in academic journals.
A. Might write in the Examiner if you want, Mr. Chairman.

532 Q CHA RMAN Sorry, I am getting as confused now as perhaps many other people. So in the event that I write a report - that is my job - saying whatever, you're not in a position to write an article at the moment in the newspaper saying, and I know you wouldn't
put it this way, the man is an idiot, he got it completely wrong, because I was approached by several Gardaí who told me the following at the time we're talking about, which ends, by the way, effectively it ends on the evidence that I have heard when Martin Callinan resigns, which is the 24th March 2014. It doesn't even go as far as the 10th June 2014. That's the evidence that I have. So I don't think you're in a position to write that article.
A. But I think it would be unfathomable, Mr. Chairman, that I would write an article that would contradict anything I've said here. You know, if I had information to give and I was comfortable to give it to the Tribunal, I would give it, rather than putting it into a journalistic article.
533 Q. CHAN RMN That seems to me to be an honourable position, all right. So there it is.
A. Thank you, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR MGGI NESS: The next witness, sir, is Dearbhail McDonald, who has made two statements to the Tribunal, one is in volume 18 at page 4876, and the second one is in volume 24 at page 6495.

ME. DEARBHAI L MCDONALD, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MD. LEADER:

534 Q. MG. LEADER: Ms. McDonald, I think you are currently Group Business Editor with Independent News \& Media?
A. Yes.

535 Q. And if you would outline your career path, please, to that position.
A. Sure. I studied an LLB in law in Trinity College Dublin and after a period of study I returned to Ireland to do a master's in journalism at Dublin City University. Thereafter, I joined The Sunday Times newspaper, initially as a freelance journalist, was later made a staff journalist, held a number of areas that I covered in that role - religious and social affairs, health correspondent, and later I found myself drifting back to what $I$ had studied and essentially specialised as a legal affairs reporter. I left, I think, in late 2006, and joined the Irish Independent as legal affairs correspondent and had a number of promotions in the time that $I$ have been with INM, serving as legal affairs correspondent, legal editor, associate editor, and, for the past two-and-a-half years or so, have served as Group Business Editor.
536 Q. And sometime in March 2014 you were asked to review a story that Paul williams was putting forward, is that correct?
A. Yeah. At that time $I$ was covering the trial of three former Anglo executives, it was a major trial at the

Criminal Courts of Justice, and I recall that March I was asked by my editor, Stephen Rae, to come in and to essentially stress-test a story that had been written by a colleague that they were considering for a publication, and I was tasked with that by my editor and asked to go off and make my own inquiries and to come back and see was it fit for publication, in my view, in terms of both being legally and factually robust.

537 Q. And did you know at that time that the article was referring to Sergeant Maurice McCabe and Ms. D in her real name?
A. No, no. My knowledge -- as I said, most of my role as legal editor at that time was concentrated on the CCJ and on that trial. I was broadly aware, obviously, of the succession of Garda controversies. I think that -I think it was in January when former Garda Commissioner Martin Callinan appeared, and, regardless of how his remarks were intended or received, that 'disgusting' remark sort of propelled that story into a major political story. As a working journalist, I could not have been but aware of that, but, as I say, my role was quite confined at that time. And the first I became of the allegations, too, in relation that had been made by the young woman who we now know as Ms. D was when I was tasked by Stephen Rae to go off and to fact-check or to give a view on the proposed publication.

538 Q. Al1 right. And when you were tasked by Mr. Rae to give
a view on the publication, did you know it was referring to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, I did. Yeah, at that stage it was fairly evident that it was, and I undertook my own inquiries and reported back to my editor, Stephen Rae, to our group head of news, Stephen Mallon, and, as the Tribunal is aware from my statement, I did compose a memo over which I've raised confidentiality and privilege, outlining some of my observations, concerns and the risks as I perceived them, and that was the end of the matter for me.

539 Q. All right. So you said in your first statement - and it can be brought up on screen, 4876, at the very bottom of the page - that you reviewed the story and watched a video-recording, or perhaps part thereof, of an interview with Ms. D on Friday, the 14th March, in your offices. And in the next page you said you believed "I an Mallon, then group head of news, may have been there for some part of this process, but otherwi se it was just Stephen Rae and myself."
A. Yeah.

540 Q. And you said:
"We had a discussion about the proposed publication in general and for the purpose of making sure the proposed article was legally and factually robust."
A. That's correct.

541 Q. All right. And aside from watching part of the video, and your discussions with Mr. Mallon and Mr. Rae, did
you make other inquiries about the proposed article?
A. Well, I think, looking back now, essentially I had been provided with the proposed article and the video. I had looked at it $I$ think on my own, first of all.
542 Q. Yes.
A. And then - I'm a journalist of over 15 years' experience now - I took away what I could from that and did what I was asked, I stress-tested it, I made a number of inquiries, and, as I say, I came back with some thoughts and observations on that day. The reason why it was March 14th I recall is that was the day that I wrote the memo and I believe that we had that meeting on that day. There was a robust discussion about it, I gave my views, wrote a memo with my notes, and that was the end of the matter, for me at least.
So all your work in connection with that article happened on one day, the 14th March?
A. No, no, I actually --

544 Q. Sorry --
A. I said on or around --

545 Q. okay.
A. -- March 14th. The reason why I'm very, very clear about March 14th in particular is because that is the day that $I$ wrote my memo. My recollection is that, in the early part of the week, I had been provided with the material and asked to go away off and stress-test it, and that process in itself of stress-testing other people's stories, it's a little bit unusual if it is finally made, but we stress-test each other's stories negatively by or on behalf of anyone from An Garda Síochána, and that would include Superintendent Taylor. I should have added that I wasn't briefed positively either, because I wasn't briefed at all by any member of An Garda Síochána, by or on their behalf, and that includes Superintendent Taylor.

548 Q. Okay. And that takes care of that side --
A. That takes care of that issue.

549 Q. Okay. And just in relation to what you've outlined, you did your memo in relation to the article. Did you have any other dealings with --
A. No, that was it. It was quite a discrete function, task that I had been assigned. I did that. I had no -- I wasn't apprised of anything that happened before that, or how it came about, and I had no interaction thereafter with it. I went back to the CCJ after that.

550 Q. Now, you were also asked at a later stage, and you
wrote to the Tribunal in relation to that, about any knowledge you may or may not have concerning an anonymous letter or a poison pen letter which was written concerning Sergeant McCabe, and you know what that letter is, isn't that correct?
A. Well, I do, since --

551 Q. It has been shown to you --
A. -- the interactions from the Tribuna1. I was quite surprised to receive that correspondence. It was the Tribunal through -- or my lawyer, our lawyers, through the Tribunal, that brought attention to it, and I have no knowledge of it, no receipt of it, haven't had it in my possession, did not see it until it was provided by the Tribuna1. And just even in terms of my own general practice, $I$ do maintain a readers' correspondence file where it's suitable to hold on to material, and, if I had received that, I would have brought it to the attention of the relevant news editor or person that was working on it. But I certainly, if it had been in possession, would not have given it away. I have a practice of retaining important correspondence when I receive it, including unsolicited and anonymous correspondence.
552 Q. And you checked back on any correspondence?
A. I have checked back through all of my correspondence from that time.
MS. LEADER: If you would answer any questions anybody else might have for you.
A. Thank you.

MR. MEGARRY: No questions, sir. Thank you.
CHA RMAN I just wanted to ask you a question, if I might, Mr. McGarry. The articles, or one or other or all of them, from the 14th April 2014 by Paul williams, are they the subject of litigation by Sergeant McCabe?
MR. MEGARRY: No, Chairman.
CHA RMAN They are not. Al1 right. Okay, no, that is fine.
A. Okay. Thank you.

CHA RMAN No, just hang on. Sorry, there may be more. 15:14 Yes, Mr. Ferry, did you want to ask any questions?

MR. FERRY: Just very briefly.

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

553 Q. MR. FERRY: He11o there, my name is John Ferry. I just have a couple of queries. You were obviously following the Anglo trial at that time?
A. I was.

554 Q. And then you carried out this task on behalf of your
employer. Just, I appreciate that you said you made inquiries and you stress-tested, is it a story or was it the --
A. It was the proposed article.

555 Q. Yeah. So it was presented to you in a draft format of what was intended to be printed?
A. Yes.

556 Q. And as part of your stress-testing, had you any information available to you as to any checks that

Mr. Williams had carried out?
A. No. And neither before, during or to this day have I had ever any discussion with Paul about that story, so I wasn't party to any of his processes in respect of doing it. I was brought in, I suppose, maybe as an independent person within the newsroom who had extensive experience of both defamation and contempt and just asked for my view.
MR. FERRY: That is fine. Thanks very much.
MR. KENNEDY: No questions, Mr. Chairman.
MR. HARTY: Chairman, I have no questions.
CHA RMAN Do you want to ask any questions, Mr. Fanning? You are going to go last, I take it?
MR. FANN NG I would go last and it would only arise if something else arises. Mr. O'Higgins may have questions on behalf of the Garda Commissioner. CHA RMAK We11, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh is first.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAI GL

557 Q. MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA GH Just two questions. Fionán Ó Muircheartaigh is my name, and I appear for Alison O'Reilly. The video on this interview by Ms. D, were you shown this as -- did I understand you to say you were shown this as part of the process of assessing the 15:17 story?
A. It was given to me for the reasons of me assessing it in the overall context of it, so $I$ viewed it in that context. delineations between print journalism and broadcast journalism, but that line hasn't been there for quite some time, so it would not be unusual if you had interviewed someone to have it on audio or video. That
A. Well, we're in a platform-neutral media environment where we don't cling on to those distinctions of print or broadcast any more. It would not be unusual if you were interviewing someone to have a video or audio of that, so it would not be entirely unusual to have the interviews or the background material, whatever it is, in a number of different formats.

561 Q. When you say it wouldn't be entirely unusual, what does that mean?
A. Well, it wouldn't be unusual at all. I think in the past there would have been very, very strict sorry, it's a little bit further down, in the meeting that I held with Stephen and possibly with Ian Mallon, I would have referred to parts of the video for the purposes of giving my advices and observations.
Q. And was there anyone -- I think you may have indicated, 15:17 was there anyone with you when you saw the video?
A. Both Stephen and Ian.
Q. And my last question is: Is it usual for journalists to have videos of their interviews with sources?
is just simply the way we operate now.
CHA RMAN In other words, I think what you are saying is, if you are reading in the newspaper and you go to the website, it may be there is going to be a clip there and you can press play and there would be a clip of some kind.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN But with someone who is anonymous, that wouldn't happen, but it could be dark in the room, actors' voice, or whatever, but that enhances, if you like, the readability --
A. That is very commonplace in broadcast, Mr. Chairman, for source material, to have voice or other ways of masking it out. So it wouldn't be unusual for sensitive material at least.
MR. Ó MI RCHEARTA GH Thank you very much.
ME. LEADER: Mr. Fanning?
CHA RMAN No, I think Mr. O'Higgins has some questions.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M' CHEÁL O H GG NS:

562 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Ms. McDonald, Micheá 1 O'Higgins for An Garda Síochána and formers Commissioners

Callinan and O'Sullivan. You were, it is clear from your evidence, you played a role in fact-checking prior to the publication of Paul Williams' article relating to his interview with Ms. D?
A. Yeah, I suppose, Mr. O'Higgins, a lot of the time when I am called in, it's actually to assess it from a legal perspective, even though I'm not a lawyer. But obviously with extensive experience, a legal affairs editor, $I$ would sometimes be asked to go in and check that that is a task that in itself involves an assessment of the facts. What I would have been looking to, as I would with most of my legal stories, are -- is, you know, if this went to court, what information we would have, how we would be able to stand it up. It was that kind of an assessment and that was the kind of advices I gave.
563 Q. Yes. You weren't present but you may have seen in the, for instance, cross-examination of the journalist paul williams, last July, there was a degree of criticism directed at the fact that his articles were published at a11, having regard to their contents, were you aware of that?
A. I can't speak to that. I wasn't -- I was just generally aware of it, but I can't speak to the particular criticisms today.

564 Q. We11, can I ask you this, and I'm trying to deal with matters at a reasonable level of generality without getting down into too much specifics, but what would you say to the suggestion that appears to have been made certainly implicitly if not expressly, what would you say to the suggestion that by your -- looking at your role in the matter, by your participating in the process that led to the publication of Paul williams'
articles in April of 2014, following his meeting with Ms. D in March 2014, what would you say to the suggestion that you, insofar as you discharged your role, you participated in a smearing of sergeant McCabe?
A. I would absolutely and utterly reject it. I believe that the advices that I gave and the role that I played actually went to ensure that Mr. McCabe's reputation was protected. I gave advices, I'm not going to go into the specific advices that I gave. But the ultimate decision of an editor is final. And perhaps I wouldn't -- wel1, I know I advised against publication.
A. I wanted to ensure it was factually correct, that it was legally robust. I gave my advices. Different editors, different journalists have different opinions of risk. I think by virtue of the role that $I$ held for many years, $I$ probably would be very, very cautious in that regard.

567 Q. Yes. And the story that was ultimately published,
you're aware, broadly speaking, of the contents of the articles that did follow in April/May?
A. I was aware of the one that subsequently appeared in April. I had no function in relation to this entire exercise after the March incident, and so literally I wasn't asked my opinion again.

568 Q. Right. Well, I just want to ask you again dealing with matters generally, the story of Ms. D or her -- the position that was put forward in the article embodying her complaint, as it were, was, if you like, a complaint that is potentially or actually critical of An Garda Síochána, isn't that right, in that -- I will finish out the question so you can deal with it -- it was part of her complaint that An Garda Síochána had failed to investigate properly her initial complaint back at the time of her disclosing the alleged offence?
A. Yes. And, sorry, your specific question in relation to that is?

569 Q. And my question is: The story, the Ms. D story that 1ed ultimately to the publication of the article, was a 15:23 story that was, on her case, critical of An Garda Síochána?
A. Yes. As I understood it, she was critical of aspects of the investigation.
570 Q. Yes. And lastly, can I ask you, what do you say to the 15:24 suggestion that appears again to have been made certainly to Paul Williams in last July that there was a failure to put to Sergeant McCabe to make him aware of the article and put its contents to him and that
that was profoundly unfair?
A. I have no knowledge of that because I was brought in specifically to assess or give my views or opinions, I have no absolutely no carriage or knowledge of what the company otherwise did in terms of liaising with Mr. McCabe or any of the relevant parties.

571 Q. Fine. I indicated that was my last question. Just one other question. It would appear from a statement of Maurice McCabe of April of 2018 that in relation to the anonymous letter about which Ms. Leader asked you, that 15:25 you, in fact, did have a role in relation to the issuance or the production of that letter and it coming to the attention of Sergeant McCabe's side of the house?
A. Yeah. And I just have to take issue and disagree with that because I am quite emphatic about my knowledge. The first time I saw or received the letter, had knowledge of the so-called foxtrot bravo letter, when it was brought to my attention courtesy of the Tribunal.

CHA RMAN Would you mind giving us a reference just for that.

MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Page 6494.
CHA RMAN It would help, probably. If we can get that up on the screen, just to make sure that she knows exactly what the thing is. I'm sure you do, but even still.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN So the page is? would you just say it
again, please, Mr. O'Higgins.
MR. M' CHEÁL O H GG NS: Page 6494. But I simply want you to just confirm this, if you might; insofar as it is contended by Sergeant McCabe that he received that particular anonymous letter on foot of something you did bringing it to the attention of his side of the house, you're absolutely clear that that is factually mistaken?
A. Yes. He says, "it was my understanding", namely Mr. McCabe's understanding at the time, that the document had been given to a person. That was -- that is not the case.

MR. MCHEÁL O HGG NS: Right. Thank you very much.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN Did you have any questions, Mr. Fanning?
MR. FANN NG No, nothing arising, Mr. Chairman.
CHA RMAN Was there anything arising, Ms. Leader?

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

572 Q. M. LEADER: There was one thing I forgot to ask you. You didn't discuss the interview or the story with Mr. Williams himself?
A. No, not at the time, not -- obviously not before and not up to and including today, I have never discussed

573 Q. And in relation to the video, did you ever discuss it with either Ms. Debbie McCann or Ms. Alison O'Reilly?
A. No, I have never had any discussions with those two
persons, or indeed any other colleagues, Ms. Leader. As I discussed, my function was a very, very discrete one; I was brought in to assess it, I gave my views, and that was the end of the matter for me. My interaction ended on March 14th, 2014.

## THE WTNESS MAS THEN QUESTI ONED BY THE CHA RMAN

574 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes, there was just one thing that arose, and I am just recalling Paul williams' evidence, indeed 15:27 I have the transcript and I have read it, but as I understood it, he - and again I may be wrong about this so please correct me in the event that I am wrong - but he said that the story initially came in terms of a plan as being here's a woman who was sexually abused by Maurice McCabe. In other words, it was, if you like, what was talked about in other newsrooms as a big Irish Independent or Sunday Independent exclusive. In other words, that it was the allegation itself being repeated in the newspaper as opposed to referred to very, very, very tangentially, is, I made a complaint and they didn't investigate it properly.
A. So, sorry, what is the nature of the question, Mr. Chairman?

575 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, the nature of the question is, I understood you to say that you had issued a negative opinion that they shouldn't issue an article like that, that it -- that it morphed, in other words, in editorial process from being an interview with someone
who says that a particular individual had sexually abused her, into being an article that here is yet another case from Cavan where someone is saying that the Gardaí didn't properly investigate their case?
A. Yeah. I can't really speak to what was generally happening in the newsroom at that time. I was concerned with matters in relation to Mr. Whelan, Mr. McAteer and Mr. FitzPatrick at that time. As I say, my role on it was very, very discrete. My knowledge of matters, not much beyond what was happening in the papers at that time. And as I say, it was an important story, and the reason why I know it was an important story was because I was called in to give my views on it.
CHA RMAK Yes. But you said you gave advices against publication?
A. I gave a number of advices, and I would have been of the view, possibly informed by the fact that I held legal editor and had quite a lot of experience with high-risk situations, and I just believed that, in the overall picture, that it probably wasn't advisable at that time.

577 Q. CHA RMAN oh, you mean to publish the article as it appeared as opposed to publish an article, a big article --
A. What I believe and what $I$ have said in my statement, Mr. Chairman, is that $I$ believe that, as part of that exercise, some of the concerns and observations that I had raised were addressed when an article was
subsequently published.
578 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes, but did the article radically change from, here's a woman saying Maurice McCabe sexually abused her into being here's an anonymous woman who says that she was sexually abused by --
A. Again, for reasons of confidentiality and privilege, I don't want to go into the specific advices that I gave, but certainly there were material changes between the draft I saw and the article that was ultimately published.
579 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. We11, Paul williams didn't claim any kind of privilege, and, look, that is neither here nor there, but as I understood him to say - and I will check the transcript, because I'm checking my note now - it started out certainly as a plan for an article 15:30 about, if it could be stood up, here is a woman who says that Maurice McCabe sexually abused her, type thing, into something completely different?
A. Again, I can't speak to his -- the journey that he went on with that story. I can only speak to what I was tasked to do, and I gave my advices. Look, I genuinely don't have any knowledge of how it came about or what was in his mind at that time. All I know is that $I$ had a very discrete role.
580 Q. CHA RMAN No, it just dropped onto your desk, basically is the situation?
A. I was asked by my editor-in-chief to assist on the story and carried out a news-gathering task in light of my duties and my job at that time.

581 Q. CHA RMAN That is fine. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

M5. LEADER: The next witness, sir, is Mr. Ian Mallon, whose statement appears in volume 19 at page 5314 of the materials.

MR. I AN MALLON, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MS. LEADER:

582 Q. MG. LEADER: Mr. Ma11on, I think you were appointed group head of news in INM, Independent News \& Media, in September 2013?
A. That's correct.

583 Q. And how long did you hold that post?
A. I held that post for one year, and then I was appointed group head of content, which was an overarching role as we11. It stil1, you know, covered news, but also brought in politics, sport, business.
584 Q. And prior to September 2013 were you employed with INM?
A. I was. I was the operations editor, as it was called, with the Irish Independent newspaper.
585 Q. okay. Was that the case in June 2012?
A. In June 2012, no, I was the deputy editor of the Herald, I think.
586 Q. The Herald?
A. Yeah. So September 2012, September 2013 with the Irish

Independent.
587 Q. And the Herald isn't part of the Independent group?
A. It is.

588 Q. Or is it?
A. It is, yes.

589 Q. It is. So it's all part of Irish --
A. INM.

590 Q. INM. Now, just, first of all, in relation to the former commissioners and Superintendent David Taylor. Do you know former Commissioner o'sullivan?
A. No, I don't.

591 Q. And former Commissioner Callinan?
A. No.

592 Q. And Superintendent David Taylor?
A. I knew him only from a telephone relationship where sometimes I would have to stress-test stories late at night that were lead stories or important stories, and I would ring David Taylor independently. I can't specifically say when or where, but I would certain7y have had telephone conversations with him, but never met him or wasn't familiar with him apart from on the phone.

593 Q. And was that as his role as Garda Press Officer?
A. Yes, he was the main person in the Garda Press Office.

594 Q. Were they on-the-record telephone conversations?
A. I can't go into -- I don't know -- if a story came to me and we were going to run it and obviously you would respect the integrity of the journalist writing the story, but there's no harm in making an extra check,
and on occasion I may have done that, but really on occasion.
A. That would have come about through Paul, through an allegation made by an alleged victim of a sexual assault claiming that there was a Garda impropriety, if you like, into the investigation, into her case, and Paul williams was the reporter who was in contact with her family. Her family had come to him, I believe. And as head of news, I would have been made aware of it.

599 Q. Al1 right. So do I take it from that that the first time you heard anything in relation to what we refer to as the Ms. D allegation, was arising out of the Paul williams contact with the Ds?
A. It would have certain7y been around that time, yes.

600 Q. Okay. If we can just look at your statement, it's at page 5315, it might assist you. You say there, if you
look at the paragraph beginning "My first know edge":
"My first know edge that any accusation concerning Sergeant Maurice McCabe having allegedly sexually assaulted a child was in March 2014."

Do you think that is right?
A. This is my statement?
Q. This is your own statement. Yes.
A. Yes, yes, of course. Sorry, I said earlier 2014, and March specifically, obviously.
Q. Yes. And you time it as follows:
"Paul Willians, a journalist with Independent Newspapers, had approached Kevin Doyle, then news editor, to arrange an intervi ew with a young woman who was cl ai ming that she had been sexually assaulted by Sergeant McCabe. I cannot recall the exact date of my becoming aware but it was around the time that Paul Willians conducted an interview with this young Iady."

## Do you see that?

A. Yes.

603 Q. So can the Tribunal take it that your knowledge of the D allegations came about as a result of paul williams' interview or dealings with the D family?
A. Yes, that's correct, and it would have been just before that, I guess, because I would have been in contact with Paul williams on the day he was going to interview
604 Q. On the very day?
A. Yeah. So, in other words, rather than say, yes, yes, that's correct, no, I would have been aware of it slightly before that.

605 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Well, we know, for instance, that Mr. Williams called to the D family before interviewing Ms. D, a few days before that, you understand?
A. Yes.

607 Q. So he made two trips to the D family. Now, you're familiar with the evidence of Ms. Harris that she has given to the Tribunal?
A. Yes, I am.

608 Q. She has timed her first knowledge of the D allegation, she has tied it into an interview or an article that appeared in the Independent on the 5th May 2013, which is almost a year before you heard of the $D$ allegation?
A. Can you say that date again, please, Ms. Leader.

609 Q. She has tied it in with an article which appeared in the Independent in May 2013.
A. In the Sunday Independent, is that correct?

610 Q. I think so.
A. Yes, by Philip Ryan, I believe.

611 Q. Yes, that article, yes. Now, had you heard anything around that time in relation to Sergeant McCabe having allegedly sexually assaulted anybody?
A. I don't think so. Not that far back, no.

612
Q. Can you rule it out?
A. I can rule absolutely in the fact that I'm not sure, in that I just don't know.
613 Q. You just don't know?
A. I wouldn't have thought so. I wouldn't have thought I would have been aware of that far back. Well, I mean, I say that, I only became aware of it in March 2014, so, I mean, if you want, I will, yes, absolutely rule it out.
614 Q. I suppose it's not if I want. It's what --
A. Yes. Well, I mean, my statement says March 2014, so that is what I will -- for the record.
615 Q. Okay. You must have been aware, as somebody who has worked in the newspaper industry for a long time, that Sergeant McCabe was raising matters in relation to standards in policing and these were being aired in public and a controversy was happening in relation to the matter?
A. I wasn't aware of too much to do with Sergeant McCabe or his grievances. I was in overall charge of news within the organisation, but I was not liaising with Gardaí. I would have dealt with our own crime correspondents, but I was not in a position to pick up rumour and gossip or whatever has been, you know, declared about Sergeant McCabe. My on1y concern -- my 15:39 main concern with this particular story, the $D$ case, was that a woman was claiming that a Garda investigation into her case was wrong. And obviously, as a part of that, I would have known that Sergeant

Maurice McCabe was the name being mentioned as the alleged attacker, if you like - I have to be careful with my words, obviously - but, you know, as the person alleged here. But regarding, you know, that he was somebody who was alleging malpractice in An Garda Síochána on a regular basis, I wouldn't have been party to much of that talk, conversation or knowledge. We11, do you think if you'd heard a story or a rumour or a murmuring that Sergeant McCabe had assau7ted a minor, do you think you would remember it?
A. I remember it in the context of paul williams doing the story, yes, absolutely, one hundred percent, and you would always remember an allegation, as such, that a garda sergeant was alleged to have carried out. But I was also aware of the fact that the most important thing for me, because the DPP had decided not to proceed with the case, that, just, you know, that there was an allegation that new evidence had come up or that a new charge was being made about the Garda investigation itself.
617 Q. Okay. So if we just take it step by step. You say you were aware in a very general sense that Sergeant McCabe was a name in public, was a public name, is that correct?
A. I don't think he was pub7icly named by the Irish Independent, Ms. Leader.

618 Q. I'm not saying he was, I'm not saying he was.
A. When you say in public, within a newsroom?

619 Q. Within Ireland. Nothing to do with the Independent.
A. No, I don't know if he was named publicly before that time.
Q. All right. We will say 2014 , he would have been --
A. I don't know when Sergeant McCabe's name came into the public ether.

621 Q. You don't know?
A. I do know now his name is very public.

622 Q. Yes.
A. But I don't know when the point was that his name came into the public ether.
623 Q. A11 right, all right. So you don't know when his name became pub7ic?
A. I don't.

624 Q. You don't. You say you would remember the first time you heard that that a garda sergeant had allegedly assaulted a child, is that correct?
A. No, I wouldn't remember specifically the date or time, you know.

625 Q. But in or around?
A. Yes, yes.

626 Q. We will put them up.
A. Sure.

627 Q. So do you think you heard that a garda sergeant had assaulted a child in 2013 ?
A. I don't think so. I don't know.

628 Q. You don't know?
A. I don't know.

629 Q. You can't explain it as a possibility?
A. Well, I wouldn't like to, no, no.

630 Q. All right. So when Ms. Harris said she heard that from one particular freelance journalist and she heard it in two occasions in May 2013, you can't exclude the possibility that you may have heard something like that in 2013?
A. No. Nor can I exclude the possibility that I wasn't at that meeting.
631 Q. But I'm not suggesting you were, I'm not suggesting you were.
A. Yes.

632 Q. I'm not you were in any way. But you may have heard something in 2013?
A. Or I may not. I don't have any recollection.

633 Q. You have no recollection of it?
A. No.

634 Q. But you would remember the first time you heard something like that?
A. I think so.

635 Q. You think so?
A. Sorry, of that size, absolutely.
Q.

And if we fast-forward to March 2014, we know you heard, via the Paul williams story, that Sergeant McCabe had allegedly assaulted Ms. D, is that right?
A. Yes.

637 Q. It would seem to be the case?
A. Yes.

638 Q. Am I correct --
A. Yes, you are correct, yes.

639 Q. -- in saying that? So -- but you don't know whether or
not that was the first time you heard it?
A. I'd love to be able to recall the date and specifically the first time that $I$-- this is one of many, many stories that would have been in my in-tray, if you like, or in my in-box. Yes, a significant story, no doubt, but I just have no idea when the first time I heard it was.

640 Q. But you can't specifically link to hearing it for the first time to Paul williams bringing the story to your news room?
A. No.

641 Q. A11 right. That is what I was trying to arrive at.
A. I would imagine that was the case, but I would say maybe -- no, I can't.
642 Q. Al1 right. Now, could you describe your role in bringing that story to print, please?
A. My role in any big news story was, as the group news editor, if you like, I compile a news list. That is basically the list of all the stories of the day or of the week, or whatever, and then those stories, then it's decided which way they go, would they fit better on a Sunday or a Saturday or in the Irish Independent or the Sunday Independent or the Herald, and then it's up to the individual editor then to make the decision whether to run the story or not. I would not influence 15:44 them at all.

643 Q. And that editor was, at the time?
A. Anne Harris in the Sunday Independent and Claire Grady in the Irish Independent.

644 Q. Yes. All right. So you say you wouldn't influence the editor at all in any way?
A. No.

645 Q. So what was your role in bringing that story to print? We have heard from the last witness that you may -- 15:44 that you partook in some of the stress-testing of that story, al1 right?
A. Say that --
Q. Ms. McDonald seems to have said that you would have been present for the stress-testing?
A. Just to be clear, I wasn't party to any of the stress-testing of that story.
647 Q. Yes.
A. Ms. McDonald carried out the stress-testing, if you 1ike.
A. I certainly would have -- I have no recollection of those meetings, by the way. I may have been in one of those meetings. I mean, I would have been at a lot of meetings, and my role generally was to drift in and out 15:45 of various meetings around the building, but if Ms. McDonald says I was at the meeting, that is fine. 649 Q. So what I am trying to get to is asking you to explain what your role in the whole Paul williams story was in particular, besides drifting in and out and knowing generally about it?
A. My role would have been, I would have been aware that Paul was -- I mean, obviously Paul Williams was going to go and interview the alleged victim and --

650 Q. Can I stop you there.
A. Yes.

651 Q. Did you have any role in sanctioning that in any way or any input?
A. Well, I would have approved it, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. I would have approved a -- before anything becomes a story, it has to get checked out, it has to be figured out, people have to be spoken to. Not all stories where people are interviewed and claims are made are carried, but in most cases where there is a genuine concern or, you know, that there is an allegation made, one would at least investigate it, and that was the case with Paul williams, that he was going to go and speak at least to this woman, and I think her family as 15:46 well.

653 Q. So you had some input into that happening?
A. Well, I would have been, I would have been one of a number of people -- yes, I would.
654 Q. And after that?
A. After that, Paul williams did his interview and Derbhail then did her stress-test. Derbhail dealt with Stephen Rae specifically with the results of that stress-test, and then the decision ultimately then to carry or to run those stories was made by the editor. 15:46
655 Q. Ms. Grady?
A. Yes.

656 Q. And did you discuss the matter with her at all?
A. I have no recollection of discussing the matter with

657 Q. Do you know the D family?
A. I have -- no, I don't, no.
Q. And in relation to the video, do you remember or not remember watching that video?
A. I don't remember watching the video. And I have been out of journalism for two or three years, I'm in a different business altogether now. I saw the other statements. If somebody said I was in a meeting where that video was shown, that is absolutely fine, I've no problem with that. I just don't recall it. I have no recollection of it.

659 Q. okay.
A. But that's on7y - sorry, Ms. Leader - that's only because, once again, the sheer volume of meetings I
would have attended, the sheer volume of clips of videos and all sorts of, you know, content, if you like, that $I$ would have been across. But there's lots of things I don't recall from that time, and that just specifically the viewing of that video. But if
Ms. McDonald or any other witness says I was there, that is fine.

660 Q. Right. And in relation to, and this may seem a strange question, but did you at any time discuss that video with either Ms. Alison O'Reilly or Ms. Debbie McCann?
A. I don't even -- no, I did not.

661 Q. Do you know those two people?
A. No, I don't, no.

662 Q. Al1 right. Okay. Now, just in relation to that story, by that?
A. Well, to me, as somebody who was a news person, if you like, the allegations that were being made of this Garda investigation in which a victim is claiming was mishandled, she was mistreated, that would, of course, if it had been as alleged, it would have been a big

664 Q. Okay. We11, I suppose --
A. And then obviously the allegation against the sergeant.

665 Q. Al1 right. So you're saying if it had been any garda
sergeant, leaving Sergeant McCabe out of this, it would have been a big story, is that right?
A. Yes, absolutely.

666 Q. I am just asking?
A. Yes, of course.
Q.
so if it was, which it was, an allegation against
Sergeant McCabe, who at that time was in the newspapers quite a lot being portrayed as a whistleblower and bringing Garda malpractice into the public, it would have been more than a big story, it would have been a huge ginormous story, it would have been something that would have changed the game completely with regard to coverage of sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. Well, that's why I said it was a big story, yes.

668 Q. All right.
A. Absolutely, yes.

669 Q. Would 'explosive' correctly describe the story?
A. I don't really -- you know what I mean -- explosive, well, yes, it would have been. Yes.
670 Q. All right. So had -- and I'm not saying it was, but had it been published in your newspaper as a story about a Garda whistleblower who had allegedly assaulted a minor, it would have been certainly capable of changing the whole narrative in relation to sergeant McCabe, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.

671 Q. okay. Was that something that your newspaper gave thought to prior to publication?
A. Just, Ms. Leader, just to be clear, I didn't have a
A. No problem. So the question again, please, sorry?

673 Q. I've actually forgotten it now.
CHA RMAN The question was: Given that it could change the entire narrative and it could go basically to saying people who imagine is a God has got feet of clay, just to use that as a tidy expression, did you give it the level of thought which would accord with the importance of the story? Is it fair to characterise it that way, Ms. Leader?

MS. LEADER: Yes.
A. I would have, yes, I would have considered it very heavily, Chairman, yes.
674 Q. And that was part of the reason, presumably, the last witness was called in to carefully stress-test it, isn't it?
A. That's correct. And that was the best practice journalistic methodology, if you like, of stress-testing, of what we did at the time or what

Stephen Rae did at the time, was that if there was a very serious story, not just this one, but other examples, say the Anglo tapes, for example, that we would have a number of people stress-testing at all times. That is not to level any mistrust at the journalist who has brought the story, but it is just to bring in the resources that we had to make sure that it was rock solid, if you like.

675 Q. So it was on the level of exclusiveness or
explosiveness, it was up there with the Anglo tapes, is that right, that story?
A. I don't -- if what was being alleged was correct.
Q. Yes.
A. And would eventually be found to have been correct, absolute1y.
Q. Yes.
A. Well, I don't know -- you know, on a measurability, if it was as big as the Anglo, probably not, but, I mean, it would have been a huge story.
A. So I don't know, is the answer. Now, the previous witness has said that the story that appeared and the story that she stress-tested were two different -- were different, but I don't know that, I'm afraid.

681 Q. So -- and this is a question, it's not a statement in any way, Mr. Mallon --
A. Sure.

682 Q. -- so that story was being published so as to show a totally different side to a garda whistleblower as it originally was thought about, is that right?
A. No, I don't agree with that because McCabe --

683 Q. No, that is okay, you don't have to.
A. No, Sergeant McCabe was not named in the story.

684 Q. okay.
A. So, no.

685 Q. Okay. So taking Sergeant McCabe's name out of the equation --
A. Yes.
Q. -- took that element of the story away, on your evidence?
A. Well, absolutely, yes.

688 Q. okay.
A. Because these were allegations at this point. Apart from, you know, defamatory reasons, or whatever. I mean, these were allegations, nothing more --
689 Q. A11 right.
A. -- of a case that had been dealt with by the DPP.

690 Q. Okay. Now, Ms. Harris, in her evidence, says that she heard from you on one occasion, and I'm paraphrasing this, that an allegation of criminal misconduct made against Sergeant McCabe, interference with a child, I think she categorises it at, but it may very well be that there is no real difference between yourself and Ms. Harris. You knew about that from the Paul williams matter, isn't that correct?
A. I think I utterly rejected Ms. Harris's claim on that.
Q. Well, that is what I was --
A. In that she made her statement, then she went back into the statement specifically with reference to myself.
693 Q. To yourself.
A. Did an about-turn, and then finally, up here on the stand, said that she was wrong about me and used the word 'wrong' three more times in her statement on the stand here. So, no, I don't accept anything that Ms. Harris said around that.
694 Q. A11 right. Do you think you ever said anything about Sergeant McCabe in Ms. Harris's company?
A. Absolutely not.

695 Q. okay.
A. Sorry, about that, about what she alleged originally?
Q. No, no, about what she said in the witness-box?
A. No, absolutely not.

697 Q. All right. Did you ever speak about the Paul williams story with Ms. Harris?
A. I have no recollection of speaking to Ms. Harris about the Paul williams story, no recollection whatsoever.
698 Q. Could you have spoken to her about it?
A. I would have attended regular editorial news meetings and news conferences with Ms. Harris on a weekly basis, maybe twice, three times a week. That story was sure to have come up. I just don't recall it specifically.

699 Q. A11 right. So you think it could have been mentioned in a meeting that you attended with Ms. Harris?
A. I don't know.

700 Q. You don't know that?
A. I've no recollection. conference, all sorts of matters would be discussed And if I understand it, that while you say that it wasn't a matter of mutterings around the office in relation to Sergeant McCabe, you're happy that everybody knew about the D allegation, or almost everybody in your office?
A. We11, I think what I objected to was the term mutterings and whispers and rumours and gossip and all that sort of thing.
704 Q. There was a particular problem with that?
A. But in a newsroom, and a newsroom is very full on when it comes to conversations about potential stories --
705 Q. Yes.
A. -- or matters that are in the public ether, or whatever, journalists don't tend to whisper and gossip around water coolers or whatever. They have overt conversations about it. That is not to say that they
are judge, jury and executioner, they are just discussing a story, you know, and that would have been normal practice for any newsroom, that stories are discussed, ones that -- part of the whole process, have you heard about so-and-so, whatever? Is there any truth in that or -- yeah.
Q. Ms. Harris's statement, was the language in relation to the word 'mutterings' and 'gossip', but you don't have a difficulty in saying that it would have been openly known and openly discussed in terms of a story in the Independent?
A. Ms. Leader, my difficulty with Ms. Harris's statement is that, in her own words, she was wrong. That is my real difficulty, you know.
Q. Well, I suppose it's for the Chairman to decide who is wrong.
A. Yes, but you asked me my difficulty. So that is my difficulty.
Q. I thought it was in relation to the language used, the mutterings and the --
A. Well, that was wrong, too, in my view.

709 Q. But --
A. Now, she says she -- Ms. Harris said she heard mutterings and rumours, $I$ can't argue with that, but she certainly didn't hear them from me.
MS. LEADER: If you would answer any questions anybody else might have.
A. Thank you.

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

710 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Mr. Mallon, you heard Ms. McDonald's evidence that she recalls being at a meeting which was attended inter alia or inter alios by yourself and Stephen Rae on the 14th March, or thereabouts, of 2014, to discuss the Paul williams story. Do you accept that?
A. I think I have accepted that, sir, that -- I don't recall it, but if she said that is the case, well then -- I don't recall that meeting. Yes. And as I understand your evidence, that was to discuss whether or not the story that Mr. Williams was then working on could be published, is that right?
A. No, that is not correct, sir. If you go back to what I said, what I said was I attended meetings with
Ms. McDonald. The final meeting in which she delivered her assessment of her stress-test to Mr. Rae, I was not there. I've already said this. Sorry, you may have missed that, but I wasn't --
712 Q. What kind of meeting do you think you attended and what was the purpose of the meeting that you think you may have attended in respect of this story?
A. I think, Chairman, I already said that I hadn't any recollection of meeting in which Ms. McDonald -- sorry, that I would have -- if Ms. McDonald said I attended a meeting along with her and Stephen Rae at the beginning of this to go and stress-test --

713 Q. You heard her evidence just a few moments ago, did you?
A. Sorry?

714 Q. You heard her evidence here?
A. Yes, I did.

715 Q. Yes.
A. That there was a number of meetings and that $I$ was at --

716 Q. Yes. In relation to the Paul williams article?
A. Yes.

717 Q. And she had been asked to stress test it after it had been written, isn't that right?
A. I'm sorry, what is your question?

718 Q. You're very quick to cavil with things, would you listen carefully. She had been asked to stress test this article after it had been written and she says she 16:01 attended a meeting with you in that context.
A. As I said, I have no recollection of the meeting. But I believe that I would have -- I thought she said that she was asked at a meeting with myself and Stephen Ray to go and stress test the story. Now if I am wrong on that, apologies. But I don't think I am wrong. And as for the delivery of the stress test I was not -- I have no knowledge of that.
719 Q. I see. We11, can we go back a few days earlier, you did say that you were party to the decision to send Mr. Williams down to carry out this interview, isn't that right?
A. I would have been -- yes, I would have been one of the people who had discussed the matter with Paul williams,
yes.
Q. And who else discussed it with Mr. Williams?
A. We11, Fionnuala O'Leary who is the Head of Digital and who is the person who was asked to commission a videographer would have been part of that conversation. 16:02 Fionnuala O'Leary's input was that it would be best, given the sensitivity of the case, that a female videographer go with Paul at the time, given the victim.
Q. And were you there for that discussion?
A. I've no recollection of it, but I certainly would have been part -- I believe I would have been part of it.
Q. Did I understand you to give in evidence a short time ago that you were part of the authorisation of the visit by Mr. Williams with a video camera person to Ms. D's home?
A. That would be correct. I would have been, I would been aware of that and I would have approved of it. Yes. You see, sir, this is nothing more than going to interview a person who is claiming an act or an improper investigation in this case against her, that doesn't mean the story has been published, it means that we are just going to investigate it further.

723 Q. I fully understand that. So can we take it that as Ms. Leader has said, that if this story turned out to
A. Yes.
Q. And I take it that as someone occupying the position which you held at the time, you were interested in the
possibility that the newspaper had an important story about Sergeant McCabe?
A. No. I've already said this. I was interested in the fact that an alleged victim was alleging that an investigation into her claims was improperly handled. Story. We've gone past that. We know that Sergeant McCabe --
A. Sorry, Mr. McDowell, you have asked me a question, I've just given you back the answer I can give you as best I can. You specifically asked about Maurice McCabe.

726 Q. Is that the best you can do?
A. And you specifically asked me about Maurice McCabe. CHA RMAN No, gentleman, gentleman, there is a question here which I may or may not be reporting on, which is how responsible was it to publish the article? Because I take it, Mr. McDowe11, that is your particular line here?

MR. MEDONELL: Yes.
CHA RMAN Is that right?
MR. MEDOVELL: I'm asking the question was he aware of
the potential importance of this story if it stood up. That is what I am asking.
CHA RMAK I think again it may help if I indicate my thinking. And I think if Ms. Leader was correct to say that it was explosive, and it's not a word necessarily I would use but it's certainly used in the media, if someone who is a national hero, let us say, even a swimming coach, and who has had, let's say, great success with swimming teams turns out to be abusing all
of the people or many of the people that he is coaching, that is a big story, that is an explosive story. If someone who is regarded highly because they are saying things about their own employer, namely the national police force, that are unpleasant but true, turns out to be a sex abuser well that is a huge story. I'm taking that as a given, if you like. So I suspect that Mr. McDowell's line of question is: If not to publish that story why elide that story in such a way that people reading it in the know would come to the same conclusion? So, I think that is where this is going.
727 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Well, before getting to that question which I do intend putting to you, Mr. Mallon, I was going to suggest to you that this was a very substantial story in which you must have had an interest as to whether the newspaper published it or not?
A. Well, as head of news, Mr. McDowell, I would have had an interest in all stories, whether they were published or not. All stories that came across my desk, yes. 728 Q. Look, of course you have an interest in all stories that come across your desk, but I'm suggesting to you that this, to use the Chairman's phrase, was a huge story and that therefore you had an elevated interest as to whether it would stand up or not and whether the newspaper could publish it or not. Is there a difficulty in agreeing with that proposition?
A. Yes, there is, sir. I didn't have an elevated interest
in this story no more than any other story, whether that as Anglo Irish or anything that was going on at the time. I did not have an elevated interest in the story. I had the same interest that I would have had in all the stories. Yes, this was a big story. I just want to stop you there. Is that your sworn testimony to this Tribunal; that you had the same interest in this story as any other story?
A. well, I mean, we're talking serious, heavy, public interest stories. I would have had -- yes, I would have had an interest in the story, of course. I can't measure it for you on whether it was more interesting to me than Anglo or more interesting to me, I think the Labour Party were in the news at the time, more interesting than whatever stories were there at the time. I remember, I maintained an interest in it. And I am suggesting to you, Mr. Mallon, and it's not a trick question, that because it was a potentially huge story you had a greater interest in standing it up or not standing it up and seeing could it be published or not?
A. I had an interest in seeing if it could be stood up or not, and if it could be published. Yes.
731 Q. And it was greater than the ordinary, because this was, to use the Chairman's term, a huge story?
A. Well no, not --

732 Q. Is there a difficulty with answering that question?
A. I've answered it already. And my answer is that I didn't hold it in any greater or lesser interest than I
would have at any big story at the time.
733 Q. At least we've got to the point that it's a big story at this stage.
A. I have already acknowledged that. I think the word used by Ms. Leader was explosive. So I have acknowledged that it was a big story. And when you learned that Mr. Williams had gone off with a video camera to conduct an interview, were you curious as to how he had got on there?
A. Not particularly, sir. I spoke to Paul williams that 16:08 day. I think it was a saturday.
Q. Yes.
A. He told me everything was in order and he was heading up and I don't think I had further correspondence with him that day or indeed the following day.
736 Q. I'm sorry, I'm finding this difficult. He said everything was in order and he was heading up and you don't think you had correspondence with him that day or the following day?
A. No, I had a correspondence with him that day before he went, but after his meeting with Ms. D and family I'm not sure I had any conversation with him that night. In fact, I'm sure I didn't.
737 Q. Well, if you didn't talk to him directly, did you ask his editor by the way, what became of the paul williams 16:09 story interview that I authorised the other day?
A. This was a story that was so serious with the allegations being made that it wasn't one that was going to be run the following day anyway. We would
have spoken on --
738 Q. I didn't suggest it was going to be run the following day. I was merely inquiring from you, Mr. Mallon, did you follow it up with anybody what became of the interview that you had authorised?
A. I have no recollection of who $I$ followed it up with. As I said, at the time, and I'm sorry Chairman, it was a previous career if you like, at the time I had no great recollections bar when $I$ got my first letter from the Tribunal here, that to try to go back over, going back over diaries, going back over memory banks if you like, that $I$ had no great recollection of my direct involvement at the time, beyond helping to organise the interview and the videographer and speaking to Paul williams that day.
739 Q. We11, I am just asking you, did your interest in this big story evaporate completely or did you attempt to remain abreast with whether or not it was going to yield a publishable article or articles?
A. Sir, I don't know, I don't recall any conversations with the editor subsequent to that. That conversation I feel would have probably taken place between the editor of the title and the group editor.
CHA RMAN Would it be fair to say, Mr. McDowe11, that the subtext is whether or not they had an interest in doing down Sergeant McCabe?
MR. MEDONELL: No, and that is not the point I am asking.
CHA RMAN I am sorry. I beg your pardon for not
taking it up correctly.

MR. MEDOVELL: I'm merely just asking what was your continuing involvement with this story after the interview was carried out?
A. My involvement was peripheral after that. If you could 16:10 even say peripheral. As I say, I explained this earlier on, sir, what we do is we try and set up, try and write up news lists on a weekly basis, we put all the infrastructures in place to see that interviews have taken place, stories come to pass and see the light of day. with that particular story I have no recollection of any further involvement in it.

741 Q. I see. Well, do you think it's probable that you had, that you were present at a meeting with Stephen Ray and Ms. Dearbhail McDonald at which its publishability was considered?
A. As I stated already, I have no recollection of that. In fact, $I$ 'd say $I$ was not at that meeting.
CHA RMAN You don't seem really to be in a position to contradict it. It's not as if it's a meeting, you know, of contract killers to see who they are going to see next. It's a perfectly legitimate meeting.
A. Oh absolutely, sir. Chairman, I would love to be able to give you the answer to that, absolutely, but I don't have any recollection of that.

742 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Maybe I will put this way: Did you ever -- did anybody ever tell you that Ms. D had made a video recording in which she alleged that she had been
sexually abused by Sergeant McCabe?
A. A video recording with the Irish Independent?

743 Q. Yes.
A. Well, of course. Because I've just already indicated as to my role within the, you know, setting up of that interview.

744 Q. Yes. But after the event, did anybody say what she had said about Sergeant McCabe?
A. I've no, I don't -- I can't specific a meeting in which I was -- I obviously found out what she had said but I don't know how that was relayed tow me. As I say, once the story is done, once it is written, once it is stress tested it is then the duty of the editor of the title or the newspaper or whatever platform that story is being carried on, I don't -- I'm not part of that process. If I had any hand, act or part in the publication of that story or the decision as to what page that story went on, I would happily recount that to you, sir, but it didn't happen like that, that is not the way it worked.
745 Q. I'm just wondering, just on a commonsense ordinary basis, asking myself, whether you were aware that she had made these accusations in a video recording which your newspaper was in possession of?
A. Of course I would have been aware that she made accusations against Sergeant McCabe, yes.

746 Q. And who would have told you that?
A. That was the whole central point of the interview. There was two parts to it really. One was a case of
impropriety in a case in which she was involved in, allegations thereof; and the second one was that she was alleged victim of sergeant McCabe, yes. But who told you that she had said these things to camera?

CHA RMAN I thought the evidence was that they reviewed part of the tape certain7y.
MR. MEDOWELL: Yes. Sorry, Judge. He hasn't said that he has ever seen the tape, he hasn't said he has ever discussed the tape with anybody.
CHA RMAN No. But he's not contradicting it either. MR. MEDONELL: We11, I don't know, Judge, that's for you to make up your mind on.
A. Maybe I can clear it up. Because I did say this. Thank you, by the way. I said I was not aware of seeing -- I have no recollection of seeing the videotape. If somebody said I was in that meeting looking at the videotape, absolutely, no problem. I have no problem accepting that. But I have no recollection of it and of course I've just said to you I have no recollection of the exact time or point where somebody told me that Ms. D had made a claim about Sergeant McCabe. But yes, I was very much aware of that. It's just, I can't pinpoint the exact time, date or location of that.

748 Q.
MR. MEDONELL: And just subjectively, just thinking back to that time, did you form any view as to whether this allegation was likely to be true or false?
A. I had no idea whether it was true; the allegation of an
improper Garda investigation into her case, I had no idea. And that was my primary concern. whether there was an improper investigation into her case. Yes, the DPP had ruled and I was concerned more if this was new evidence that was coming to light in which then obviously a case could be reopened in my knowledge. 749 Q. Did you form any view as to whether the underlying accusation in that was that Sergeant McCabe had sexually abused this girl --
A. I formed --

750 Q. -- was true or false?
A. Sir, I formed no subjective view whatsoever. I was completely objective with regards to this.
751 Q. What was your objective view as to whether it was true or false?
A. I didn't have a view either way. I didn't have the knowledge. I didn't know enough. Now, as time has passed and we are where we are today, well obviously, something was, you know -- I'd rather not say. I didn't have a view at the time whether it was true or false.
CHA RMAN It just, it always seems to coincide, I'm sorry, Mr. McDowell, with the Hardiman lecture series which of course because it was circulated to the Bar Council you will be terribly aware of.
MR. MEDOWELL: That is Mr. McGarry's business.
CHA RMAN Yes. Well, I thought it was circulated indeed to every member of the Bar and solicitors, at least that was the plan, you know, in honour of

Mr. Justice Hardiman.
MR. MtGARRY: For students. It was expressly stated to be for law students.

CHA RMAN Just for fear anyone might not be aware, because I'm sure great that efforts were taken in that regard, it's every Tuesday and Thursday all the way through June. There's vigorous nodding going on but that wasn't happening 1ast Thursday.
MR. MEDONELL: We11, that is Mr. McGarry's department.
I am not chairman of the Bar Council.
CHA RMAN Yes, I know. And I am supposed to sit until four o'clock, which is five hours already. And my head is frankly spinning as a result of today.
MR. MEDONELL: We11, if the Tribunal is indicating that we could resume tomorrow --
CHA RMAK Again, I know. But look, I think of myself as a courteous person, Mr. McDowe11, I am sure you do as well, and like, if a witness is here I would prefer to get them finished, and if necessary I will sit on.
MR. MEDOWELL: A11 right. I wil1 speed up, Judge.
CHA RMAN Yes.
752 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Could I ask you to look at page 6376 please? This is statement of Fionnuala o'Leary who is your digital editor for Independent Newspapers Group, is that right?
A. That's correct.

753 Q. Could I ask you to look at page 6377, the third paragraph from the top?
A. Yes, sir, I see that. Yes.

754
Q. which says:
"Early the foll owing week, I cannot recollect the exact day, Caoi me Gaskin upl oaded the vi deo. I bel i eve I wat ched this on my own and then l watched it in conference with Stephen Ray, Group Editor in Chi ef, I an Mallon, Group Head of News and Cl ai re Grady, then Editor of the Irish I ndependent. We wat ched the full version of video. It was not edited. It was clear to me there was no possi bility that this interview could be put onl ine in any shape or form lt was therefore a matter as far as being editor of independent.ie l would have no i nput. The print si de woul d have compl et e control over deci sions as to publication, editing and l egal ing. "

So that ring a bell with you?
A. Sir, as I said, I have no recollection of that meeting but if Fionnuala o'Leary states that $I$ was at that meeting -- I have said this a number of times, sir. I have no recollection. But if somebody says that I was at that meeting that is absolutely fine by me.
755 Q. She goes further, she says that you watched the entire video?
A. Yes. And once again I will give my same answer. I statement originally to the Tribunal.

756 Q. I see. And you formed no view as to the allegations, as to whether the allegations that were set out in that
video interview were true or false, is that right?
A. Sir, how could I set out a view of whether they are true or false? This was an allegation against somebody.
Q. Yes?
A. I mean, somebody makes an allegation you suddenly make a decision in your own head whether that is true or false? That is not how I operate or how I could have operated on an objective basis.
I suggest to you as an experienced newspaper man and editor you would say that has a ring of truth about it or that looks very suspect, those kind of notions would occur to you?
A. That's absolutely not the case. No. I mean, as a journalist or as an editor even with responsibility of that, one doesn't simply suddenly jump to a conclusion when an allegation is made.
759 Q. I see.
A. I mean, that is farfetched to say the least.

760 Q. It's farfetched to suggest that you might looking at an interview in full ask yourself does this sound true or false, is that right?
A. Looking at an interview, sir, in your own words to jump to a conclusion to say whether something is fact or not, absolutely.
761 Q. I see. But we are agreed, and I can shorten matters, that after this episode involving Mr. Williams many journalists in INM were aware of this story?
A. After publication, sir.

762 Q. Yes. After publication of the Williams --
A. Yes.

763 Q. -- story, isn't that right?
A. Yes, absolutely.

764 Q. Was it a secret that there was a video of it?
A. I would not -- I would say the knowledge that there was a video piece done was not widely known.

765 Q. I see. And --
A. And sorry just, that is purely on the basis of any story or whether it is an exclusive story or whether it 16:21 is an allegation or whatever, that certain things are just kept in a small group in-lodge, if you like, in a senior group, until a decision is made on whether to publish or not.
766 Q. I see. Obviously you've completely forgotten the video, is that right, at this stage?
A. Sir, I've told you already, I've no recollection of it.
Q. I understand, I haven't seen it either, but I understand that it was filmed on the basis that it showed the back of Ms. D's head and she was not identifiable in it?
A. I have made inquiries about the video and I have been told the same, yes.
768 Q. I see.
A. In order to try and rack my own head at the time, I did 16:21 ask somebody who would have seen the video what way, what was the format and they said that you could see the back of her head and the interviewer over her shoulder, if you like.

769 Q. So it was never intended to identify her at all by this video, is that right?
CHA RMAN We11, you could identify somebody by a voice. But it was filmed from the point of view of the noddies as opposed to from the point of view of the person being interviewed.
MR. MEDONELL: Yes, yes. We11, I have got to suggest to you that I mean it seems that it was filmed on the basis that it could be shown to people without identifying Ms. D?
A. Well, I would imagine that would have been the way -the way it was shot would lead you to believe that, yes.
771 Q. Can I put to you, to cut a long story short, that Ms. Harris as editor of the Sunday Independent carried quite a number of stories that were favourable to Sergeant McCabe and supportive of his position?
A. Yes.

772 Q. And can I put it to you that her evidence to the effect that she put down any discussion suggesting that he was, had abused a child, that she put it down as something she didn't want to hear, that that is true?
A. I saw that statement and I've no -- I certainly did not hear that.
773 Q. You didn't ever hear her do that?
A. No, I never did, absolutely not.

774 Q. And can I just finally ask you, what is your position, do you say you never discussed the williams articles or the Ms. D allegation with Ms. Harris at all?
A. The williams articles, no. Because in the same way that I did not discuss the Philip Ryan stories in the Sunday Independent with the editor of the Irish Independent. My role was an overarching group role. So things that editors spoke to me or didn't speak to me about I wouldn't discuss with other editors.
Q. And do I take it therefore that on your account you never spoke to her about Ms. D's allegation against Sergeant McCabe at all?
A. I have no specific recollection of that, no. As I said 16:24 earlier on, I think to Ms. Leader, it may have come up in news conversations, news conference conversation but I have no specific knowledge or detail of that.
Q. Have you any recollection as to her attitude if such a matter was raised in her company?
A. No. I have never known her to shutdown any conversation in her news conferences.
Q. Well, did you ever hear her entertain the possibility that Sergeant McCabe had sexually abused Ms. D?
A. No. I didn't. Once again, I have no recollection of any conversation like that.
Q. And bearing in mind that she was uncertain in the end as to what language she said you'd used --
A. Sorry, I think she was very certain. She used the word wrong. That was certain.
Q. Yes. But she stuck to the point that you did discuss it with her, isn't that right?
A. Just to go back to what Ms. Harris said in her initial statement, Chairman. She said in her initial statement
that I had been part of a whispering campaign or words to that effect. In her second statement, which she sent back in to the Tribunal, she said that my involvement, Ian Mallon involvement, was disproportionate. And then thirdly, she said that in regards to, and I'm sorry to use myself in the third person here, but Ian Mallon, in regards to Ian Mallon I was wrong and then she hid under a cloak of freedom of speech where she said we get things wrong as journalists and she --
780 Q. Listen, you're not here to score points against her.
A. I am answering your questions.

781 Q. I am putting to you that you did have a discussion with her about the allegation against Sergeant McCabe?
A. I think I have answered this three times. I said I have no recollection of a conversation with her about Sergeant McCabe. Ever.

782 Q. I see.
A. I cannot be clearer on that. If I did have a conversation with her about Sergeant McCabe, Mr. McDowe11, I would have no problem in recalling it, or if I had evidence and I have gone through my diaries and everything. what harm would that be?

783 Q. Exactly. what harm would it be?
A. Yeah.

MR. MEDONELL: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Does anyone else have any questions at all really?
MR. LEHANE: Yes, Chairman, I appear for Ms. Harris, I
have a couple of questions.
CHA RMAN Al1 right. We11 then, maybe you can then clear up the mystery as to who said what. I am beginning to wonder do journalists get along with each other at all.

MR. HARTY: I have a number of questions on behalf of Ms. O'Doherty.
CHAN RMAN You're going to have to be quick because, you know, I have been here now for five and a half hours listening to all of this kind of stuff.
Otherwise we will pull up the stumps and come back tomorrow but I don't want to do that to Mr. Mallon, no more than I would want to do it to anybody, so please just hurry up.
MR. LEHANE: Will I go first on behalf of Ms. Harris?
CHA RMAN I don't care. Yes, please do Mr. Lehane.
MR. LEHANE: Thank you for your courtesy.

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

## FOLLOVG:

784 Q. MR. LEHANE: Mr. Ma11on, I will start with the
allegations. Sorry I am here on behalf of Ms. Harris. Your evidence to the Tribunal is that almost every journalist in the Independent Group was aware of the fact that there were allegations against Sergeant McCabe and that he was associated with the article and that the DPP had given directions that there was nothing in those allegations, is that right?
A. Sorry, can you pull up my statement there so I can see
what you are saying?
785 Q. Ah no, I will break down --

786 Q. I will break it down.
A. Yeah.

16:27
787 Q. Your evidence to the Tribunal is that almost every journalist in the Independent Group was aware that there were allegations of sexual assault committed allegedly by Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

788 Q. okay. And you also say that almost every journalist in the Independent Group was aware that those allegations or that the DPP had decided not to prosecute in respect of those allegations, that is your evidence, is it?
A. Yes.

789 Q. In relation to the DPP's directions, how did you know that?
A. I was aware of the DPP dropping the original case at some point. I do not know when that point was.
Q. okay. In fairness to you, you say that these matters were being discussed in an open way around the Independent Group, isn't that right?
A. Well, as I said, I mean there was nothing whispering or murmuring about any stories in my view when I was present.

791 Q. So if somebody was to say that these matters were being discussed in offices, in corridors over coffee or at the watercooler you wouldn't disagree with that would you?
A. No, I wouldn't.

792 Q. okay. And were you privy to any of these conversations?
A. No. Not beyond specific professional, you know, editorial overview.

793 Q. okay. And was the word kiddie fiddler ever used?
A. Pardon?

794 Q. Was the word kiddie fiddler ever used?
A. It's not a word I like, or a phrase I like, so it wouldn't be used in front of me.

795 Q. I don't think anyone likes the word kiddie fiddler.
A. I'm just telling you, yes, I mean, that is what I said. I don't like that phrase so $I$ wouldn't certain7y have used it and nor would it have been used in front of me.

796 Q. Did you ever overhear anybody using it?
A. No, not at all.

797 Q. Was the word paedophile ever used?
A. Not that I'm aware of. Certainly not in front of me.

798 Q. Would you agree with me that paedophile is a term, it's not a legal term as such but it's used informally to refer to persons who commit sexual offences against children, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

799 Q. Would it surprise you if that word was being used in discussions which were going on all over Independent or 16:29 Talbot House in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Would it surprise me?

800
Q. Yes.
A. Absolutely.

801 Q. Why?
A. Well, grown-ups are supposed to be objective, journalists are certainly supposed to be objective and I would never have been of the view that people were running around saying so and so is a paedophile, absolutely not.

802 Q. Would it surprise you if loose language was being used by journalist in relation to these allegations -CHA RMAN Mr. Lehane, I'm sorry to interrupt you, but at the end of the day, how am I going to write in my report about any of this stuff?
MR. LEHANE: Sorry, Judge --
CHA RMAN How does it impact on my duty to tell the Oireachtas whether or not there was a campaign against Sergeant McCabe run from Garda Headquarters?
MR. LEHANE: Chairman, one of my functions, and I am very conscious of the time --
CHA RMAN Forget about the time, Mr. Lehane, forget about people complaining about my patience or lack of patience, forget my courtesy or lack of courtesy, just forget about that now for a moment, the question is: How does this help me reporting to the Oireachtas? MR. LEHANE: We11, Chairman, my client when she was giving evidence was challenged on certain accounts that she gave of what transpired and what $I$ am trying to do is I am trying to put questions to this witness and another witness in relation to these matters and one of those unfortunately is was the word paedophile used in the context of these discussions. Obviously it's a
matter for you, Chairman, when you're writing your report, I'm simply just trying to ascertain whether or not the word was used and the witness has given his evidence.

CHA RMAK But if it was used it would be perfectly proper, Mr. Lehane, to use the word, wouldn't it? MR. LEHANE: we11, that is the point, Chairman. That is the point.
CHA RMAN Yes. It carries a technical meaning and there's another word unfortunately which I can't remember, which again is derived from Greek, which carries a technical meaning for those who have a sexual interest in people who are budding adolescents.
MR. LEHANE: That is the point. There would be nothing unusual.

CHA RMAN No, there wouldn't, Mr. Lehane.
MR. LEHANE: That is why I am asking this question.
This witness is saying absolutely not, I never heard it used, I didn't use it. whereas my client is saying that that word was used in her presence. That is the reason I was asking the question, Chairman.

CHA RMAN All right. Either way it's not going to help your client or help Mr. Mallon.
MR. LEHANE: Simply. I don't want to say, Chairman, have I to ask -- because the issue was raised I have now asked the questions with Mr. Mallon and I have finished asking those questions.

803 Q. Mr. Mallon, just in relation to, your problem with Ms. Harris is that you described, it was simply
nonsense or unrealistic for her to suggest that there was a silent muttering campaign ongoing in Independent Newspapers, isn't that right? That's what you say in your statement?
A. Say that again, sorry, I beg your pardon.

804 Q. You say in your statement that it is simply nonsense and unrealistic for Ms. Harris to suggest that there was a silent muttering campaign ongoing where the allegation was well known to all?
A. Yes.

805 Q. And your evidence is that your problem is with the use of the word muttering campaign or that it was silent?
A. Yeah.

806 Q. You're not making any suggestion that it is nonsense or unrealistic for Ms. Harris to suggest that this matter was being talked about in a general sense, it's just the manner in which it was talked about?
A. Yes. Sir, I think I may have touched on this already. Absolutely. Everything can be discussed in general sense, especially news stories or proposed stories of the day. But not in a muttering, sort of, gossipy, kind of wink-wink sort of way.
807 Q. When this Tribunal was set up and when the Tribunal gave his call for information, did you contact or write to the Tribunal and indicate that you had overheard or were aware that these matters were being discussed in the newspaper after March 2014?
A. No. The Tribunal contacted me.

808 Q. okay. why didn't you do that?
A. Because I didn't have -- I don't have any information, sir.
Q.

Just in relation to what Ms. Harris actually said, and I will just put to you her evidence to the Tribunal to give you a chance to comment on it. She says that, and 16:33 this is at page 119 and there's no need to put it on the screen, that you came in very busy, you came in and out of meetings, usually to give some message and then out again. And I think that's your evidence. That you would dip in and dip out of meetings as required, is that right?
A. I dipped into and out of many meetings. I've stayed for the duration of many meetings with Ms. Harris also.
810 Q. Yes. And she says that what you said to her was:
"It wasn't a very big Tuesday conference, it was a different one to the best of my recollection and he just said the same sort of thing, he said -- "

And this is you now saying.
"-- oh you know, we have to bear in mind that he's -there's more to this than, there's more to Sergeant McCabe that meets the eye and that's all there was." And then she said you said:
"You know about MECabe and children."
A. Sir, once again, and I have said this four times now,
once again I will return to when Ms. Harris was sitting where I am sitting and she conceded absolutely that she had got it wrong about me. So I mean, yes.
811 Q. Ms. Harris clarified the accounts that she had previously given and the Chairman can draw his own conclusions --
A. Yes, absolutely.

812 Q. -- based on the letters and the evidence that she gave under oath here. But the point is, would you agree with me that what she attributes you saying there is a fairly mild version of the conversations that on your account were flying around Independent Group headquarters at that time?
A. Chairman, that's absolutely incorrect.

813 Q. We11, I have to put to you that you did say that.
A. I didn't.

MR. LEHANE: Thank you very much?

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

814 Q. MR. HARTY: Mr. Mallon, my name is Mark Harty and I am 16:35 counsel for Gemma O'Doherty. I want to bring you back a year earlier - I am just here - to April 2013, what was your role at that stage?
A. I was Operations Editor as it was called of the Irish Independent, which was an operational and editorial

815 Q. And Ms. O'Doherty was one of the staff journalists --
A. Yes.

816 Q. -- in the Irish Independent at that time?
A. Correct.

817 Q. Do you recall receiving a phone call in relation to Ms. O'Doherty appearing at the doorstep of the former Garda Commissioner Martin Callinan?
A. Yes, I do. the home of the Garda Commissioner and effectively was door-stepping the Garda Commissioner as the phrase is used.

821 Q. Do you recall calling Gemma o'Doherty then?
A. I rang her immediately.

822 Q. Right?
A. And I asked her to desist and please, just move away from the house, get away from the house and just go home and we can discuss it the following morning. And that I just would have said to her that there are And the first $I$ knew that she was door-stepping the home of the Garda Commissioner was when I got that phone call. And I would have always been privy to any
of our reporters making door-steps. Door-steps can essentially be dangerous things when you just suddenly arrive on somebody's door in this case at night and an editor would always have to know about it.
CHA RMAN Gentlemen, it's now quarter to five or thereabouts. I'm sorry you have to come back in the morning but you do have to come back in the morning and I think I have sat here long enough. I can't take any more.
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