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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVB, ON FRI DAY, 15TH J UNE, 2018:

MS. LEADER: Mr. Reynolds, please.

MR. PAUL REYNOLDS CONTI NUED TO BE CROSS-EXAM NED BY
MR. MCDOVELL:
MR. MEDONELL: Chairman, yesterday Mr. whelan made an intervention on behalf of the Gardaí -- they are not here.
CHA RMAN There is no Garda here at all?
MR. MEDONELL: I wil1 continue anyway, Chairman. I was going to say --
CHA RMAN No, no, we will wait, Mr. McDowell. It could have been that there was some kind of an incident 10:05 such as mentioned in the context of Dowra, but I doubt it. No, don't worry about it. You are fine.
MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, might I just say I have received some information that the Garda legal team will be another five minutes.
CHA RMAN okay. Well, why don't we all just wait. I understood, Mr. McGuinness, there was a colleague of mine in the High Court who later went to the Supreme Court, no names will be mentioned, who when sitting in Galway and was told that the parties needed time to consider the settlement of a case, simply sat there until such time as such settlement was effected. But I don't think $I$ am going to do that. So $I$ will go.

THE HEARI NG ADJ OURNED BRI EFLY AND THEN RESUMED AS FOLLOVG:

CHA RMAN Just one other thing vis-à-vis the week after next, $I$ understand certain inquiries are being made including down in the courts to see if we can find some place to sit. So, Mr. McDowell.

MR. MEDOVELL: Yes, Chairman, yesterday Mr. Whelan intervened and said that it might shorten matters if Sergeant McCabe were to indicate whether he was withdrawing the suggestion that Commissioner O'Sullivan had orchestrated the RTÉ coverage. Sergeant McCabe isn't in a position to withdraw anything; he has faithfully reported to the Tribunal what he was told by Mr . Barrett and it's up to this Tribunal to ascertain whether his account of what Mr. Barrett told him is correct or whether it's not, but he is not withdrawing his testimony as to what he was told by Mr. Barrett. CHA RMAN I think that's right, Mr. McDowe11, and I also think this is like habeas corpus: Once I am required to investigate something $I$ just have to do it, it doesn't matter what anybody says. But of course, you know, if it turns out that it is being said now, we11, I was misheard, misunderstood, never said that at a11, wel1 that does obviously make a difference. But let's see where the thing shakes up, and I think everybody knows because the relevant statements have been circulated.
1 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Mr. Reynolds, could I ask you to look at
page 5905 again, please, which is page 8 of your May 2016 notebook. Have you got that there? In typewritten form.
A. Yeah.

2 Q. And maybe I should just remind you that it corresponds to page 5931, which is the manuscript version of that page in the notebook?
A. Sorry, what am I looking at here?

3 Q. You are looking at typewritten version.
A. What is at the top of the page? Page 8, "not exagger at ed" .

4 Q. Page 8, "not exaggerated". Yes. And could I ask you whether those notes are notes of a conversation with somebody or are they your own notes as an aide-memoire as you were going through the report?
A. Can we just scroll down them a little bit more, please?

5 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah, they look to me like they could be an aide-memoire, an initial outline.
6 Q. I see. And you'11 see that after item 9, I take it, there is a numeral of some kind on the left, but there's "truthf ul to the Commi ssi on in his evi dence he lied to a seni or of ficer (lied)"?
A. Yeah.

7 Q. Can you just indicate was that your reflection on what you were reading or was that somebody saying that to you?
A. No, I think that would be my reflection on what I was reading, on what I had read.

8 Q. So you decided, having read the relevant paragraph in the o'higgins Commission report which referred to an untruth which he had uttered in order to shake Superintendent Clancy out of complacency, you decided to put in the term "lied", is that right?
A. Yeah, yeah, that was my decision, as I said. And I can give you the reasons for it again if you want but I gave them to you yesterday.
9 Q. No, we have gone through all of the catechism and the dictionary. I am just curious that this was your term 10:19 and you decided to use it, unprompted by anyone else, is that right?
A. Yes, no, I used the word "lie".

10 Q. I see. And on the next page, page 9, you have "false report to super, reported to GSOC, hadn't" and then the 10:19 phrase "found fal se report untruth"?
A. Yeah.

11 Q. That refers to the same thing again, does it?
A. Yeah, it looks like it, doesn't it.

12 Q. So this was a matter of some considerable concern to you that sergeant -- in terms of your analysis of the report, you've made two separate notes now of that incident, is that right?
A. Ah, yeah, yeah, yeah, I saw it as a significant issue, all right.

I see. Now, could I ask you, did you ever think, in conducting your analysis and your editorial analysis, to deal with issues such as the amount of occasions where Sergeant McCabe's evidence was preferred to that
of people who had given evidence to the Tribunal implicating Sergeant McCabe -- or sorry, the Commission, implicating sergeant McCabe in the incidents of which he was complaining?
A. Ah, yeah, I did consider, like, I considered the positive aspects as well as the negative, I think that is reflected in the research.
No, but you didn't, you never said that on many occasions the Tribunal -- sorry, the Commission had to deal with issues where Sergeant McCabe had to give evidence contrary to that of other Garda witnesses and that on each and every occasion Sergeant McCabe's evidence was accepted and preferred over the contradictory statements of his colleagues?
A. No, you are correct. Like, I mean, there's many occasions in the report, as I said it's 360 pages, I mean, I looked at it in the round and I tried to reflect as much as I could the balance of it, you know, the positive, the not so positive it, the issues. But by zeroing in on the untruth paragraph, and Mr. Gillane has told us that you read that out in your radio interview, by zeroing in on that and by never referring to the fact that Sergeant McCabe, his evidence had been preferred to the contradictory evidence of other Gardaí, you were giving the impression, surely, that he was an unreliable person?
A. Ah, no, no, I wasn't, because I was very conscious and very determined to put in the part in the report where he was never less than truthful in his evidence, and I
would have thought that that reflected what you are saying there, you know. But it didn't deal with the fact that he had had to contradict other Garda witnesses on a number of quite serious matters?
A. Ah, well, it mightn't have gone into the specifics but I think the judge's finding that he was never less than truthful in his evidence to the Commission, I think you know, that does cover it.
I see. Well, could I ask you to look at page 5481, please. You might find it easier, by the way, if you took out Volume 21 and looked at it in the flesh, so to speak, because these things rolling past you on the screen are a bit difficult to follow.
A. What page am I looking for?
A. Okay.

19 Q. It appears at the bottom of the page that you had sent Ray Burke, Kevin Bakhurst and Hilary McGouran a proposed text for your piece on Monday's one o'clock news, is that right?
A. Yeah, I think this is in reference to the News at One, yeah.
Q. Your proposed text was going to start with the phrase, which is on page 5482 , start with the sentence:
"The O' Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on says the whi stlebl ower, Sergeant Maurice McCabe, did not withdraw an allegation of corruption agai nst the former Garda Commi ssi oner

Martin Callinan, despite being invited to do so."
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. And as I see it, Mr. Burke says:
"I thi nk we can avoid any accusation of bi as if you started by sayi ng --"

This is at paragraph 2 on his reply to you.
"-- that the O Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on has sai d that former
Gar da Commi ssi oner Martin Callinan is entitled to have his reputation vindi cated and that allegations made agai nst hi mby whi stl ebl ower Sergeant Maurice McCabe were unf ounded and deepl y hurtful.
A. Yeah.

22 Q. And he then puts in:
"I think a lead-in like that above does not put the boot into McCabe strai ght away."
A. Mmm.

23 Q. Now, I know that you have said that this correspondence was a frank editorial interchange of ideas.
A. Raw, robust.

24 Q. Not intended to --
A. Casual.
Q. Yes. Not intended to be poured over by lawyers at a later stage.
A. Yes.
Q. But I do have to suggest to you that, even allowing for
that, the underlying feeling is that your piece was putting the boot into Sergeant McCabe?
A. Ah, no, no, I mean, I mean, everybody would have their own opinion on the pieces anyway and they are entitled to have that, of course I accept that. And you know, as I said yesterday, nobody seems to have been happy with it and so be it. But really, I mean, as I said as well, you have to look at this email in the context of the previous emails and our overriding concern was to make sure that we were fair to everybody, to all parties, and that we were impartial. And while I did see it, I saw it as a very significant finding, not only the fact that Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins had found that the Garda Commissioner or the former Garda Commissioner was not corrupt, but I also thought it was significant that Sergeant McCabe did not withdraw that, and it was the only case where he didn't withdraw it, so he was -- it appeared to me that he could possibly still be maintaining that and I actually thought that was very significant. And yeah, as you can appreciate it's all part of the editorial process where other people come in with other ideas and look at it with fresh eyes and clearly Ray Burke looked at this and said yeah, I see your point, but really we have to be very, very careful, we are reporting on the facts of what Mr. Justice Kevin o'Higgins found, but really, we have to be so careful so that we are not seen, not only that we are biased against Sergeant McCabe, but we have to be seen not to be biased, and if there is any
possibility of a perception like that emerging, we have to make sure we have taken steps to avoid that, and to show that. And I think that is what that shows there.
27 Q. Yes. Well, that email is, as I understand it, sent to you at nearly half past nine on the --
A. Sunday night. contacted -- made contact with Sergeant McCabe or attempted to make contact with Sergeant McCabe by telephone?
A. I think there is a time on my note in one of those handwritten notes, isn't there? I think it was possibly after it, but if you -Yes.
A. If you can put up that, I think it was 9:55 but I stand to be corrected. I think it was 9:55.

31 Q. Yes.
A. I can look through the hard copy, I have in my bag if you like.
Q. And what did you --
A. I think it was after that.
what did you intend to do in a phone call with Sergeant McCabe at that stage when your texts had all been written?
A. I was going to present the text to him and ask him what his response was.

34 Q. At ten o'clock on a Sunday night you were going to
present him with your written texts --
A. Yes.
think the final report -- sight of the report is a breach of -- I think it's my duty to present him and say look, this is what we are doing tomorrow, I want you to be aware of it and if we have got anything wrong and any mistakes in it please tell us and we will stop now.

39 Q. So you were expecting him at ten o'clock on a Sunday night to start going through your proposed texts which
A. Yeah, we11, I mean, I wasn't going to send him all my emails or everything, but I was going to read out -- as you know yourself there is a seven o'clock report and
an eight o'clock report, so I was proposing to read, you know, the minute or minute and a half of the, say, seven o'clock report and an eight o'clock report, which is both the same. So I could read that to him first and see what his reaction would be, and if he chose to comment on that then I could have given him further details in relation to the question and answer in relation to what the Commission had found in relation to his actions with regarding the eight criminal investigations. And then, as you rightly point out, you see on that email from the News at One, that is embargoed until one o'clock, I mean, that isn't even the finished product, because when we finished Morning Ireland we then looked at this and with fresh eyes on that in the morning, we looked at it again and I imagine there were further changes to the News at One before it was actually broadcast. So there was plenty of time for that. So ten o'clock on a Sunday night, it wouldn't have taken too long to get a reaction from Sergeant McCabe.
40 Q. You see, I am suggesting to you that this is entirely fanciful and that you were simply going through the motions.
A. But why would I go through the motions?

41 Q. That you had no intention of varying the script which prepared in question-and-answer form?
A. Ah, no. Like, I mean, look, I'd worked on this and I had read it and I knew, if anybody was familiar with
it, Sergeant McCabe was most familiar with it. I mean, he had lived it for years. So you put it to him. I mean, if there was anything wrong or anything objectionable or anything that could be questioned, I mean, he was in a position to do so.

So is your position a bit like former Commissioner Callinan, that he was given an opportunity to have input into your broadcasts but failed to avail of the opportunity?
A. I am not sure if I would use the word failed. He didn't. I mean, that is his choice and his right. I mean, as in the previous broadcast, he had -- I mean, al1 I can do to people when I'm writing about them or broadcasting is give them the opportunity. I want to hear their side of the story. That is my -- I have a statutory obligation to hear from all parties and to be as fair -- be fair and impartial. And I have to put it to people.
CHA RMAN I am right in thinking, amn't I, that there was a phone call, a message was left but there was no reply and it was $10: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ on the Sunday, which is about -- well, that is about nine hours before the first broadcast.
A. That's correct. And I mean, we had received solicitors letters from Sergeant McCabe before, so if there was any problem I would have no doubt that we would have heard from the lawyers, you know. And if there was a difficulty, $I$ 'm sure we could have stopped it, like, you know.

43 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Was he to consult his solicitor at ten o'clock on a Sunday evening?
A. Ah, no -- I mean, that is open to him, that is open to anybody, whatever. I mean, he was -- nine hours beforehand I made sure that he was aware that this was going to happen.

44 Q. I see. Now, can I suggest to you that, again that you were simply going through the motions, that you didn't intend to have any significant input from him, and secondly, can I suggest to you that you were putting him in a wholly embarrassing position, that if he did comment and you pub1ished that fact, that he would be implicated in breaching the confidentiality of the O'Higgins Commission?
A. Ah, no, no, no, Mr. McDowe11. I mean, that never crossed my mind.

45 Q. We11, would you have said Sergeant McCabe denies all of this?
A. I would hear what he had got to say first. I didn't know what he was going to say.

46 Q. Would you --
A. He could have told me that is all wrong, you are completely wrong. He could have said you haven't -you have got the wrong report, I have got another copy of it here, it says this, he could have said anything to me.

47 Q. I see. We11 --
A. I mean, I could put a situation to you, imagine if he said to me well actually, you are completely wrong
there, 10.86 isn't in the final version, you have got a previous draft, I would have been rightly snookered. I see. I am suggesting to you, just to close off on this, that approaching Sergeant McCabe at that stage by a telephone message was just simply going through the motions of pretending that you were being evenhanded in dealing with your sources?
A. This is too serious for pretence, Mr. McDowell. I have a statutory responsibility. RTÉ is the only organisation in this country broadcasting -- or the only news organisation in this country that is regulated by statute, and I have a statutory responsibility to report in a fair and impartial manner. And I had to contact Sergeant McCabe. well, if you had to report in a fair and impartial manner, why did you not mention the fact that sergeant McCabe's evidence had been preferred by the o'Higgins Commission on all of the areas where he was in conflict with other Gardaí?
A. Well, as I explained to you, I mean, I dealt with his evidence, the Commission's overall finding was that he was never less than truthful.
50 Q. And I'm suggesting to you that you omitted the fact that his evidence was preferred to that of other Gardaí who gave evidence against him to the o'Higgins Commission on numerous occasions in the report?
A. No. I wrote these reports very, very conscious to be fair and balanced.

51 Q. Just to remind you, issues such as whether he was
involved in letting Jerry McGrath out on bail, whether he was involved in the loss of a computer, whether he allowed the man who assaulted the young girl out on bail after 20 minutes interrogation, things like that where -- whether he was the person who told Mary Lynch that she needn't bother attending court, all of those incidents were where other Gardaí testified against him and where the Commission said that his version was correct.
A. I went through each of the individual cases and where the judge found that he was to be praised, I quoted directly from the report and praised him.
52 Q. I see.
A. And where the judge said he was to be criticised, I quoted the criticisms directly from the report.
53 Q. And you see, you did an analysis about how many times Superintendent Clancy had been mentioned and how many times Sergeant McCabe's allegations against him had been found to be unsubstantiated, and you counted them all up, isn't that right? I think, was it 17 or 19 times? 19 times? Sixteen, 17 or 19 times, whichever, you counted them all up?
A. Mmm.

54 Q. But you never once counted up the occasions on which Sergeant McCabe had had to defend himself against evidence of other Gardaí and where his evidence had been preferred to theirs?
A. Mr. McDowe11, there is 360 pages in that report, $I$ have no doubt that you can cherry-pick, you can go right
through it and pick out all the bits I missed and I wi11 accept exactly what you are saying, but if you ask me if those reports on RTÉ gave a fair, accurate, impartial and balanced account of the report, I think any fair-minded person will say to you that they did. In fact, $I$ am just quoting from the transcript just so that we will be clear about it, you said:
"It states at least 19 times that Sergeant McCabe's compl ai nts agai nst Superintendent Cl ancy were i naccurate, unreasonable, incorrect, mani festly unfounded or not supported by the facts."
A. Yeah, but sure, that is a fact in the report.
Q.

I see. Did you hear Mr. Philip Boucher-Hayes' broadcast on the Drive Time programme?
A. I didn't. I was preparing for the six o'clock news.
A. I don't think I did. No, I didn't listen back to it. I was preparing for the nine o'clock news. There was, a solicitor's letter came in from Sergeant McCabe.
59 Q. Was the day before yesterday the first time you heard that programme?
A. The day before yesterday?

60 Q. Yes.
CHA RMAN In other words, when we played it hear.

61 And did it not strike you as you heard it that it was far more balanced and fair than the picture you presented?
A. Well look, if you want to tell me that Philip Boucher-Hayes is a far better reporter than me I am not going to disagree with you.
Q. I didn't suggest that to you and I wouldn't be that offensive to you. What I was suggesting to you: That his analysis and his reportage on the o'Higgins Commissioner Callinan report was far more balanced and fair than your output that day?
A. You are perfectly entitled to your opinion, Mr. McDowe11, and everybody is entitled to their opinion.
Q. So you didn't share that opinion?
A. We11, I can't have an opinion on this. I mean, I just put the work out as it is and people can take from it what they will.

66 Q. I see. Did I understand your evidence to be that on the day of the Public Accounts Committee hearing at which Mr. Callinan used the term 'disgusting' that you in Leinster House, is that right?
A. Yes, I passed by him, yeah, in passing.

67 Q. Yes.
A. Mmm .

68 Q. And did you have a conversation?
A. Not a conversation.

69 Q. Or telepathic --
A. I beg your pardon?

70 Q. Did you have a conversation with him or it was telepathy?
CHA RMAN No, I think the evidence was that - I mean, we are all human beings - apparently one or either of them was urinating, the other was passing by or going to the urinal or whatever, and the person who I understood was Commissioner Callinan who was at the urinal shook his head as if to say I have made an eejit out of myself.
MR. MEDOWELL: I don't think urinals were mentioned in 10:40 the evidence.

CHA RMAN We11, I mean, what else are people doing in toilets? I mean --

71 Q.
MR. MEDONELL: But he said:
"I met himin the bathroom outside, I was washing my hands and he said to me--"

And you were asked:
"Q. And this is where? In the Public Accounts Committee?
A. This is in the Public Accounts Committee. And he sai $d$, he shook his head and knew he shoul dn't have said
the word di sgusting."

And you said later on:
"Yeah, it was just sort of a -- you know, he just knew, 10:40 he knew he shoul dn't have done it."

So that's your -- his body language suggested that to you, is that what you are saying, not anything he said or you said?
A. It was a combination of both, yeah. I mean, I don't have the exact words but I knew exactly, he just shook his head, you know, just disgusting, you know, I knew what he meant.
CHA RMAN But he didn't say anything?
A. I mean, he said anything, well, I shouldn't have said it, you know that sort of thing, I shouldn't have said it. I mean, I don't have the exact memory of it, but I knew exactly, it was just a fleeting moment but...
72 Q. MR. MEDOWELL: And you know that he was passed a note asking him to explain it or to withdraw it from one of his colleagues?
A. Well, I heard that, yeah.

73 Q. He didn't. And we know that the following day, he went to visit -- or he went to visit the car park in west Dublin and spoke to Deputy McGuinness, you are aware of that?
A. But sure, I don't know anything about any of that. I mean, I only know what is in the public domain.

74 Q. I see. And I am suggesting to you that he seems to have had a different attitude on the subject in whatever remarks he made in his dealings with you than he did with anybody else?
A. Sure, I don't know that.

75 Q. It does suggest, though, that he was on close terms and in a position to trust you not to go and say the Commissioner shook his head after the meeting and told me -- led me to believe that he regretted using the term?
A. It's just a human moment, really, you know. It doesn't suggest anything.
Q. But you never broadcast that?
A. I did.

77 Q. At the time?
A. On the day he retired.

78 Q. That he had regretted it?
A. Yes.

79 Q. I see. And do I understand that your relationship was such that he could tell you all of that and rely on you to back him up on the date of his retirement?
A. Sorry, repeat that again.

80 Q. I am suggesting to you that this suggests that he had a relationship with you of friendship?
A. I wouldn't agree with that.

81 Q. You wouldn't agree with that?
A. No, I wouldn't agree with that. I think we are all human, Mr. McDowe11, you know.
82 Q. And you are aware -- well, you exchanged an email with
him on the date of his retirement, isn't that right?
A. No.

83 Q. Or sorry, a text message, are you saying that wasn't you?
A. Sorry, can you show me what you are talking about. You 10:43 said an email --

84 Q. I thought Ms. Leader showed you a text message the other day?
A. Two days after his retirement.
Q. Two days after his retirement. I see. And on the 22nd 10:44 March, before his retirement, somebody sent him a text message saying:
"Reynol ds would hel p out if an intervi ew arose somewhere. "

That suggests that you were supportive --
A. But sure, I can't be responsible - I told you that yesterday - I can't be responsible what other people say or don't say or think or don't think. Sure I don't know who that is or what that is about.
Q. You see, I am suggesting to you to you that nobody would send that text to the Commissioner if they didn't believe you would help out with an interview?
A. But sure who was that?

CHA RMAN We11, I mean, Mr. Reynolds, I appreciate it can be hard to, I suppose, chaff, but it's not really a question of debating. If it is the case that you would remember you would have been in contact with him later
or you would have suggested, and it could be completely on a human level, feeling sorry for someone who has lost their job, offered to put his side of the story or do some kind of an interview, then you must know that, and if Mr. McDowell asks the question you really have to tell me.
A. But sure, I have answered that yesterday, and I have accepted that.
CHAN RMAN what is the answer?
A. Which? In relation to the text?

CHA RMAN No, it's in relation to, I suppose, the events surrounding the text. In other words --
A. The text was two days after he retired.

CHA RMAN No, I know that.
A. I am sorry, I am not clear on what you are looking for. CHAN RMAN It's really what was going through your mind in relation to this.
A. After he retired, is it?

CHA RMAN yes.
A. What was going through my mind two days after he retired was, wouldn't it be great to get an interview with the former Garda Commissioner, wouldn't that be some scoop.
87 Q. MR. MEDONELL: We11, I am suggesting to you that before he retired somebody sent a text -- well, perhaps we'd better look at it. It's at page 4615, volume 17. And somebody sends a text, do you see it there?
A. I do, yes.

88 Q. At item 18 on that page, somebody sends the

Commissioner a text on that day, in the evening time, saying:
"Yeah, just thi nki ng so much pressure bei ng exerted from Labour riding on Varadkar's opener."

That is presumably, though we don't know it, to deal with the distinguished rather than disgusting thing.
"Hope Kenny can control the PAC on Tuesday, and you woul d need a plan B if needed in a hurry. I mean, what you were putting together yesterday. Si milarly if you were door-stepped or at an official function. Reynol ds woul d hel p out if an intervi ew arose somewhere. Just thoughts and not recommendations."
CHA RMAN This by the way, is two days before he resigned?

MR. MEDONELL: Yes, exactly.
89 Q. So there's somebody saying to the Commissioner that you would help out with a helpful interview or a piece?
A. Well, no, no, I would be very interested in speaking to him at that time on the record on camera. And, as I said, my record speaks for itself, I'd have a few very interesting questions to ask him, I have no doubt about that. As I said to you before, I mean it's a lazy assumption and it's not fair and not true.

90 Q. It's the phrase "help out", I mean if the Commissioner was in trouble at the time and beset by crises of different kinds, he was being told by some adviser that
you would help out with an interview?
A. I would certainly interview the Commissioner and I would certainly have some very interesting questions for him. And I would have at that time, as I do -- as I have had with all commissioners and as hopefully I will continue to do so in the future.

91 Q. Yesterday, the various updated versions of your news story on the 24th February 2014 were circulated, and it would appear that at a quarter to five in the afternoon, you updated your piece to say that:
"The Commissi oner has said he wrote to the whi stlebl ower Sergeant Maurice McCabe 14 months ago and tol d himto cooperate with the investigation into allegations that penalty points had been cancelled."
A. That's correct.

92 Q. And that, you say, as I understand your evidence, that version of your text was discussed with Superintendent Taylor, is that right?
A. Sorry, can I have a copy of the documents as wel1, is that possible?
Q. I am sure it is.
A. So we are all on the same page.

94 Q. Yes, I think that is fair you should have it. I was given it while I was cross-examining you. [HANDED TO THE WITNESS]
A. Thank you very much. Now, you are talking about "the Gar da Commi ssi oner said he wrote to the whi stlebl ower Sergeant Maurice McCabe 14 mont hs ago"?

And he had come back to you and said yes, that's correct, is that right?
A. Yes. Well, look, I said to him what is the position or what is -- something along the lines, what's Garda Headquarters -- what is the Commissioner's position on this, like? Clearly he wrote it on the 14th of December 2012, is he still of the view that that he didn't cooperate? Yes, he said he wrote to him. There it is.

98 Q. Yes. Now, could I ask you just, at this stage as I understand your evidence yesterday, you didn't have the 10:50 direction in front of you?
A. I had had sight of the direction on which I based the first report.
Q. Yes. But you didn't actually have it in front of you or in your possession, isn't that right?
A. Well, look, $I$ had sight of it, that is as far as $I$ am prepared to go.
100 Q. Somebody it shown it to you, is that right?
A. Well --

101 Q. And you hadn't kept a copy because you didn't discover this document to the Tribunal, is that right?
A. My evidence is I had sight of it, I mean --

102 Q. Yes, but I am asking you: Somebody had shown it to you and you hadn't kept a copy, is that right?
A. We11, I haven't got a copy now and I hadn't got a copy when the Tribunal was set up.
103 Q. Did you keep a copy?
A. As I said to you, it wasn't a particularly big story.

104 Q. Did you keep a copy of it?
A. How do you mean did I keep a copy of it? If I had had a copy when the Tribunal was being set up I would have submitted it, like we submitted all our notes and all our references.
Sorry, I just want to understand; is this a case that somebody showed it to you and you went off to write your story, or is it a case that somebody gave it to you and you had it in front of you when you wrote the story?
A. I am on7y prepared to say that I had sight of it, Mr. McDowe11. I am not prepared to go into the provenance of the news gathering --
CHAI RMAN No, I appreciate that, Mr. Reynolds, and I'm certainly not going to make a ruling that you have to because you do have a privilege in relation to this, but it doesn't infringe your privilege to say -- look, I presume you are a careful journalist and I presume that, no more than myself, when I'm writing something I check and recheck and therefore Mr. McDowel1's question is: Did you have it in front of you when you were writing it out?
A. Yeah, but who showed it to you and was he sitting beside you, and you know, was he a tall fella or a sma11 fella, was it male or female, you know what I
mean. I mean, it's clear that --
CHAN RMAN Mr. Reynolds, you know, the level of suspiciousness, I don't actually share it, and I know where the point needs to be cut off. It's a very simple question and it's simply whether or not you actually had a copy, that's all. So in other words, when you were writing this out, did you have a copy in front of you? Did you cross-check it? That is not going to reveal anybody as your source, at all, under any circumstances, whatever about reading nods and winks in a toilet, this is very, very far from it.
A. That's -- as I say, that is just a human moment.
Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Could you answer the question? Did you have a copy of the Commissioner's direction in your possession when you wrote the story?
A. I was looking at a copy of it when I wrote the first draft, the first report.
Q. I see. And where did you see a direction to cooperate with the investigation being carried out by Assistant Commissioner John O'Mahony?
A. "If you have any further concerns, and without prej udi ce to your rights under the confidential reporting mechanism such matters can be brought to the attention of Assistant Commi ssi oner John O Mahony."
108 Q. "If you have any further concerns"?
A. Yeah.

109 Q. That was not a direction to cooperate with --
A. That is a paragraph within a sentence -- that is a sentence within a paragraph which is encompassed in a
direction which relates to the cancellation of fixed charge notices.
110 Q. And he was told -- he was told to desist first of all?
A. Yes, the direction was desist --

111 Q. Yes.
A. -- and if you have any further concerns, bring them.

112 Q. If you have any further concerns what?
A. Yes, bring them to Assistant Commissioner John o'Mahony.
113 Q. It doesn't say bring them, it says what?
A. "Such matters can be brought to the attention".

114 Q. "Can be brought"?
A. Yes.

115 Q. "If you have further concerns". Now, I'm suggesting to you that it was a complete distortion of that paragraph to say that he was directed to cooperate with Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony's investigation.
A. Well, Mr. McDowell, as I said to you yesterday, I'm a journalist. You know, I work in the English language, I don't work in a particularly -- in a parliamentary version of it or in a formalised version of it. My job is to explain things to people, in a clear, concise manner. And yes, this was a formal direction, written in a particular form of legalistic or disciplinary language, but my job is to translate that into a form 10:54 of words that most people will understand. The common parlance. And that is what I did.

116 Q. You see, the point is that it had been stated in public that Sergeant McCabe had not cooperated with this
inquiry.
A. What are you referring to?

117 Q. It had been stated in public.
A. But what are you referring to? who stated it?

118 Q. In the Dáil.
A. This is Minister shatter, is it?

119 Q. Yeah.
CHAL RMAN Yes, it's --
A. Yeah, I thought he said he refused to cooperate.

CHA RMAN Just hang on a minute, if you wouldn't mind. $00: 55$ I think it's possibly best to put it this way: That the Garda line was that he was directed to cooperate but wouldn't. In other words, he was hiding his head in the sand. And the implication of that is, that here is a man who moans about everything but when it comes to actually putting up the evidence and actually sitting down and working out what's right and what's wrong he is elsewhere.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN So that, if you like, is the Garda line.
And Mr. McDowel1's questions are directed to saying, weren't you following the Garda line? Now, I am not saying it's the Garda line, $I$ am saying that it is a line of cross-examination that has been pursued over the course of weeks. Do you understand that?
A. Well, okay --

CHA RMAN That is the question. Mr. McDowel1, am I correct in that?
MR. MEDONELL: That's correct.
A. Clearly I was following the Garda line in that report because the Gardaí gave me the official line on the record, which I put on the record. I was also seeking the Maurice McCabe line, which he wasn't prepared to give me, and he had -- he had clearly decided or somebody had decided that it was going to Prime Time, which was on at half ten that night. And so, Sergeant McCabe was prepared to allow this, which you are telling me is highly offensive and so unjust and yet he was prepared to allow this to remain for six-and-a-half hours without any alternative view.

120 Q. I see. So, could I ask you to -- you have your 16:45 version of your story there, is that right?
A. That's correct.

121 Q. And could I ask you to go to the second page of it and about five paragraphs down you will see, this is a quotation from Minister Rabbitte:
"Mr. Rabbitte said he was not in a position to draw concl usi ons on recent allegations and whet her $M$ ni ster Shatter should apol ogi se to Ser geant MECabe."
A. Yeah. I didn't write that. I only wrote -- if I can explain how this works. I was explaining about the RTÉ copy system yesterday where information comes in from al1 different journalists in different parts of the organisation. So the political stuff was all written by political journalists. And it's all into the system and the online editor tagged it on or when a new line comes in, it goes up the top. And it sort of keeps
developing or changing throughout the day. So I didn't write any of the political copy. That came from our political units.
I see. well, somebody else then was aware of the fact that Minister Shatter had represented Sergeant McCabe publicly as failing or refusing to cooperate with the o'mahony --
A. Well, somebody else was writing that stuff for the system. As you can see as we11, I mean, "Si nn Féi n's Pádrai g MacLochl ai nn", you know "Fi anna Fáil's M cheál Martin", all these, you can see at the moment "read M chéal Lehane's bl og", he was obvious7y inputting into the whole thing as well.
123 Q. You see the point I am putting to you is that this was a matter of public controversy and you waded in by saying that the Garda Commissioner -- firstly without contacting Superintendent Taylor, you asserted that the Garda Commissioner had issued a direction to Sergeant McCabe to cooperate with the investigation?
A. Yeah.

124 Q. That wasn't true?
A. But it is true, yeah. That's my view on it. I mean, as I explained yesterday, that's it. That is a direction. I mean, the Gardaí are a disciplined organisation. I mean --
125 Q. I see. Well, I don't think I can put it much further than that. That is your view of the English language. CHA RMAN Look, I think the point being made by Mr. McDowe11 and indeed I think I explained it
yesterday, but just let's have another go to see where we get. I see a very different situation emerging, if someone says 'if you wish to eat any further meals you may go to the canteen' as opposed to saying 'you will eat all further meals in the canteen'.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN So one is an option and the other is a direction. You can't go anywhere else.
A. But my point --

CHA RMAN So as I understand it, the report seems to say, now I'm again I am only asking a question. The report seems to say you actually go to the O'Mahony investigation and you tell them what you know. And on the other hand, the document seems to say, you definitely stop accessing Pulse, that's at an end, but in the event that you have got something else that you need to tell anybody about Pulse or fixed charge penalty notices well then the place to go is O'Mahony, not to the newspapers, not to your lawyers, not to anybody else. That's what Mr. McDowe11 is putting to you.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN And what he is saying is, the way it comes over in your report is, not as an option --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- but as a direct order.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Such as 'turn up tomorrow --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- and wear your full uniform'.
A. okay.

CHA RMAN That is what he is explaining.
A. Can I explain that?

CHA RMAK Yeah. No, but I am leaving it between you and Mr. McDowe11.
A. The point there is, and my position on that is, is that the Garda Commissioner first of all, in a ranking organisation, in a disciplined force, does not give sergeants options when he sends them a piece of paper with the word "direction" at the top of it. That is the first thing. Secondly, this direction was read out three times to Sergeant McCabe in full by his line manager, his chief superintendent, in Mullingar Garda Station, and three more times the chief superintendent 11:01 said to him, this is a direction. That's six times that Sergeant McCabe has been informed that this is a direction. Now, this is not my opinion, I am not taking a view on this, I'm just citing these facts as to why I see that as a direction. I don't have an opinion on it at a11.

126 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Well of course, you are now giving evidence based on the transcript of what happened in Mullingar as supplied to Prime Time by Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. But that is in the transcript, yeah.

127 Q. Yes. And I'm suggesting to you that the direction was to desist from accessing Pulse or communicating its contents to any third parties.

A. My position is --
Q. Sorry, do you accept that?
A. Sorry, no. No, my position is I think it's perfectly legitimate and it was perfectly legitimate for me to report this as a direction, as stated on the document. 11:02
Q. And I'm suggesting to you that he was being directed not to access Pulse or to communicate its contents to third parties and he was informed that if he had any further concerns he could bring them to the attention of Commissioner O'Mahony?
A. Well, as recently as two weeks ago the former Garda Commissioner gave evidence here at this Tribunal and he said the full paragraph was a direction.
Q. Now, you know that Minister Shatter apologised to Sergeant McCabe on the record of Dáil Éireann for suggesting that he had failed to cooperate?
A. No, I think he said for saying that he refused to cooperate.
Q. And you draw a distinction between those two?
A. I do, I do, I do, yeah, very much so. I never said he refused to cooperate.
Q. But you did say it was a disciplined organisation?
A. Yes, I said he didn't cooperate.
Q. He didn't cooperate?
A. Yeah.

134 Q. You are saying he didn't refuse to cooperate?
A. I'm saying -- I am saying I didn't say he refused to cooperate.
Q. You are just saying he didn't cooperate?
A. Exactly.
Q. And I have got to suggest to you that that is untrue and indicates a deep prejudice against Sergeant McCabe?
A. No. It indicates the way $I$ have behaved throughout a11 of this work and the way I consistently behave; that I report the facts.
137 Q. That was the next point. I am going to suggest to that you that it is indicative of the way you behaved throughout all of the matters that you have been giving testimony about?
A. I reported the facts, impartially.

138
Q. And I just want to -- one last thing I just want to ask you about. You have given evidence that on no occasion did Commissioner Callinan discuss Sergeant McCabe in a negative way with you?
A. Yes.
Q. You said that yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever discuss Sergeant McCabe with former Commissioner Callinan at all, negative or positive or neutra1?
A. I would have -- no, I would have reported on his public comments, any on-the-record conversations I can't really go into. But as I said, I was never negatively briefed by anyone --

141 Q. Sorry, I'm just asking a question: Is it the case that you ever spoke to Commissioner Callinan about Sergeant McCabe --
A. I am telling you I can't -- I have conversations with
people all the time.
CHA RMAN We11, it strikes me, Mr. Reynolds, that in the event that you didn't talk about Sergeant McCabe, you wouldn't be doing your job.
A. Yeah, but --

CHAN RMAN It was a very big thing.
A. But you have to respect my position. I mean -CHA RMAN we are not at the stage yet where we have to look at that.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN we really aren't. I mean, I doubt -Commissioner Callinan wasn't asked that question, but I very much doubt that he would say no, we never discussed sergeant McCabe. I mean, it would be quite ridiculous, it would be the elephant in the room, literally. well, not literally, but metaphorically. So I'm sure you did discuss Sergeant McCabe, at least I can't conceive of how you couldn't have.
A. Well look, I mean --

CHA RMAN So the next question after that is: Did he tell you he was a child abuser? So maybe you can help --
A. Never. And that is the point. CHA RMAN Or anything of that variety?
A. That is the heart of the matter. And that goes right across the board. And I have given that evidence and that's the truth.

142 Q. MR. MEDONELL: You used the phrase yesterday that --
A. I thought that was the last question.

143 Q. Sorry no, it's not that easy. If you'd answered it differently it might have been the last question.
A. You are telling me.

144 Q. You used the phrase yesterday that you weren't briefed in a negative way or there was no negative discussion on a number of occasions. Did you discuss the D allegation with the Commissioner at any point in time?
A. Never.
Q. Did you discuss the investigation or the DPP's directions in respect of the $D$ allegation --
A. No.
Q. -- with the Commissioner at any time?
A. No.

Did you discuss them with any senior Garda officers at any time?
A. I have to say to you what I said in relation to this allegation: That $I$ heard there was an allegation, $I$ heard it was investigated, I heard a file had gone to the DPP, and I heard there was no prosecution, and that was the end of it.
A. But I had to find that out, so $I$ had to have a conversation to find that out. And I cannot tell you the source or the provenance of that conversation. Only to say that I was satisfied and I satisfied myself 11:07 there was nothing in it.

149 Q. I just wanted to ask you about the coverage of the O'Higgins Report that you broadcast. Did you ever deal with the fact that the o'Higgins Report was critical of
the Byrne/McGinn report in many respects?
A. As I said, I mean you can cherry-pick the bits that you believe that I missed and, you know, we can be here all night with you picking bits out of the report, all I can say is --

CHA RMAN Mr. Reynolds, seriously, we will go through it quicker if -- don't worry about having an argument or disputing things with Mr. McDowe11. He is actually entitled to ask these questions and that are substantial differences where $I$ suppose you might say O'Higgins is tougher than Byrne/McGinn. I mean, I know that, I think you know that as well.
A. I don't think I went into the details -- I don't think I went into the details of the Byrne/McGinn because I think it would have been too complicated, you know. CHA RMAN We11 then, that's the answer.
A. Okay, all right.

150 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: You see, Sergeant McCabe is anxious to point out that there are many, many things in the O'Higgins Report which were favourable to him and upheld his side of the argument, which simply never saw the light of day in your reportage and did see the late of day in the Philip Boucher-Hayes programme that was broadcast after yours?
A. Mmm, yeah.

151 Q. You would accept that is true?
A. We11, I mean, I accept if Sergeant McCabe was happier with Philip Boucher-Hayes' reports than he was with mine, that's fair enough.
Q. And I have got to suggest to you that your reportage was based on discussions with Gardaí of various ranks, people who'd provided you with the report and that you were taking the line that the report was bad news for Sergeant McCabe and that it was fair to put the boot into him?
A. No, I reject that. I reject that totally and I think the emails show that. We were very, very conscious we needed to be fair to Sergeant McCabe.
MR. MEDONELL: I see. Thank you, Mr. Reynolds.
CHA RMAN Mr. McDowell, just before we leave this, would you mind just clarifying, I did write a down before, but $I$ have hundreds of pages of notes at this point and it's going to take me a wee while to find it, is this the subject of litigation, the actual report?
MR. MEDOVELL: Not that I know of. CHA RMAN Right, okay.
A. No, there was -- I think there was a solicitor's letter but I don't think there was any follow-through.
MR. MEDONELL: The solicitor's letter was sent on the day of the broadcast but I think the time has well passed for litigation.
CHA RMAK No, no, no, I appreciate that but sometimes these things, people can either delay them or they can time take to get to court.
MR. MEDOVELL: No, no. Mr. Reynolds' reportage is not the subject of litigation.
CHA RMAN Was there something else then that was?
MR. MEDONELL: Yes, the Chief Superintendent Rooney
letter and the Gerald Kean interview.
CHA RMAN Well, the Gerald Kean interview, that's finished.

MR. MEDONELL: Yeah, that is finished.
CHAI RMAN And the Chief Superintendent Rooney letter, that is a claim against the State I presume.

MR. MEDOWELL: Yes. Not against RTÉ.
CHAI RMAN And there is a claim in relation to general bullying, harassment, tort type thing.
MR. MEDONELL: There is no claim against RTÉ.
CHA RMAN All right. No, fine. Just so as I know. Thank you. So Mr. Ferry.

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

MR. FERRY: Good morning, Mr. Reynolds, my name is John Ferry and I am one of the lawyers that is representing Superintendent David Taylor. And I think we find ourselves now at a stage in the Tribunal where you are perhaps the sole remaining journalist of those that are listed by my client as being those who he briefed. Now, there is perhaps one other journalist, but in relation to the list, I think you may be the last member from that list, and in relation to my client, he finds himself as a current serving officer superintendent in charge of a specialist unit here in Dublin, and he finds himself in a position where he has said that he was directed by Martin Callinan to negatively brief journalists, and Ms. Leader brought you through what that entailed. And I just want to
just recap on your evidence, because it appears to me that you have been very clear in saying that you were not negatively briefed. My client says that you were negatively briefed, so there is a large gulf between our two positions. So, first of all, I think that you opened your evidence by saying that you became aware of the allegation in relation to Sergeant McCabe in 2013 and that is similar to the evidence of some other people that have given evidence here, including journalists. And my client says that it was from the middle of 2013 up until the retirement of Commissioner Callinan that he was engaged in the process of negatively briefing journalists. So I just wanted to bring you to that time when you heard that, because like a few other journalists, and I have questioned them on similar lines, whoever your source was in relation to the first mention of an allegation against Sergeant McCabe, they seem to speak in very precise, almost legal terms. And in fact, you have referred to it today and on the first day of your evidence, that you were given four facts, isn't that correct? And you said fact one was there was an allegation, and then you said, child abuse; fact two was there had been an investigation; fact three was it was a file to the DPP; and fact four was that there was no prosecution. Now, other journalists have given evidence and they have said things such as that that was why he fell out with Garda management and that was the start of it, things like that and I put it to them they have been given a
rider on the end of it. But it seems to have been very specific to you and it seems to have stopped exactly at that point, that was the end of it. Once you heard there was no prosecution, that was the end of it, is that what you are saying?
A. That's correct.

154 Q. Yeah. And you said in your evidence that "that's it, once I heard no prosecution, nothing to do with me as a reporter". Now, I would submit to you, Mr. Reynolds, that in your position where you are probably the most high profile reporter because of your role with RTÉ, in relation to Garda matters, that that was a staggering set of facts to be given in 2013, because you've already said that in your evidence, I think, you said when you first heard that rumour that it was in the context of the penalty points issue when this emerged, is that correct?
A. Yeah, it probably would have been around that time anyway, yeah.
So you would have been fully aware that An Garda
Síochana and in particular the senior line of management was having to explain or going to have to explain the actions of the force as a result of issues brought to their attention by a serving sergeant, isn't that correct?
A. Yeah, they had been investigated by Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony, yeah.

156 Q. Yes. So you were aware of that, and in your position that you have, your association with An Garda Síochána
and with policing and justice, I'm putting it to you that it was an absolutely huge and extraordinary set of facts to then be presented with at the same time as hearing about the penalty points issue?
A. No.

157 Q. That a serving sergeant, who just happened to be the sergeant that may be holding the management to account, had these allegations made against him?
A. No, I don't -- I don't see it that way.

Because I would put it to that you if it was any person in the State that you heard that about, you'd be saying, God that is a terrible story, what is this about, etcetera? But to think that it was about the same man that was behind the penalty points issue and you'd heard it in the context of the penalty points issue, I put it to you it was an extraordinary piece of information to receive?
A. No, I wouldn't accept that. I hear -- I have heard things like that about Gardaí before, I have heard them about doctors, politicians, teachers, all people from
all sorts of society and, you know, I would tend to hear information in the context of big stories anyway because the sort of stories I do tend to be kind of big stories, you know, murders, major drug seizures, major criminal stories, major political events in relation to 11:17 the crime and justice system. So not particularly, no.
159 Q. Well, that's what I mean; I mean, you are the newsman in this country. I mean, that is your job. I mean, people have jobs. That is your job: You are the front
of RTÉ in this country in relation to crime and policing, etcetera, okay? So I appreciate you are not going to sit and blow your own trumpet but I mean, that is your job, isn't that correct?
A. I am the crime correspondent for RTÉ, I report on criminal justice issues.
Q. In your position, I put it to you it is completely unrealistic that you would say that was the end of it and you wouldn't make any further queries or the person talking to you wouldn't say anything further about the serving sergeant that an allegation of child sexual abuse had been made against him?
A. No, no. No, I mean, as I said, I hear that stuff all the time. And there was a clear end on this. As I said already, there was no process, there had been no arrest, there was nothing, you know -- you could see there was nothing in it, you know.
Q. So you have a situation where the journalist that is normally in front of Garda Headquarters, normally in front of the Department of Justice or normally standing in front of a murder scene tent on the six o'clock news, he is told that the actual sergeant who is raising the penalty points issue that the Garda Commissioner is held answerable to has been accused of child sexual abuse in the past --
A. Has -- sorry, has been --

162 Q. -- and the journalist says that is the end, no further inquiries?
A. No, no. He has been exonerated. And that there is
nothing in it. There was nothing in it, so...
163 Q. It's a bit like, I don't know if you ever saw the Naked Gun movies and Lieutenant Drebin is standing in front of the fireworks factory that has just gone on fire and he is giving a press conference to the media and saying move along folks, nothing to see here while the entire fireworks factory is exploding in the sky behind them.
A. You should work in television.

MR. GLLANE: Chairman, while colourful, it is still
the same question now asked about ten times.
CHAL RNAN No, he is entitled to ask the question and putting the question in a colourful manner is very helpful. So I didn't actually remember that scene but I must go back and in the course of my work --
A. Who is Frank Drebin?

CHA RMAN -- I will try and see the film again. MR. FERRY: Lieutenant Frank Drebin he was in the police squad.
CHA RMAN I do know about all of that, yes. Maybe, look, the point is this: That there is a big story and there is a big story and what this is being analogised to is nothing to see here, but there is a firework factory literally going up in a blaze with multiple explosions behind you. In other words, whatever you say about hearing something about someone, this is an enormous story because it's Sergeant McCabe and it may explain that his allegations are motivated by bitterness. That's the point you are making Mr. Ferry, isn't it?

MR. FERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We11 then, $I$ think you really have to deal with it on that basis.
A. Okay. I mean, look, it wasn't that way at the time. You know, the penalty points report was coming out, you 11:21 hear this allegation and there is nothing in it, fine. There was no big -- to use your analogy, you know, the penalty points at the time wasn't a huge fire in 2013, it sort of -- all of these things developed, developed, developed, kept going, you know, you hear this man has been exonerated in the middle of it and that is it, gone, nothing to do with it. As you said yourself, nothing to see here, move on. But you know, all -- you know, this has only been incremental, I mean, this has only become bigger and bigger when we have various people losing their jobs and then we suddenly have a commission of investigation and now here we are today with a tribunal of inquiry. You know, but five years ago --
164 Q. MR. FERRY: We11, you might be forming part of my submissions there, Mr. Reynolds, because that will be something I will be coming back to; that people who are involved in a smear campaign never envisage a tribunal several years in the future.
A. But sure, I --

165 Q. That is the whole purpose.
A. As far as I am concerned, there was no smear campaign.

166 Q. Exactly.
A. It didn't exist.
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Q. And again just $I$ will recap because $I$ have said it to other journalists: Superintendent Taylor was the Press Officer, he was the senior officer and he was being directed by Martin Callinan, but he wasn't holding court or a press conference outside a murder scene and saying, hear ye, hear ye, I want to brief you, it was being done in a very, very subtle way. And it was, when the Maurice McCabe story was in high profile he dropped it into conversations.
A. It wasn't. Sorry, I will have to stop you there. It actually wasn't. I was at those murder scenes, I was at those press conferences, never at any time did Superintendent Taylor, and he may be the most brilliant spook in the world and I may be the most stupid person in the world, the most gullible person that didn't even realise he was being taken for a patsy, but the reality is it didn't happen. He didn't come over -- there was no backhanded talk, there was no reference to this exoneration at a11. Superintendent Taylor's evidence doesn't stack up, it doesn't make sense to me.

169 Q. Last week --
A. I never -- can I just -- I never heard those riders.
Q. Yes. Yes. Well, I will move on from this now.
A. And this didn't happen.

171 Q. I would submit to that you in your position and I have already outlined the significance of the story, etcetera, and the timing of it. It was a time when Maurice McCabe would have been high profile because you 11:24 said you heard it in the context of the penalty points I am saying that would have been contactually one of the times when Superintendent Taylor and yourself would be talking about Maurice McCabe. Are you saying that you never had a conversation with Superintendent Taylor 11:24 about Maurice McCabe?
A. It didn't happen.

172 Q. Yeah. We11, did you ever have a conversation with him about Sergeant Maurice McCabe?
A. I did, on the record, yes.

173 Q. On the record. So first of a11, I say that -- that, I would submit, just isn't -- it doesn't add up. We will move on from that.
A. Sorry, it does add up.

174 Q. You also said that it was the story, the allegation 11:24 about Maurice McCabe was circulating, you said in the media, Gardaí and political circles, is that correct?
A. Yeah.

Now, I put it to you that is your entire world; you work for the media, you report on the Gardaí, and you are also reporting around government buildings and officials. So, in other words, your entire world in 2013, the story of Maurice McCabe and the allegation of sexual assault was circulating?
Q. Yes.
A. It doesn't circulate. We don't tell each other what we 11:25 know about various stories because we all work independently. That is the way journalism works. There was no circulation.

177 Q. Yes. But in Ireland and in the Gardaí and I'm sure in journalism, people rarely have conversations with
somebody who tells them that the subject of the conversation is a serving sergeant and has been accused of child sexual abuse and there was a file to the DPP and there is no prosecution and it stops at that?
A. But sure, we weren't having this conversation about those -- once we knew the facts in relation to it, at least once $I$ knew the facts in relation to it, that was the end of it.

178 Q. Yes. For example, Mr. Lally has given evidence that that was the reason why he fell out with management and 11:26 that was the start of it. So he had a rider on the end of it which indicated --
A. That is Mr. Lally's evidence.

179 Q. Yes. But that was the evidence last week from
journalists, that there was a rider to what they had heard. But yourself and I think Mr. Williams was similar on Monday, they just had bear details and it stopped and they didn't think anything -- you didn't think anything further of it once you heard there was no prosecution, that was the end of it?
A. Yeah, but you see, that's the allegation from Superintendent Taylor, that there were riders, and I'm telling you there weren't riders. I never heard these riders.
180 Q. Yes. Now, you also said you are clear that you weren't negatively briefed and then you went on and gave information of how it didn't make sense and it just didn't happen. And you indicated at, I think it's at pages 145 of Wednesday's evidence, day 91 , you were just explaining to the judge of how it couldn't happen. And again, on my instructions I will be putting to you that it's quite easy to happen. You explained to the Chairperson, to the Tribunal, in answer to Ms. Leader, when she outlined to you what superintendent was doing 11:27 in relation to negative briefing, that it constituted telling people about the D allegation and linking it into Sergeant McCabe's motivation and making complaints in relation to low Garda standards and penalty points. And she asked you what do you say about that and then you go on and you gave a breakdown of what happened, and you said:
"Well, that di dn't happen. And anybody who knows
reporters, working in the field, knows that that, you know, coul dn't happen the way it's expl ai ned there."

And then you give an example to the Chairman, you said:
"। go to murder scenes, they are busy pl aces. I arrive with a camera crew or a satellite van. I get at the scene. I have to find out what is going on, what happened, what are the details. l'm moving around, l'm trying to identify if there are any eyewitnesss. l'm trying to -- we're trying to, you know, for everything, to try and find parking for the satellite van and trying to find location for a live view."

CHA RMAN I get the point, Mr. Ferry. And indeed I 11:28 heard it, but I think the point that you are making to Mr. Reynolds is this: That indeed one can be terribly, terribly busy but there is a bit of downtime? Isn't that the point you are making, Mr. Ferry?
MR. FERRY: yes
CHA RMAN That when you have done your report you relax and people may be there and you may have a further chat.

181 Q. MR. FERRY: Yeah. I mean, crime scenes, and Superintendent Taylor has said that he spoke to you directly, and crime scenes I would submit are not chaotic places, there may be some chaos around journalists trying to get a story out quickly but the Garda Press officer is never there at the time of it
the murder, hopefully, and by the time he arrives, it's usually a very settled situation and the account that he gives is given after the police have obtained a lot of information. And I put it to you while you said it was a chaotic scene or chaotic places, and you may just 11:29 have been saying that in the course of your evidence, but that is not the case at scenes when the Garda Press officer attends. So there would be ample opportunities to talk and I think you even said, you spoke about yourself and journalists shooting the breeze. I mean, I would submit that murder scenes and crime scenes there can be an awful lot of hanging around at them waiting on officials to arrive and people to arrive, and that would also go for the Press officer and the investigating officers, journalists have to spend sometime a lot of time before the police are ready to talk to them. So it's not fair or not always the case to say to the chairperson that crime scenes are chaotic places where you wouldn't have time to talk to somebody.
A. We11, my experience is that when I arrive at the scene and when -- what you are saying, for example, is so let's take your scenario then and when Superintendent Taylor arrives, as I explained, he arrives into a huddle, there is a huddle of microphones there, so there is a collection of journalists and some are on the list and some are not on the list. So for him to begin this negative briefing, as I said, he has to select the ones who are on the list and they have to be
briefed and he has to ensure that the other don't know anything about it. And of course the ones that are on the list have been named, myself, Conor Lally and Mick o'toole, who would know each other quite well. I mean, the idea that Dave Taylor was arriving in full blue, in 11:31 the uniform ready to give us the latest appeal about this horrific murder or whatever, that the three of us would be saying, oh, other here comes Dave now, I wonder what news he has got in relation to Maurice McCabe this week, I wonder is he going to tell us the story that he has been telling us for ages; the idea that this wouldn't become almost like a joke, that he was going to repeat the same mantra that he had been repeating, that none of us would have said to each other that Dave was actually perpetrating this line and that we wouldn't have said to each other well, did he say this to you, why did he say this to you, why do you think he is saying this; the idea that even if Dave had been saying this to us that I wouldn't have said to him what are you talking about, this guy has been
exonerated, why are you telling me this, what is going on, what is this about, is there something else; the idea that when the press conference is finished, that is the time I am busiest, that is when I have the superintendents interview, when it must be put on radio 11:32 and it must be put television, and when I have to cut a television package, when we have to go live, I don't have time to talk to anybody after that.
CHA RMAN I honestly get that. And we are in a stage
now where we are not having questions and answers but more like speeches. I think the point you are making is, okay, you are busy. But Mr. Reynolds, I must say, over many, many years I have heard people saying I couldn't have committed the crime because of whatever. And it's very unconvincing. on the other hand, you are saying, look, if something like that had been said to me, the first thing I would have done was I would have started talking to my colleagues about this and what is this line and why is it being promulgated, that seems to be your answer.
A. well, it is just an example.

CHA RMAN I know, but --
A. It would have been known amongst us and then it would have popped up as an issue amongst us.
CHA RMAN I see the point you are making, Mr. Ferry.
182 Q. MR. FERRY: It's not a big point anyway. I am just making the point that you went into great detail about how chaotic the scenes are and you couldn't talk to Dave Taylor, and I am just saying we all know the reality of scenes that you attend at.
CHA RMAN All right. Well, Mr. Ferry, you can take it as a fact that I would find it hard to accept that although people are very busy, I know people are very busy, and in my extended family there is one person who ${ }^{11: 33}$ claims to be working 19 hours a day, I know that the plain reality of it is that there is always a bit of time to talk to somebody, otherwise things being very inhuman. But the point you are making --
A. It didn't happen.

CHA RMAN -- is that it didn't happen. And secondly, if it did happen you would have queried it. And then thirdly, you are saying --
A. It would have circulated itself.

CHA RMAN -- if it was something that was being done among people whom you know you certainly would have talked about it and why was it happening.
A. Exactly. We would have been aware of it and it would either have become a serious issue or it would have become a joke.

183 Q. MR. FERRY: But I mean, I am just saying like, David Taylor, $I$ don't think you -- I think in your statement anyway you say that there was no big difference between him and the previous press officers, but he attended the scenes and I think you said that he would usually give the press briefing on his own without the senior investigating officer. So I am just saying he was a man that yous knew and I am sure there were occasions when you had a chat or yous had a chat about something before you went live on air, would you accept that? CHA RMAN I think I would accept that. I think I would accept that there is always an opportunity -- I'm not impressed by the point, oh, we couldn't possibly, far too busy.
A. No, no. Don't get me wrong, I mean, there may have been a conversation but, like, I mean, it would have been a conversation about what is going on. The idea that Superintendent Taylor would just introduce this,
you know, completely irrelevant point of conversation. CHA RMN: But that is a different point.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN I do --
A. And that is the point I make. The fact that this would 11:34 come out of the blue --

CHA RMAN I see that point, Mr. Reynolds. I am going to take it as a fact that people attending at a crime scene with Gardaí, they have an opportunity to chat. That is just it.
184 Q. MR. FERRY: And in relation to you saying that you were never briefed and it couldn't have happened and didn't happen, we11, I mean, you were the man that was briefed by Superintendent Taylor in relation to the o'Mahony report and the issue of whether Sergeant McCabe cooperated or not?
A. Well, it actually wasn't a brief, it was an on-the-record statement.

185 Q. Yes. But you see, I appreciate what you are saying and this Tribunal is about a number of people, but my client is, as you used yourself, you were talking about yesterday about separating the goat from the sheep, but my client kind of is the goat separated from the sheep because he was a member of the senior management personnel and now he is out on his own making these claims. But when you are saying you weren't briefed, Superintendent Taylor right from the outset has said that one example was the report of Assistant Commissioner John O'Mahony into allegations made by

Sergeant McCabe and that he was instructed by the Commissioner to brief the media that Sergeant McCabe had refused to cooperate with Assistant Commissioner o'mahony, and Superintendent Taylor says that he later found out that this was untrue. So, he says that is an example of even he was being used to get a briefing out to journalists on behalf of Martin Callinan that he later found out was untrue and I am simply saying you were the conduit for that.
A. Yeah, but you see, that is exactly the point, you see. Because if he had briefed me that Sergeant McCabe had refused to cooperate I would have written that down and said is that an official statement from Garda Headquarters? The Garda Commissioner is saying that Sergeant McCabe refused to cooperate? And that's what I would have put into that report. I wouldn't have put in the report that the Garda Commissioner has said that he didn't cooperate, I would have said, oh, you mean these guys are supporting the Minister? So that is not only the Minister for Justice is saying the sergeant refused to cooperate, it's also the Garda Commissioner. But I didn't do that because it wasn't said to me. But it was Superintendent Taylor who gave you that information about the direction to cooperate and that was I think --
A. No, he gave me an on-the-record statement from Garda Headquarters.

187 Q. Yes. Which Superintendent Taylor says turned out later to be untrue.
A. No, he didn't. He said the distinction is again -- the distinction is between a refusal to cooperate and did not cooperate.
188 Q. Yes.
A. And it's an important distinction.

189 Q. But he gave it directly to you as opposed to any other journalist on that day?
A. I presume he would have given it to any journalist who asked for it. I think the newspapers reported it as well, as far as I know.
190 Q. Yes.
A. I think at least one did.

191 Q. He also gave you the story of the resignation of Commissioner Callinan on the morning of his resignation?
A. The retirement, yeah.

192 Q. Oh, sorry, the retirement. So he did select you in relation to the retirement?
A. Pardon?
A. Yeah, well, he rang me up and he said the Garda Commissioner is retiring.

CHA RMAN I think the point that is being made to you, Mr. Reynolds, is this: That you are being targeted for preferential treatment in terms of certain stories, now 11:38 whether you accept that or not, that is the point that is being made to you, and that in consequence it's likely that you would be targeted as well for this particular very unpleasant story.
A. I don't think that one truth validates a lie.
Q. MR. FERRY: Yeah. And later that day, Superintendent Taylor says that he was directed by the Commissioner to get the Bandon Garda station tapes document to you and that he met you and gave you the letter on the evening of the retirement?
A. That, Chairman, I am claiming privilege on.

CHA RMAN Well, I mean, that is the evidence that I have, and if you want to contradict it, it's fine. Now, what one makes of it is a different matter entirely and it's evidence on the record from Superintendent Taylor after all.
A. Well, I can't comment on the source of that document. CHA RMAK We11, all right. Where does this leave us? Superintendent Taylor is saying that the letter was passed over, it was passed to you, but by the way, you would be a natural person to send that to, and you are saying I can't comment. And then Mr. Ferry is making the point, if he gives you this letter, if you get this kind of preferential feeding of information you are very likely to get preferential feeding of the information or be trusted with the information that, for instance, Sergeant McCabe was a paedophile. And again I am not saying he was a paedophile, I am saying that was the allegation.
A. I never heard that, Chairman. Never heard that. CHA RMAN A11 right. MR. FERRY: Now, there is a dispute on the evidence with former Commissioner Callinan in relation to that
detai1. I think his counsel will probably come back to that, but I think he disputes what Superintendent Taylor says in relation to that aspect, but Superintendent Taylor is clear that he was briefing on that day, on two occasions, to get the word out to you that he was retiring, and in the evening, briefed to get on to Paul and get the letter to Paul. And that you were met outside Garda Headquarters and the letter was given to you.
CHA RMAN Al1 right. But again, I don't need to go into that but I think if you like, Mr. Ferry, take this as being the position. The evidence is there, it's uncontradicted. Now, the rider to the question which is, therefore, isn't it very likely that would you also have been told about Sergeant McCabe, is really the issue you need to deal with.
A. Well, as I said to you, one truth doesn't justify a lie and the point $I$ am making --
CHA RMAN I am finding it hard to get my head around that. So, what is the answer?
A. Just because one person tells something that is truthful, that doesn't mean they are telling the truth in relation to everything. And my point is, and I was never negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor.
196 Q. MR. FERRY: No, I appreciate --
A. It didn't happen.

197 Q. I appreciate that is your evidence and that is what journalists are saying, but from Superintendent Taylor's position and the evidence before the Tribunal,
and I put it that you are in a similar vein, everything that you heard about Sergeant McCabe was negative. Right from the outset, the first thing you heard about this man was that he was accused of sexual assault of a child. So, like all other journalists that have given evidence here and have addressed this issue, there was a seed planted in your head --
A. Sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative and certainly I don't mean to interrupt you, but that is not true.
It's not true that everything I heard about Sergeant McCabe was negative. I heard positive as wel1. I have told you that. So...
198 Q. Okay. We11, you have those three instances anyway of the o'Mahony direction to cooperate, the decision to resign -- or retire, and the Bandon tapes letter, that they were all directly from Martin Callinan through Superintendent Taylor to you?
A. I'm not accepting that.

199 Q. And just to finish off, Mr. Reynolds, Superintendent Taylor had a long career before he ever became the Press officer and he now finds himself that he is the, like you said yesterday, the goat separated from the sheep, but up until a certain stage in his career after leaving the Press Office, he was from the same pool as a11 the senior officers; he was a detective almost all his career, in and out of Special Branch on promotion, and while there was talk about his qualifications and qualifications of other press officers, I think the reality is that the guards all joined the force at the
one level.
CHA RMAR No, I do get the point, but the point you are making, Mr. Ferry, is that you would have both been well-known to each other, is that the point? For professional reasons?

MR. FERRY: Yes, but also he was similar to other press officers and that there was nothing untoward about him while he was the Press officer and that he was doing his role in accordance with the Commissioner's instructions as far as journalists were aware, would that be fair to say?
A. First of all, I didn't know him at all before he joined the Press Office. I only met him when he was appointed to the Press office. And secondly, I don't know anything and it didn't happen, what he says. It didn't 11:43 happen.

200 Q. Yes.
A. The things he says that he said, didn't happen.

201 Q. Yes. But Superintendent Taylor has said that he believed what he was told by his Commissioner, and you have spoken this morning for somebody who is not a member of the guards, of how the Commissioner in a ranking organisation, in a disciplined force does not give sergeants options when he sends them a direction, I thought it was a very informed statement from somebody who is not a member of An Garda Síochána.
A. Yes, but I have no evidence or information in relation to any direction that Superintendent Taylor alleges was given to him by former Commissioner Callinan in

No. But you're somebody who is not a garda and you are of the firm belief, according to your evidence this morning, that the Commissioner in a ranking organisation, in a disciplined force, does not give sergeants options when he sends them a direction. CHA RMAN I see the point now, Mr. Ferry. being, actually being a member of An Garda Síochána who has been long time serving and who has been promoted on three occasions and finds himself on a one-to-one basis as a superintendent right beside the serving Commissioner --
MR. G LLANE: Chairman, $I$ don't know if this is fair. CHA RMAN I think, it may help if I just put the question like this, Mr. Gillane, it may solve things. You have taken the view that the Garda Síochána is a disciplined organisation, you have taken the view people obey orders. We11, the evidence here has been is David Taylor was given an order go and calumniate this person who is causing a great deal of trouble and making a great deal of fuss about road traffic fixed penalty notices. Therefore, it's highly likely that he did it and did it to you. Is that fair, Mr. Ferry?
MR. FERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN So what do you say to that question by Mr. Ferry?
A. He didn't. It didn't happen.

204 Q. MR. FERRY: And the reason for that is that he believed
what his Commissioner was telling him, and he has said that there was a campaign to discredit Sergeant McCabe. But what he was doing may only have been one strand of that campaign, and there has been evidence here before the Tribunal of other officers being asked to do different things in relation to different aspects involving Sergeant McCabe. And I'm putting it to you that you were one of the journalists that was negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor and the reason for that is you were the most trusted journalist 11:46 of them all.
A. I was not negatively briefed by Superintendent Taylor about Sergeant McCabe. It didn't happen.
MR. FERRY: Thank you, Mr. Reynolds.
CHA RMAN Thanks, Mr. Ferry. Was there any other questions, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh? Mr. Lehane? No. MR. Ó MI RCHEARTAIGI Thank you, Chairman. I just have one or two questions because $I$ think there is a certain amount --
A. Could I take two minutes, do you mind?

CHA RMAN Yes, you can.
[THE WTNESS STOOD DONN]
I will stay here, if it's not too long. Can I just ask, this morning, we have who else and it's just things are -- it's nearly 12:00 now?
MS. LEADER: Ms. O'Grady is the next witness, sir. CHA RMAN And she is not very long, I understand?

MS. LEADER: I don't think so.
MR. MtGU NESS: We also have Mr. --

CHAN RMAN -- Barrett.
MR. MEGU NESS: Fionnan Sheahan and we have Mr. Burke from RTÉ and also Mr. Conor O'Callaghan from Three. CHA RMAN I would ask people to compress things insofar as they possibly can. There has been a lot of focus and detail, which is very helpful. Really, I think we should start compressing things.

MR. MEDONELL: Could I just say that in many cases I would have no objection to the witnesses being asked if they have made a statement, if they stand over it rather than put through it all.

CHA RMAN I appreciate that, that intervention, Mr. McDowe11, but I think as I understand the duty on a tribunal, we have to really ask all the relevant questions so that does tend to take time. But we can 11:48 compress it as much as we can.

## [THE WTNESS RETURNED TO THE WTNESS BOX]

CHA RMAN So I think Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, you had a 11:52 number of questions?

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

205 Q. MR. Ó MI RCHEARTAI Gt Thank you very much, Chairman. Fíonán Ó Muircheartaigh is my name, Mr. Reynolds, and I 11:53 represent Alison O'Reilly. I am having difficulty and I am sure you might be having difficulty too with the phrase "negatively briefed". And really, it's not entirely clear that everybody understands the phrase in
206 Q.
the same way. Would it be fair to ask you what you understand by the phrase "negatively briefed"?
A. We11, I presume it refers to making derogatory comments, poisonous comments about Sergeant Maurice McCabe on a consistent, persistent regular basis, as part of some kind of orchestrated campaign. We11, $I$ think I agree with that, it certainly would include that. But I think part of the difficulty here is that it could include other things as well, and, for example, if somebody went to the Garda Press Office on the record and said some honourable citizen like Mr. McDowe11, maybe I shouldn't choose Mr. McDowe11, but of an impeccable record, went and said you know that man was attacking children, small children, and can you confirm there was a complaint about him, and the Gardaí came back and said, oh, yes, there was a complaint about him. And then you asked another question, well, did anything come of the complaint? And they came back and said, well you know, the DPP said there wasn't really -- they couldn't prosecute the 11:54 case. Would you accept that the Garda Press office, however inadvertently, would have given information about that ordinary decent citizen which they weren't really entitled to?
CHA RMAN In other words, imagine someone who was in 11:55 the news or just imagine someone who is not in the news, let's say a judge somewhere in the west of Ireland, and a story comes to your attention that in the past there has been some allegations against that
person, you rang the Garda Press Office and the Garda Press office says yes, that is true, but the DPP ruled that whatever happened was, let us say, only someone tickling a child and it was certainly nothing to do with a sexual assault --
A. And this didn't appear on the record at all?

CHA RMAN We11, it would appear on a record somewhere.
A. I know that. But I mean, public record.

CHA RMAN We are getting off the point, again, Mr. Reynolds. The point Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh is asking you, in the event an allegation is made, you hear about it, it's about citizen A who is a good upstanding citizen, the allegation is that there was child sexual abuse somewhere in the background, you check it out officially with the Gardaí and they say yes, a complaint was made but the DPP ruled even if you take the complaint at its height it didn't amount to sexual abuse, or an assault, isn't that the point you are making?
MR. Ó MI RCFEARTA GH That is the point I am making.
A. So an official check through the proper channels. CHA RMAN Yes. Would you regard that as anything like negative briefing?
A. Well, you wouldn't get that information officially. CHA RMAN But I mean, let's not dodge the question.
A. No, I am actually trying --

CHA RMAN well, if you got it unofficially?
A. If you got it unofficially, yeah, that there was no case to answer? Like, I did? Yeah, no, I don't regard
that as negative briefing because the person was exonerated.

MR. Ó MURCHEARTA GH Well, the next thing I'd come to and it's just a development of that, really, is that in relation to the briefing you got before the o'Higgins Report was leaked to you, you were doing research and you got an insight into where this report was going, and I think in your discussion with Mr. McDowell, I think would you accept that the perspective that comes from that note is that in relation to these very serious eight or nine complaints about murder and rape and all these other things, that the point that comes out in that briefing is that, you know, junior gardaí, unsupervised gardaí, al1 very unfortunate, but insofar as they are true, you know, no responsibility attaches to those in authority in relation to this matter, isn't that what the notes sort of suggest?
A. These are the initial handwritten notes you are talking about or is this the full notes, the emails, are you just talking about the initial hand --
208 Q. The nine pages of notes that have been typed out.
A. Yeah, those are my handwritten ones, yes, just to be clear. I think there was a reference to poor supervision in that, so it wasn't necessarily all about junior stuff, it was about supervision and management as well and senior gardaí, so -- and as I said, this was the start, the initial -- these were the initial notes. So I don't -- in short, no, I wouldn't accept what you are saying.

209 Q. Yes. Because I think it might be helpful to you and indeed to the Tribunal to consider what negatively briefed means and to the effect of these kind of contacts. Now, you didn't identify who they were, but the number of people who'd access to this report was very, very limited, and it just seems to me that when you are saying you were never negatively briefed, you know, you may not have fully considered the effect of what must have been quite a lengthy meeting going through 360 pages or whatever it was, of the report, and going through these cases and getting a particular perspective on it?
CHA RMAK In other words, were you influenced by what you had heard, is that the point? No smoke without fire type thing, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, is it?
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAI GH Yes. And you know, the information we have forms part of the intellectual information on which we base our reports. I mean, we do our research and we have got detailed information from one perspective and then the report comes out, and you know, I would take the view -- I mean, I fully accept that the report is very conscientious and every effort has been made to be balanced, but I put it to you that it does reflect the orientation that was given prior to you ever seeing the report?
A. As I said yesterday, I wanted to see the report, that's what I wanted, and that's what I based my reports on.

210 Q. You see, the last question is: Around about this time, there were still journalists going around who either
believed or had been told that Sergeant McCabe was a paedophile; were you aware of that?
A. No. Never heard that.

211 Q. But you told us you had discussions with David Taylor on the record about Maurice McCabe?
A. which I published.

212 Q. Tell me, when you have a discussion with a press officer about any issue and he speaks to you on the record about any issue, is it normal or is it possible or is it likely that the Press officer will say, now that's for the record and now $I$ will just tell you a few other things? Does that happen?
A. There are conversations between a press officer and a journalist and not all conversations are published. I mean it's quite common practice in other jurisdictions, 12:01 in the PSNI, for example, or the British Police Forces will issue press releases and the press information on the record stuff, is on the -- is on the first page. And then underneath it says "for gui dance onl y" and then they give a little bit of background. So that's common practice among press officers all over the world.

213 Q. So you had discussions with David Taylor about Maurice McCabe?
A. Yes.

214 Q. And were those discussions subsequent to the time when you learned that there were just four things: There was a complaint, it was referred to the DPP, the DPP reverted and said there was nothing to it? Did you
ever discuss -- did the topic of Maurice McCabe ever come up after you ascertained those four points?
A. Yes. Those on-the-record comments were after I ascertained those four points and I'd satisfied myself there was nothing in it.
Q. And there were no off-the-record conversations?
A. There was no off-the-record conversations in relation to paedophilia or sexual assault or anything like that. Thank you, Mr. Reynolds. CHA RMAN Mr. Whelan, did you want to make a submission or make an indication as to -- you'11 appreciate you said there is two major things here.

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

218 Q. MR. WFELAN There are two major things, judge, and Mr. Reynolds, firstly Noel whelan, I appear for An Garda Síochána and I have questions in particular on behalf former Commissioner Callinan and former Commissioner O'Sullivan. And I will have to take a little bit of time, judge. Ultimately our clients are persons who are the subject of the two central terms of
reference in which Mr. Reynolds is giving evidence. CHA RMAN I appreciate that, Mr. Whelan. It's been a -- well, I am going to say nothing. But we are really, really, really, really crawling, and well, yes, I am a human being and there is a limit to my patience, ${ }^{12: 03}$ yes, and I appreciate there's so many parties represented we have to go through so much. But the witness says Martin Callinan never briefed me, Nóirín o'Sullivan never briefed me, David Taylor never briefed me. As regards anything to do with Garda Headquarters, 12:04 his evidence is extremely definite: No, I got the reports, I am not saying where I got the reports from. But as to the specific term of reference, and as to the specific allegation in it, which is that Nóirín o'sullivan used briefing material in Garda Headquarters 12:04 in order to brand Sergeant McCabe a liar and irresponsible, that is completely refuted because what he says is, I got the report, I talked to a number of people, but the report was what I wrote in relation to my reports, that is what I based it on. That is his evidence. How does one make that better from the point of view of An Garda Síochána?

MR. WFELAK we11, I think, I am conscious that we are going to have to deal with some of this in terms of submissions, it's necessary for us to lay the basis for 12:05 doing that in the terms of evidence. This is the only substantial witness on term of reference [k].

CHA RMAN Mr. Whelan, I am not trying to stop you. Please understand that. I am not trying to say in any
way that anyone on behalf of An Garda Síochána or anyone else has done anything less than a fully conscientious and fully proper job. Please understand that. Now please do ask the questions in as concise a manner as you can, given that I think I have summarised things insofar as $I$ can be helpful to you in a way that indicates my thinking at the moment.
MR. WFELAN And I appreciate that, and on the central factual issues that touch on particularly allegation [k] that is of considerable assistance.
219 Q. Can I start with a couple of things? Can we deal firstly with the suggestion, one of the reasons you are here is because you are named as one of the nine, plus two, that David Taylor has named as somebody he negatively briefed, if we use that phrase, about Sergeant McCabe. And you are the latest in a series of those persons who has said you weren't so negatively briefed. Can I ask you, at the time that the story broke on the 4th October 2016, about protected disclosures having been made by, I think the story broke in the Examiner on 4th October 2016, it was Clare Daly had an interview on Morning Ireland on 5th October 2016, Deputy Daly, that night it became a major political controversy, and I think on the 5th or 6th, it seems, in the media, the fact that the protected disclosees were Superintendent Taylor and Sergeant McCabe was revealed. At that point, your state of knowledge, as I understand it from you, was that sometime in 2013 you had heard the generalised
suggestion about Sergeant McCabe having been the subject of an allegation of child sexual abuse, is that correct?
A. Yeah.

Is that right?
A. Yeah.

221 Q. You had made your own inquiries and established that he had been exonerated of that allegation in the form of the Director of Public Prosecutions not taking -- not proceeding with charges, isn't that correct?
A. Yeah.

222 Q. okay. And just pause there for a second on the last line of questioning. It would be wrong to say, wouldn't it, that any conversation that you or anybody had about the Mrs. D allegation was in the form of a negative smear in that the conversations you had with the people who said no, the Director directed there was nothing to that, the Director directed no prosecution was, as it were, more a J-cloth than it smear in that it was clearing away the suggestion that he had done something wrong, isn't that correct?
A. Yeah. I mean, can I just clarify something as well. I know, Chairman, you referred to calumny and detractor yesterday and the detractor narrates what he thinks and I was thinking about this overnight. I mean, the narrator in the case, the people who talked to me about this, you know, they are not talking about child abuse, they were talking about police procedures and investigation in reference to the note. You know, they
weren't talking -- there wasn't any -- I got no detail in relation to the alleged allegation. I just got detail -- just got the fact that there was an allegation.
223 Q. If I take you back to that week in October 2016 then, you knew, as far as you were concerned, there had been no campaign to smear Maurice McCabe by David Taylor, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

At this stage you hadn't been named, Superintendent
Taylor didn't name any journalist until many, many months later, but were you asked for your view? I mean, Mr. O'Toole told us, Michael o'Toole told us in evidence sometimes the generalist in his organisation or political reporters in an organisation would come to 12:08 the crime specialist and say was there anything to this. Were you asked by RTÉ whether on your information there was anything to this suggestion that David Taylor had run a smear campaign?
A. Yeah, I don't know if I was asked but I would certain7y 12:08 have told people like Ray Burke, you know, this didn't happen. I mean, I hadn't seen any evidence for this.
225 Q. And that may or may not have fed into their interpretation of how to run the story, as it were, in the widest sense?
A. And you know, with the other journalists, the likes of Conor Lally and Mick O'Toole, would have said do you know anything about this? And none of us knew anything about it.
Q. Let me ask you a question akin to that put by Mr. Marrinan yesterday to Mr. Stephen Rae, which is: If he had, if David Taylor had said such things to you which suggested that Sergeant McCabe had been the subject of an allegation or had been guilty of child abuse, what would your reaction have been, apart from talking among your friends or colleagues?
A. If he said he had been guilty?
Q. And if you had established that there was no evidence is the proof?
A. Where is the evidence? where is the conviction? where to that, either from those queries, would the fact that 12:10 the official Garda Press officer had openly smeared a whistleblower to you, be of itself a newsworthy story?
A. Yeah, it would be an outrage.
Q. An outrage. And what would you do with that outrage, you now have a story in your own ears that the Garda Press officer has said or suggested that the prominent whistleblower had been guilty of --
A. We11, I would have to substantiate it and stand it up.

230 Q. okay.
A. And prove it. But if I could. And if it was on the record, it's a story.
231 Q. It's a story. And you put it into that structured editorial process we have seen that applied to --
A. Yes.

232 Q. -- at one stage, eight or nine different editors who were involved, but you'd get into, with Mr. Burke or others, into one, is it true, and two, if it's not true, the fact that it's being spread is a big story?
A. Yes.

12:11
Absolutely?
A. Yes.

234 Q. No hesitation on that?
A. No.

And at first, it would have to be handled very carefully in how it was subsequently reported and presented but out of all of the organisations RTÉ has both the resources and patterns, as it were, and structures within which to do that, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What if the Garda Press Officer had said to that you Maurice McCabe had psychiatric and psychological problems and had been guilty of the most heinous -guilty of horrendous and grave wrongs, and you interpreted that to mean that he might have been guilty 12:11 of sexual assault or rape, what would your response --
A. Well, if he said he was guilty of anything, the first thing I'd ask for is the conviction.
237 Q. okay. I am sorry, maybe I am being loose with the word of the guilty. If he had suggested to you that he had done these things?
CHA RMAN And perhaps just to clarify, Mr. Reynolds, just for fear again, we are talking --
A. Hypothetically.

CHA RMAN -- at tangents. An awful lot of things never reach court, such as, for instance, rape cases or child sex abuse cases, and we all know that. So if people are telling you on a confidential basis, and this is what Mr. Whelan is saying, that someone had done things in the past, it's not just a question of getting the record of the Central Criminal Court or the Circuit Criminal Court. The plain reality of it is, gardaí can be in the know and know things and be able to tell you things and say, we11, didn't get to court but it actually happened. Isn't that the point you are making, Mr. Whelan.

MR. WFELAN That is the point I am making.
A. Yeah, but it's a big jump, you know. You'd need the evidence for that.

MR. WFELAN But if you had established that it was not accurate to suggest that the whistleblower had committed a sexual assault in the past, then the fact that somebody officially was spreading that rumour, would be of itself a news story, isn't that correct?
A. It would -- you'd certainly know about it among the journalists and, you know, you'd be thinking what is going on with this guy.
239 Q. And what if the Commissioner himself had used those kind of phrases to you about a whistleblower?
A. Ah, well, then you have got a story, haven't you?

240 Q. You have got a massive story potentially, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, yes.

241 Q. And if you had the additional colour that it had been done in the corridors of RTÉ itself, wouldn't that make it a significant story? wouldn't that add to the colour of it?
A. You would want a lot of proof, like, you know.
Q. Yes. You would have the proof of your own ears.
A. Well, that might not be enough.

CHA RMAN But I think you are getting the wrong end of the stick. It's not that there was sex abuse in the past. what if the story becomes the calumny itself? That is the point being made to you. And again, I don't want to interrupt you, Mr. Whelan. But you didn't seem to understand that.
A. People -- you know, people, in the past, have tried to spin me stuff and I have believed they have tried to do 12:13 it for malicious reasons, and you lose all trust with them, you stay away from them and you never go near them again, and you can't make a story out of it, but you have seen what they are trying to do.
243 Q. But if the Garda Commissioner had said something to you 12:14 that was calumnious of a whistleblower, that was defamatory and damaging of a whistleblower, of the most serious type, because it suggests that the whistleblower had committed sexual assault, then that was a news story that would go into your process, isn't 12:14 that correct?
A. Well, I mean, it could be a news story. You know, it depends, you know, what was said, if you had witnesses, if you could substantiate it, if you could stand it up,
you know, all that sort of stuff.
244 Q. All of which are the likes of things you would engage with exploring with the likes of Mr. Burke and others, isn't that correct?
A. Oh, well, if you were beginning on the news process, yeah.

Yes. Can I ask you then, if we just turn briefly then to the date of the 24th February 2014, when you -- when an on-line story by you about Maurice McCabe's cooperation, or otherwise, with the O'Mahony inquiry into penalty points. Now, as I understand it, you said that at 2:28 that day an on-line story written by you but processed through the central desk, and presumably the on-1ine editor, went up on-1ine, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

246 Q. And the effect of that story, and we have seen it in its various iterations, the effect of that story was that a direction had been given to Maurice McCabe to give whatever information he may wish to give around penalty points to the O'Mahony inquiry, isn't that correct?
A. That was the -- well, not the effect. That was what I reported.
247 Q. That is what you reported, okay. But the only aspect that's, I suggest, relevant to this inquiry is whether, in coming to the view that he was given that direction, you made your own mind up on that on foot of sight of the direction or somebody darkly spun that
interpretation to you?
A. Nobody darkly spun that interpretation. I made -- I wrote that story on the basis of sight of the direction and in my knowledge of crime, security and disciplined forces.

248 Q. Now, did I understand you to say that, as it happens, none of the editors of the big programmes for the afternoon on television or radio were interested in it as being a big story?
A. That's correct.

249 Q. And by default it went up on-7ine only perhaps then in those circumstances?
A. That's correct.
Q. They are offered it about two or half two?
A. Yes.

251 Q. They don't take it up?
A. Yeah.

252 Q. It goes up on-line. And did I understand you to say it also featured in the news headlines then at 3 and 4 and 5 o'clock?
A. No, I don't think it did. I think it only featured at 5 o'clock in the headlines.

253 Q. In the radio news headlines?
A. Yes.

254 Q. But that at a point --
A. Not necessarily -- sorry, not the headlines. Just the bulletin.

255 Q. In the bulletin. okay. So, I suppose, what I mean is, the bulletin at 5 o'clock is a short bulletin, so it's
just in the radio news bulletins itself. And it did not appear at all on television, isn't that correct?
A. No.

So an editorial view had been taken that at that stage it was a relatively small story, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

257 Q. Now, is that, in part, perhaps shaped by the fact that the Commissioner himself had outlined the fact that this direction had been made in his evidence to the Public Accounts Committee itself a couple of weeks earlier? He had told the Public Accounts Committee, and this Tribunal has the transcript of the Public Accounts Committee, I don't need to take you to it, but he had told the Public Accounts Committee that a direction had been given on -- he named the date, was it the 14th December, whatever year, 2012, to desist from Pulse, to desist from circulating anything from Pulse to any other persons, and that in that direction also was the fact that any further information he had was to give to Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony. Were you aware that that had been -- happened at the Public Accounts Committee?
A. Well, I was aware that happened in the Public Accounts Committee all right, but I don't -- I mean, I don't know why the editors made their decisions, various decisions not to follow up on it.

258 Q. Like all journalists, every day others take a different view of a story than you?
A. Yeah. Every journalist thinks they have got the
headline story and it's...
259 Q. Now, the Chairman heard that dispute between you and Mr. McDowell as to whether that -- the approach you made, if I use that phrase, to Sergeant McCabe for comment, was before or after the story went up on-line. 12:17
A. Yes.

260 Q. But in any case, you didn't seek to make an approach to Sergeant McCabe before it went up or some little time after it went up on-line, is that correct?
A. Sorry, I did, you mean, I did.

261 Q. You did. You said before it went up, you think.
A. No, I can't be 100 percent sure, to be honest with you. I believe I would have, you know, but I can't.
262 Q. And whatever comment or observation you'd have got from sergeant McCabe, if you had got any, would then have been inserted into the text on-line, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

263 Q. And the fact then that it stayed up on-line from half two, half three, half four, half five, half six, half seven, half eight, until half nine, without any comment ${ }_{\text {12:18 }}$ or interpretation from Maurice McCabe, was because he hadn't given you one, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

264 Q. And you had left a message, presumably, asking him to ring you back?
A. I am not sure if I left a message, but I was trying to contact him.

265 Q. And then when you ultimately spoke to him, he was clearly very aware of the story and he had, as it were,
as is his right, made a decision that he would deal with Ms. Hannon in Prime Time rather than giving you a response, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

266 Q. And then - and I don't know if you had a chance to see it, taking up Mr. Gillane's offer to the Tribunal and al1 of us a couple of days ago, that all of this stuff is on-line - Prime Time that night, even though this story didn't feature at all in the news bulletins on television, Prime Time that night led with Sergeant McCabe's view or correction, as he would see it, of the interpretation suggested that he had been directed to cooperate with the O'Mahony inquiry, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

267 Q. And you, I don't know if you saw --
A. Sorry, I beg your pardon. I did see Prime Time. I am not sure if they led with it, but I will take your word for it.
268 Q. And we can point -- lead you to the on-line site -location, if need be. But they led with that story, and it took the form, you may recall, of a one-to-one interview piece between Miriam O'Callaghan, who was presenting the programme, and Katie Hannon, who was the journalist, isn't that correct? Do you recall that?
A. I don't recall it, but $I$ do recall getting the information. That is where I got my information for my subsequent updating of my news stories.

269 Q. Now, interestingly, and again the words are in many
ways, perhaps, firstly, closely aligned or interchangeable, but you took a view that he was directed to cooperate with the o'Mahony inquiry, and that, in part, is shaped, as I understood your evidence to be, from a knowledge and experience in policing that 12:20 the word 'direction' has a particular meaning?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Chairman knows that the direction was one given by a super or chief superintendent, one of his superiors, where the officer has to come in and it's read out to him and he is talked through it, as it were, and its implications, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. g a super or chief superintendent, one of his
Q. okay. And it is your interpretation, having sight of it, was that that direction extended to the last paragraph, which was about the O'Mahony inquiry, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Sergeant McCabe takes issue with that, and anybody reading that can take an alternative view that the last 12:20 paragraph was, to use the Chairman's word, an indication that he could give information to the O'Mahony inquiry and that the direction was the top-half of a desisting from Pulse, but that is about words, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Ms. O'Callaghan, that night, in presenting the programme, introduced the piece by saying that sources in --
> "Garda sources earlier today suggested that Maurice McCabe had been instructed to cooperate with the O Mahony i nqui ry. "

And that's an understandable substitution of the word "instruction" to the word "direction" because "instruction" is one it's understood more generally, I think that would be fair to say, isn't it?
A. Yeah.

274 Q. The only difference, and again you may not recall it precisely, but the only difference between Ms. Hannon's account and your account, because Ms. Hannon's piece begins with playing the clip, actually, where the Garda Commissioner, Callinan himself, spoke about that
direction at the Public Accounts Committee, he -- it starts with Ms. Hannon introducing that and it being played. And then Ms. O'Callaghan's subsequent questions asks Ms. Hannon: What do we understand was Maurice McCabe's interpretation of that piece of paper or direction as it related to the o'mahony inquiry? And Ms. Hannon outlines that he undertook it to be -you know, certainly her response was that it wasn't -he didn't take it to be a direction, that is the issue he was taking. That is the only substantial difference ${ }_{12: 22}$ between what was on Prime Time, albeit given live Prime Time television coverage, and what was in your on-line piece, would that be correct to say?
A. Well, I mean, I am not going to dispute it.

275 Q you had been given the interpretation by Sergeant McCabe that he didn't take that last paragraph to be a direction, you'd have incorporated that into your piece, isn't that correct?
A. Most definitely.

276 Q. And the important point again in term of reference -this is, as I am trying to understand it, relevant to the terms of reference in this inquiry because it's suggested it was some spin or smear from the gardaí which caused you to interpret it as a direction. You are very clear that, having read the direction yourself, you came to a view that he was directed on the o'Mahony investigation also, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

277 Q. Okay. Can I turn then to the last area I want -- wel1, sorry, just before I do that. I mentioned earlier about the risk that any conversation about the $D$ case is viewed as a besmirching of Sergeant McCabe, and I am hoping now $I$ have the numbers of the pages right. Could we look at 5905, I think is the relevant note where there is this talk about the manager down the corridor conducting the investigation. I am sorry if I am wrong, but 5905.
MS. LEADER: It's 5910.

278 Q. MR. WFELAN It's 5910. Sorry, that is my second note. Thank you. 5910. The bottom of that page, if I recall correctly. Now, you are jotting down in a notebook and this is a typed version, you've the handwritten
version in your notebook, you know - two members of An Garda Síochána "working in the same station", isn't that correct? Sorry, you are looking for the hard copy. Let me tell you, it's page 5910.
A. I have it now. Sorry.
Q. Volume 22,5910 . Bottom of the page, there is reference there --
A. "Boss down the corridor asked to investigate it." Is that what you are talking about?
Exactly, that is it. And I think the Chairman
explained -- emphasised yesterday that the purpose of the Tribunal team is to put to you all -- the interpretations that might, in a sense, be seen to link that to an attempt to undermine the reputation of Sergeant McCabe.
A. Okay.
Q. So in saying that to you, it wasn't that the Tribunal itself is taking a view.
A. okay.

282 Q. It's saying, 1isten, can you tel1 us what your view on whether this --
A. Yeah.

283 Q. Now, the concern about the fact that the "boss down the corridor", whether figuratively or literally, was instructed to conduct the investigation into the Ms. D
allegation, could be an issue from three perspectives for the people involved, I put it to you. Firstly, and as was put to you yesterday, for Sergeant McCabe it could be a concern that he was -- had the added burden
of having local people looking into this sensitive matter, a local police officer, somebody who might be characterised as his boss, and that would be an additional difficult dimension for him. That is one interpretation, isn't that correct? And that is one that was put to you yesterday. A second one is that, and I may be wrong but I understand this was part of the concerns raised by Ms. D, is that it was being kept in the local area and the local person was investigating it and that that was inappropriate because it might be suggesting an attempt to not adequately investigate it or dampen it down. And the third possible interpretation is that it was unfair to the person or people who were asked to investigate it locally, to ask them to, as it were, investigate something that was so sensitive as between two colleagues. And I don't know if --
A. You see, I know nothing about any of that, and I never viewed any of those as a possible option. As I explained yesterday, the person that was telling me that, he or she, I never viewed them as a detractor because they never talked about the actual --
284 Q. Investigation?
A. -- abuse case. They were talking about police procedures and they were talking about the way it been learned and, if you like, this was such an incident in the Bailieboro area that it was nearly part of the corporate memory.
Q. Yes.
A. And that people weren't actually talking about the incident itself but they were talking about the 1essons --
Q. okay.
A. -- that could be learned from it, that this should have been an investigation outside the division.
Q. And it should have been an investigation outside of the division, in fairness to the officers who were investigating it, in fairness to the complainant who might have a sense that it was being kept within the division and in fairness to Sergeant McCabe who didn't -- wouldn't -- would have preferred perhaps not to have had local people asking him --
A. That is an analysis we didn't get into and that was never put to me.
Q. Can I ask you then to look at - again, I have a list of numbers here, $I$ hope this is the right page - 5924 is the handwritten copy of your notes.
A. okay.

Now, I just pause there for a second. I am looking for that note where there is reference to large numbers of sergeants coming and going. But there is an indent just at the top of the page, and I am a terrible handwriter myself, but you tel1 us, the second indent down or the third indent down, just read those two sentences for us --
A. Sorry, which one are you talking about now?
Q. The one about guards -- "sergeants coming and going".
A. Sorry, "i nvesti gated locally - wrong"?

291 Q. No.
A. I am on 5924?

292 Q. It's on the screen in front of you.
A. Okay, I have it here.

293 Q. Now, read your handwriting there where it talks about sergeants coming and going. Am I right?
A. I don't see "sergeants coming and going".
Q. 5924 .

CHA RMAN We see "sergeant in charge".
A. I see "sergeant in charge", yes.

295 Q. MR. WFELAN "Sergeant in charge".
A. "Compl ai nt case agai nst him investi gated locally, mistake, wrong, Superintendent Cl ancy."
296 Q. Go up two 1ines. Sorry. Thank you, registrar.
A. "Wanted out of a ki p".

297 Q. There it is.
A. Oh, sorry. Yes, I beg your pardon, yes.
"Accel er at ed recruitment - probationers - I ot of sergeants coming and goi ng."
298 Q. Now, but it's "- probationers" and then "- a lot of sergeants coming and goi ng" and then "wanted out of a ki $p^{\prime \prime}$, is that right?
A. Yes.

299 Q. Okay. And again, because the Tribunal has to do this, an interpretation was put -- a suggestion was made to you yesterday that that could be interpreted to suggest that Sergeant McCabe wanted out of the division because it was a kip; that is one possibility, isn't it?
A. Yeah.
Q. But I am putting to you that, allowing for the flow, it says:
"Li kel y to be that the reason there was such a hi gh turnover of sergeants" --
A. Because lots of sergeants were coming and going and they wanted out of the kip.
Q. They wanted out because to them it was a kip?
A. Yeah.

302 Q. And it's a while since I've read --
A. We11, I think it was a conversation about, you know, failings in Bailieboro, and we did see that as well at superintendent leve1. In the Garda Síochána for a long time, there was a superintendent would be appointed from Dublin -- would be promoted and he would be promoted to Bailieboro and he would there for six months or four months and he was gone again, and that happened for a number of years.

303 Q.
In fact, it's a long time since $I$ have read the
o'Higgins Report, and indeed since you have, I suspect, but there was talk in the O'Higgins Report about the high turnover of sergeants, isn't that correct? CHA RMAN That was a point made by Mr. Justice Morris very forcefully.
MR. WFELAN Yes, in Donegal at the time.
CHA RMAN Yes, absolutely. And one notes that Chief Superintendent McGinn has been there for ages, which is a good thing.

MR. WFELAN So I suppose my general point is that we can look at any of your individual notes, and you yourself have cautioned of the risk of all of us sitting here, whatever our varying degrees of intelligence, trying to interpret what you were jotting down at the time, but those two notes, for example, are open to alternative interpretations, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, I will accept that.

305 Q. Let me come then to the central point. And could I ask 12:30 to see the protected disclosure 244 , which is the protected disclosure of Sergeant McCabe. Now, as you will have been aware -- now, the second paragraph begins:
"I amcurrently on work-rel ated stress due to --"

And he says the Garda Commissioner's treatment of him.
"-- and fal se evi dence produced at the O Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on. "

That is a subject of a separate module, as he describes it, as an attempt to set him up, and we are not going to deal with that today. But the third item there is, effectively he says is:

[^0]2016 purporting to leak an account of the unpublished O Hi ggi ns Cormi ssi on report in which l was branded as a liar and irresponsible."

Now, the point has been made by Mr. McDowell this morning that, in terms of this allegation, sergeant McCabe was doing no more than repeating what was said to him by Mr. John Barrett, and my clients don't have a view on it, the Tribunal itself will deal with a conflict of evidence, but Mr. Barrett says he said no such thing to Sergeant McCabe. But the point here, that the suggestion that the series of broadcasts was disgraceful, is not coming from John Barrett, it's coming from sergeant McCabe, and the suggestion that the series of reports branded him a liar and irresponsible, is not coming from John Barrett, it's coming from Sergeant McCabe. And when we look at the terms of reference, but the allegation as worded there is personally targeted at my client. It says that she -- sorry, we will read the next sentence, actually. 12:32 не says, next sentence:
"I am now satisfied on impeccable authority that those RTÉ broadcasts were pl anned and orchestrated by the Cormi ssi oner, Nói rín O Sullivan, personally using briefing material prepared at Garda Headquarters."

Now, it's a damn fair allegation - we would say conspiracy theory - to suggest that the
then-Commissioner was planning and orchestrating an RTÉ report and that she was doing it in a way that that report would end up branding him a liar and irresponsible and making a disgraceful series of reports, that is a damn serious allegation against the Garda Commissioner. It's, of course, collaterally, a significant maligning of your journalistic work on the day.
A. Yes, yes.

306 Q. And nobody has actually, I have noticed, suggested to you, apart from Ms. Leader obviously, but nobody else has suggested to you that you were influenced or shaped by anything Nóirín O'Sullivan did or any briefing document she prepared, isn't that correct?
A. Nobody -- no, nobody has suggested this -- well, it's suggested there.

307 Q. Yes. It's suggested there it's very serious?
A. And it's not true.

308 Q. And I can understand why you were anxious to emphasise that. My client says it's untrue as well. And just for completeness, the Tribunal has had access to, I think Mr. Marrinan put it, thousands and thousands of documents from Garda Headquarters, and there is no briefing document or anything that could characterise it either. And the suggestion, if I recall correctly, wasn't even put to Ms. O'Sullivan by anybody apart from the Tribuna1. So whether he heard it from John Barrett or not, whether he heard it from somebody else or whether it is something he arrived at himself, the
conspiracy theory that Nóirín o'Sullivan planned and directed the series of radio reports broadcast on that day, is untrue, isn't that correct?
A. I was not involved in any conspiracy. That is clearly
untrue.

309 Q. Can I ask then the next one, which is, the Tribunal has taken the appropriate and broad interpretation of those series of broadcasts to include the broadcast, two other broadcasts which were not by you, one was keelin shanley's conversational piece or debate piece on the programme with the man who unfortunately lost his wife in the murder arising from -- we won't get into the details.
A. Lorcan Roche-Kelly.

310 Q. And I think an interview with the journalist michael Clifford. You indicated yesterday that you had given your working -- your document to Conor Kavanagh, who was editing that programme?
A. Producer, yes.

311 Q. By way of background?
A. Email, yeah.

312 Q. For his piece?
A. Yeah.

313 Q. By way of background for his presentation?
A. Yeah.

314 Q. Okay. Did you provide similar information or documents to Today at Five for Mr. Boucher-Hayes' piece?
A. No, but they would have been available in the RTÉ system and they were put on-line as well, so I think
they would -- they would have got them. That said, I should emphasise, and it's clear from the wording of his piece, as we heard it the day before yesterday, that when he was giving evidence, Mr. Boucher-Hayes was anxious to emphasise that he had his own leaked copy of the o'Higgins Report, that he had his own leaked -- you didn't share your copy of the o'Higgins Report, or copies, or any of them, with Mr. Boucher-Hayes?
A. No.

316 Q. Okay. Can I then turn briefly to the term of reference (k), and I know it will take the registrar a moment to bring it up off the website. But my general point is this, and that we'11 look at the terms of the terms of reference in a second by comparison to that allegation made by Sergeant McCabe. But let's be clear on this: From the minute the broadcast -- the story went up at line on 8 o'clock on the morning of the 9th May --
A. Sorry, which term of reference are you talking about?

317 Q. I am going to look at (k) in a second.
A. So which one?

318 Q. We will look -- it's in front of you now. (k), is it?
A. Okay.

319 Q. Now, this is, shall I say, and this of course is done by the members of Dáil Éireann and Seanad Éireann, and the terms of reference are framed by them, obviously, not by Sergeant McCabe, it bears a resemblance, albeit a toning-down, as it were, but for the terms of the question -- of this Tribunal, as to why are we here,
why are we here for these two days looking at your broadcast on the 9th May, the terms of reference sent to the Chairman by the Oireachtas were:
"To i nvesti gate whet her Commi ssi oner O' Sul I i van, using 12:36 briefing material prepared in Garda Headquarters, i nfluenced or attempted to influence --"
which is a toning-down from the planning and orchestrating.
"-- broadcasts on the 9th May 2016 purporting to be a I eaked account of the unpubl ished O Hi ggi ns Report."

Now, that word "purporting to be", which is in both the 12:36 allegation and in the terms of reference --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- I take it you take that as a maligning as well --
A. Well, it's clearly --

321 Q. -- to suggest you were claiming to have it and
A. Exactly, the evidence is that $I$ had it.

322 Q. A11 us lawyers understand what the word "purported" means in that sense. But then it goes on to say:
"In whi ch Sergeant McCabe was branded a liar and irresponsi ble."

It actually, on one reading, doesn't ask the Chairman
to establish whether the report brands him a liar and irresponsible; it almost takes it as a given, coming from the Oireachtas, that your work on those two days did brand him a liar and irresponsible. Now, again, it's a matter for the Chairman, but we all heard the reports. You have explained the careful way in which the word "1ied" or "1ie" was used. But the point I am making to you is, the Oireachtas sent forward a task to this inquiry to inquire into those reports, almost working on the presumption that it was a lie and irresponsible. And that brings us back to the day of the 9th May itself, because shortly after 8 o'clock it is very clear that Sergeant McCabe regarded your reporting as wrong and irresponsible, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

323 Q. In fact, by the -- by half twelve, or so, that afternoon -- that morning, in that morning into afternoon, with the benefit of legal advice, he had grown to characterise it as a gross defamation, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

324 Q. And therefore, he was unhappy with your report on the day itself, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

325 Q. Now, that is elevated to a conspiracy theory about my clients' involvement, he says on -- placing reliance on something told to him by Mr. Barrett, but, of itself, it reflects the fact of a, as it were, a broadcasting
complaint about the quality of your broadcast, isn't that correct?
A. Well, it's both a broadcasting and a legal complaint. Which I suppose raises the next question. The Chairman has clarified that it didn't give rise to legal proceedings. Did it give rise to any complaint to the Broadcasting Complaints Commission?
A. Not that I am aware of.

I suppose that's clear you would be aware of because you would get the chance to reply to the Broadcasting Complaints Commission, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Instead, your only chance you get to reply to that allegation bandied around the Dáil at the time of the referring of these references and put by the Dáil and Seanad into these terms of reference, is in what $I$ suspect at this stage as being a tiring series of two or three days for you here at the Tribunal, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

MR. WFELAN I just want to make sure I haven't left anything out. Thank you very much Mr. Reynolds.

CHA RMAN Yes. Was there anything that needs to be cleared up, Ms. Leader?
Mg. LEADER: Unless Mr. Gillane...
CHA RMAN Yes, Mr. Gillane, was there anything you wanted --

MR. G LLANE: Yes, could I maybe just take three minutes just to clarify a few things with Mr. Reynolds.

## THE WTNESS WAS THEN EXAM NED BY G LLANE:

329 Q. MR. G LLANE: Mr. Reynolds, firstly just in relation to the typed notes that have been put up on screen, these are your notes that you were taking, I think, in April and May 2016. I think you've -- you can confirm that these are effectively scraps of conversations that you are having with people, is that right?
A. Yes. As I've said, notes, jots, bits and bobs, streams 12:39 of consciousness.
A. Yes.

That insofar as you are taking notes during the course of a conversation, you're trying to keep the conversation going, and the fact that you write something down doesn't mean you are approbating what's being said or indicating that it's true, false or otherwise?
A. No, that's true. And just can I -- because there was an issue made about it yesterday where -- in relation to where I wrote "attempted murder". I was thinking about that last night and I went back and checked it; actually, it should have said "poisoning and attempted poisoning". That is what in the report. So I could have written down the word "murder" by mistake because I was thinking of the chapter in relation to the murder
Q.

And these are notes that you discovered to the
Tribunal. And occasionally people speak metaphorically about notes on the back of an envelope; $I$ think, in fact, one of your notes literally is on the back of an envelope?
A. Yes.

333 Q. Now, I think the position is that at this time when you were doing this work, as I understand it, Ray Burke, the news editor, had, in fact, charged you and asked you to get out there and see whether you could, in fact, get your hands on the report?
A. Yes, I think we were of one mind anyway because, you know, we wanted to know what was in this report.
334 Q. Yes. And I think contrary to the suggestion that was made some months ago by Mr. McDowe11 when the phrase "exclusive" was used, in fact, on the contrary, RTÉ was behind the curve to a certain extent because this report was being discussed by other media organisations?
A. Yeah, that is true. But, I mean, I would argue -look, I think we were the most comprehensive. We mightn't have been the first.

335 Q. Yes.
A. I mean, I think people can make up their own mind. If you look at the other reports, they seem to be selective. They didn't -- nobody had reported the detail of the criminal investigations.

336 Q. Yes. I mean, that included, for example, an interview
with Mr. Mooney on the radio where there was a suggestion that Sergeant McCabe was rubbished?
A. Yes.

And it also appeared to be a report that was featuring in other mainstream newspapers?
A. It was on RTÉ before I did it.

Now, you are satisfied, and I am not going to labour this point and Mr. Whelan has been over it, that Nóirín O'Sullivan had no hand, act or part in a single syllable you uttered on those broadcasts on the 9th May?
A. I am satisfied, totally.
Q. And you are absolutely satisfied that you were never directed by Superintendent Taylor that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by malice arising out of this underlying complaint?
A. Never.
Q. Now, in relation to the February report - I will deal with this briefly - the February report in relation to the cooperation issue, now, firstly, that is a report that isn't in the terms of reference but nonetheless is a relevant matter for the Tribunal to consider. In respect of that, can I just ask you the following: The context of that report on the direction was that, in the background, Mr. Shatter had in the Dáil said the whistleblowers had failed to cooperate, and I think the then-Commissioner had given evidence to the PAC that the whistleblowers had ample opportunities to come forward, isn't that right?

341 Q. I think there had been significant public discussion in relation to the direction to desist from using Pulse, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
A. That's correct.

Now, it's been specifically put to you in the context of the 9th May report, that in terms of your statutory obligation to get replies from people, that you were going through the motions, that you'd no intention of varying your script, and that effectively seeking a response from Sergeant McCabe was somehow fraudulent in one sense. Now, in the context of this specific report, I just want to put particular emphasis on what you did here. As soon as you heard that Sergeant McCabe was disputing the report -- or the interpretation of the direction, $I$ think as early as quarter past nine that night you amended your story to even made a response to you?
A. That's correct, seventeen minutes past nine.
made any response to you, you not only amended the story, you amended the headline, and the headline on the story at that stage, before Prime Time even went on air, is: "McCabe disputes cooperate clain'. And it then says: "Whistlebl ower Sergeant Maurice McCabe is understood toni ght to be di sputing the Garda Commi ssi oner's statement", as already indicated, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

346 Q. And that by the time Sergeant McCabe's account was then 12:43 subsequently broadcast on Prime Time, the story was then amended by you again to include chapter and verse of everything Sergeant McCabe was now saying about that direction?
A. At a quarter to midnight.

347 Q. And that was the story then that remained on-1ine in that context, giving a full voice to what he was saying, isn't that right?
A. That is the story we carried on from then on.

348 Q. Now, can I ask you this in relation to the use of the phrase "branding Sergeant McCabe a liar and irresponsible". You never at any point in any broadcast anywhere used the word "irresponsible" in connection with Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. Never.

349 Q. Similarly, you never called him a liar, let alone branded him a liar. You referred to a single instance of what you described as a lie, and I think you can confirm that you indicated explicitly in the broadcast
that Judge O'Higgins had referred to that as an untruth?
A. That's correct.

350 Q. And that you also, in that context, said that Sergeant McCabe's concern in relation to that matter was understandable and, in the context of this, the report had referred to his concern as genuine and commendable?
A. That's correct.

Now, you referred to it yesterday just briefly, but did $I$ understand you to say that in the course of a given year you might do 200 television news broadcasts?
A. 200 television news broadcasts plus on-1ine. I mean, for example, the 24th February didn't make TV. Yes. So in the context of any given year, possibly 200 television broadcasts in the crime and justice area, is 12:45 that right?
A. That's correct.

353 Q. In terms of radio, would it be a similar total?
A. Yes.

354 Q
So we are talking of over 800 , even over 1,000 broadcasts, radio and television, on-line, in the crime and justice area over the course of the four-year period --
CHA RMAN We11, I am not sure how 200 and 200 make 800, Mr. Gillane. Sorry, I am not trying to be smart. But let's suppose he is terribly busy or even working 19 hours a day, but I will take that as a given.

MR. G LLANE: I am saying over the course of four years.

355 Q
Q. But my point is this, the question $I$ want to put is that Mr. McDowe11 put it to you that you exhibited a deep prejudice against Sergeant McCabe?
A. That is not correct.
Q. And --
A. Not true.

357 Q. -- I just want to put to you that it appears that you have been cross-examined on that basis despite the context of however many broadcasts you have made on the basis of one day's news on the 9th May 2016 and an on-1ine report in 2014 that never even made it to the television?
A. That is true. In the course of 400 television reports, six of them related to Sergeant McCabe.
Q. And I think --
A. And they were all based on the record from, as I said, Oireachtas committees or --

359 Q. And I think you can confirm that you weren't, in fact, sued nor was RTÉ sued arising out of the allegation that that report was defamatory?
A. No.

MR. G LLANE: Thanks very much.

## THE WTNESS MAS RE- EXAM NED BY M. LEADER:

MS. LEADER: One thing I wanted to check with you, Mr. Reynolds. Do you have any knowledge of the foxtrot bravo letter other than in the context of this Tribunal, a poison pen letter in relation to Sergeant

McCabe?
A. I don't know what the foxtrot letter -- is this the -CHA RMAN It's the one that was on the screen.
A. The same --

CHA RMAN It says pyjamas, and al1 the rest of it, and 12:46 couch.
A. No, no, no. The first time I saw that was when the Tribunal showed it to me.

MS. LEADER: Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN I just wanted to ask you maybe two or three 12:47 questions.
A. No more hard ones, though.

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

361 Q. CHA RMAN First of all, the foxtrot bravo letter is a very good example of calumny, isn't it? I don't know if you can help me, Ms. Leader, by giving me a page number and we can put it up on the screen.
MS. LEADER: The page number in relation to the $D$
allegation is 6480.
A. Just to say something in relation to that. when Anne Doyle worked in RTÉ, she used to get 50 letters a week from farmers wanting to marry her. When you work in this business, you get all sorts of stuff through the mail, you get emails, you know, all sorts of poison pen 1etters.

CHA RMAN I know. But there is a bit of a difference between a farmer saying I think you are very beautiful
and I want to marry you and someone saying what is in this.
A. No, but the point $I$ am making is --

CHA RMAN No, I am not sure it's a great point, and if you let me ask the questions, we will actually get out of here a lot quicker. So, if you look at it, a young gir1, et cetera, et cetera, sleepover, sexually assaulted, the nature of the sexual assault is there, that is calumny. Now, did you hear anything like that about Sergeant McCabe?
A. No.

362 Q. CHA RMAN The second thing is this: How do you feet about Superintendent Taylor nominating you as one of the people to whom he felt able to broadcast whatever calumny he claims to have been broadcast?
A. You want my personal feelings?

CHA RMAK And the other thing that has come up, of course, is that someone who is well-known in the journalist and academic sphere said that you came up to him at a meeting and said, do you know Sergeant McCabe is a paedophile. How do you feel about that?
A. I feel very annoyed about that and I resent that too. CHA RMAN Okay. Thanks very much.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

# CHA RMAK So just in relation to this afternoon, I 

 mean, are we going to get through anything or going to be able to make things maybe a bit more concise and get moving on it?MR. MEGU NNESS: Chairman, we are going to do whatever is necessary to get the relevant evidence out, and nothing short of that.
CHA RMAN No, I know that. A11 right. We11, I don't see any reason why we can't sit at half one, then.

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

MR. MARRI NAN Claire Grady, please.

## M. CLA RE GRADY, HAV NG BEEN SUORN, MAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN

365 Q. MR. MARRI NAN would you mind just giving the chairman a brief history of your career in journalism?
A. Yes, Chairman. I was a journalist for probably about 30 years, most of it with Independent Newspapers. I was a reporter for about half that period of time and I was in what you might call a supervisory position then for the other half of the time, as in I was on the Irish Independent news desk for a few years, I was on the Evening Herald back desk, which was commissioning columnists and things like that, then I became the editor of the Herald for one year and I was the editor then of the Irish Independent also for one year, from August 2013 to August 2014.
366 Q. I think that you met with our investigators on the 26th October 2017, and the memo of the interview with you is at page 3577 of the material and goes to 21 pages.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

367 Q. But perhaps I could just simply condense it in this way. I think the Tribunal investigators went through the terms of reference of the Tribunal with you?
A. That's correct.

368 Q. And asked you whether you had any information to offer
in relation to them, and you indicated that you hadn't any information to offer, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

369 Q. With the exception of one circumstance, and that arose out of paul williams, the journalist, bringing an article --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- and an interview that he had with Ms. D --
A. Yes.
Q. And the consideration that was given by you and others, and we heard from Mr. Rae yesterday and we have also heard from Mr. Mallon in that regard.
A. Yes.

373 Q. And also from Dearbhail McDonald.
A. That's correct.

374 Q. And I think a process of many meetings were had to consider whether or not the Independent would run with the story, is that correct?
A. I wasn't involved -- I know Stephen Rae gave evidence that there was six meetings, and I have no reason to dispute that. I wouldn't have been involved in all six meetings. To the best of my recollection, I was involved at an early meeting, when I saw the video and the story was laid out? And at that time when -- you know, when I heard the story first, it was in no way in a position, I felt, you know, it hadn't reached a position that it could be used without further checks
and things like that being done. So Dearbhail McDonald undertook, along with Paul williams, to firm up the story.

Yes. The story, we know, was brought to you in around about March of 2014. Prior to that, had you heard anything in regard to Sergeant McCabe's background?
A. No. I certainly hadn't heard any allegation that was covered in that story. I think there would have been chitchat about oh, you know, this man has a grudge, you know, that sort of general thing. But to be honest, at 13:35 that particular point I was editor of the Irish Independent for a year, so a lot of the conversations go on and by the time they come to the editor the story kind of has reached fruition or close enough to reaching fruition, so that it's news editors in general who would be sort of dealing with the reporters and kind of teasing out stories and hearing that sort of thing. And at that particular time in that particular year in the Irish Independent, as I say, there was a lot of changes going on structurally, there was a lot of issues around the structure of the newspaper, so I wouldn't -- it's not that $I$ hadn't been involved in those sort of, you know, conversations in previous roles in the Independent, you know, where you'd be chatting to reporters and you'd be hearing gossip and inclined to have the time or the interest in chitchat.

376 Q. Right.
A. But I absolutely had heard nothing about that
allegation, you know what I mean, that was the basis of that story, before it was actually presented to me by paul williams.

There's just one statement that you made to our investigators. It's at page 3585, if that can be brought up on the screen. And if you could scroll halfway down the page, you say:
"I amaware that the official Garda Iine on the whi stlebl owers at the time was that they were persona non grata."

What did you mean by that?
A. What I meant by that was that Martin Callinan had gone into PAC in January and had described them as
'disgusting'. Now, I know it was sort of -- he rode back from that subsequently. But to my mind, it was a revelation of the thinking of the most senior garda in the land that the whistleblowers were disgusting.
378 Q. And then you go on:
"I remember thinking at the time that someone must have drawn Paul Wilians' attention to the young woman's story. It seemed to me to be conveni ent for seni or gardaí that the story surfaced at that particular time as it was post Martin Callinan's appearance before the Public Accounts Committee."
A. Yes.

379 Q. So it would appear that at that time you were
suspicious that perhaps Paul Williams had been given the story by the gardaí, is that what you are suggesting?
A. I mean, really what -- I mean, Paul had said, and I have absolutely no reason to dispute him, was that he was contacted by Ms. D. And I'm trying to remember at the time did I -- you know what I mean, did I know that he was contacted directly. I know he was contacted by Ms. D. I think what I meant was that, Paul is a journalist of many years experience and would have all sorts of contacts in the guards and even if it was from the point of view that, of what -- I think my frame of mind would have been that a guard would have -- that it was most likely a guard that gave Ms. D Paul williams' number. I'm not saying that a guard initiated, got the 13:38 whole thing rolling. But my initial thing was, I mean, part of my job was being sceptical about stories.

380 Q. Yes. No, indeed. And if we go to 3586 , the following page of your statement, you say:
"I was aware that these allegations agai nst Sergeant McCabe were emerging agai nst a background in whi ch seni or gar daí, i ncl udi ng the Gar da Commi ssi oner, consi dered Sergeant MLCabe to be a persona non grata."

So you have repeated that.
"I al so bel i eved it was quite conveni ent for the Garda authorities that the story was emerging at this time.

However, l bel ieve that the publication of this story in whi ch Sergeant MECabe was not identified would not contri bute in any way to impugning his character in the publ ic eye. Wile a number of gardaí would have known the identity of the garda in the story, there was no reason that the general public woul d have."

So again, I mean, I think you're just merely expressing perhaps an observation at the time --
A. Yes.
-- that this was very convenient timing for the story --
A. Yes.

382 Q. -- to come into the newspaper, is that right?
A. Yes.

383 Q. But beyond that?
A. No, I mean, I'm explaining -- really what I'm saying there is, I'm explaining my initial resistance, shall we say, to the story. It wasn't -- like, it was presented by a very experienced reporter and, you know, other types of stories you just accept at face value, but this went through an additional process apart from the seriousness of it. It was quite convenient, you know, I thought at the time, that a story that would -if it was written in a particular way, you know, impugn 13:40 Sergeant McCabe, that that would sort of fit into what Martin Callinan had said at the PAC.

384 Q. But in any event, it having been, I think the expression that has been used here, it having been
stress-tested, it was decided to publish the article, and it was published on the 10th April --
A. That's correct.

385 Q. -- of 2014. Thank you very much. Would you answer any questions, please.
A. That's correct.

MR. MEDONELL: No questions, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. O'higgins.
MR. MCFÉL O H GG NS: No questions, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MEGI NESS: Mr. Fionnan Sheahan, please.
Mr. Sheahan's statement is to be found at volume 14, page 3651.

MR. FI ONNAN SHEAHAN, HAM NG BEEN SUORN, WAS DI RECTLY
EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS:

386 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Is it Sheahan or Sheahan?
[pronunciation]
A. Sheahan.

387 Q. Thank you. I think you were appointed editor of the
A. That's correct, January 2015.
Q. And you still hold that position?
A. I do.

389 Q. And prior to that you were the group political editor, which covered the three paper publications, isn't that right?
A. Yes, it covered from the summer of 2013 through to December of 2014. I was group political editor of the 13:42 INM titles, which encompassed the Irish Independent, the Sunday Independent, independent.ie, the Herald and the Sunday world.
Q. Yes. Prior to that you were political editor of the Irish Independent?
A. That's correct, from 2007 onwards, up to that period.
A. Yeah, I flitted between Leinster House and I would come over and back to Talbot Street for meetings, but I was predominantly based in Leinster House. Yes. In paragraph 7 of your statement to the Tribunal, 13:43 you obviously offer the opinion:
"I did not and never bel i eved that Sergeant McCabe was guilty of any wrongdoi ng. "

But you say:
"I was aware from general di scussion in political
circles that there was an all egation of this nat ure
agai nst Sergeant MLCabe. However, as a political correspondent who is based in Lei nster House for over 15 years, I have learned not to pay much attention to unf ounded gossi p."

And you refer on7y there to "political circles". And can you recollect what you heard, as such?
A. Well, I mean, throughout this period -- I mean, Mr. McDowell outlined a series of issues that were raised regarding the Garda whistleblowers in general, Chairman, across this period. You had -- when the issues around the penalty points were brought forward, they were being dismissed, they were proven to be correct. You then had other issues around wrongdoing or allegations of malpractice in Bailieboro, which were 13:44 proven to be well-founded. There were other issues around missing computers, the release of suspects, and so on, and then also the issue which this Tribunal is examining. So, no, I mean, it was basically throughout that period -- in Leinster House, it is a gossip factory, in effect; you walk across the plinth in Leinster House, you would hear more gossip than in a bingo hal1 on a Thursday night. That is the nature of it. If you are there long enough, you learn pretty fast that you only pay attention to the stuff that is actually founded on some basis of realty.
394 Q. Yes. I was just trying to elicit from you,
Mr. Sheahan, what you heard and then I was going to ask you when you heard it?
A. Sure. what I heard generally was that there was suggestions against Maurice McCabe.
Q. Well, can you be more precise there?
A. No, not really, and I beg your forgiveness in this regard.
Q. Yes.
A. There was all sorts of suggestions that were undermining the credibility of the whistleblowers, but there was nothing that was actually founded in any fact or in anything that you would describe as actual
briefings. I think numerous witnesses have appeared before this Tribunal. John McGuinness probably summed it up; he said if you walked through the corridors of Leinster House, you could hear mutterings about these individuals.

397 Q. But you refer in that paragraph to "an allegation of this nature".
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Are you referring specifically to an allegation of sexual assault? Was that what you were hearing?
A. No, it was that and the other ones.
Q. Okay.
A. So there was a series. I mean --

400 Q. Can you help us just in terms of a time when you first heard it or can you recollect that moment or did it have any impact on you at all?
A. I would say it didn't. I would say, because you hear so much in Leinster House, that actually, no, it wouldn't have.

401 Q. Okay. We11, just the way you phrased it there, can I take it that you're excluding having heard it from, as it were, Garda circles?
A. Oh, yeah. Absolutely.

402 Q. I think just you seem to be quite clear in your statement that you have "never spoken to David Tayl or, Martin Callinan or Nói rín Ơ Sullivan about Ser geant MLCabe and none of these have ever bri ef ed me to say anything negative of or concerning Ser geant MLCabe or to use my influence to be negative about him"

So would it be a fair summary that you have never been negatively briefed by any member of the Garda Síochána in the terms of reference sense?
A. Oh, yeah, I outlined those three names, I suppose, in my statement because they're the three names that are being represented here, but that can apply, yes, across the board. Martin Callinan, I never met. Nóirín O'Sullivan, I met her at an event here in Dublin Castle in 2015, I said hello to her, that was it. David
Taylor I would have dealt with; routinely you'd put calls in to Dave Taylor and say, do you have a comment on this? I wouldn't regard David Taylor as anything resembling an off-record, confidential or anonymous source. Those were not my dealings with him.

403 Q. All right. Now, can I ask you this: Can you recollect when you first heard of the fact that Sergeant McCabe had been accused of sexual assault, that it had been investigated and the results of that?
A. No, Chairman, I'm afraid I can't.
Q. You can't recall?
A. No.

405 Q. Mr. Colum Kenny wrote an article in the Sunday Independent on the 2nd March 2014 in which he referred 13:47 to Sergeant McCabe by name as having been the subject of a serious accusation which had been investigated and as a result of which there would be no prosecution. would that have come across your desk at the time?
A. What's the date?

406 Q. 2nd March 2014.
A. No, I mean, colum Kenny, he's a columnist with the Sunday Independent, or he was at the time.
407 Q. Okay. Can I just ask you about something that Mr. Mallon told us.
A. Sure.
Q. Mr. Mallon, whose statement is in Volume 19 at page 5314, but he said this in his statement on page 5316, he says:
"I can say that al most every journal ist working in I ndependent Newspapers was aware of Sergeant McCabe's identity fromthe Paul Willians articles and knew that there was an old allegation made agai nst hi mof sexual assault agai nst a child and that the Director of Public 13:48 Prosecutions had rul ed there was no case to answer."
would you agree that that is correct?
A. I would say that subsequent to that, to that article in
the following weeks, I mean by that stage this issue was also being raised in the Dáil, so it was coming up in different platforms. Micheál Martin raised it some months after that period. So, like, can I precisely say on the day the article was published that everybody ${ }_{\text {13:49 }}$ knew - no, I can't say that.
409 Q. Yes. No, but, I mean, Mr. Mallon is speaking in terms of the context of Mr. Williams' article, articles, which you must have been familiar with, I take it?
A. You're talking about April.

410 Q. Yes.
A. April of 2014.

411 Q. Yes. But is that statement correct; so that, since then, every journalist would have known about it in Independent Newspapers?
A. I don't know what specific timeframe he's talking about it. I mean, that story was published in April of 2014.
412 Q. Yes.
A. Following on from that period, yes, it certainly would have been.

413 Q. Had you any hand, act or part in the Paul williams article and the stress-testing of it, or were you consulted about it at all?
A. No, none whatsoever.

414 Q. Okay. But you would have presumably become aware of the fact that the article was in the pipeline and was going to be then published, as it was on the 12th April?
A. No, I wouldn't have.
Q. You wouldn't have been?
A. No.

416 Q. Okay.
A. I mean, if I wasn't -- I wasn't consulted about it, I wasn't involved in it, I had no hand, act or part in any of these meetings being referred to, I wasn't asked about it at all.

417 Q. A11 right. So you learned of it from the date of publication onwards then, is that it?
A. Yes.

418 Q. A11 right. Okay. Now, a witness, Ms. Anne Harris, made an earlier --
A. Sorry, may I just add to the previous question. The point here about, Paul Williams' article is published in April 2014. There was no change in terms of the coverage coming from me or from my political staff or to the input that is coming from me into how this broad story is covered on foot of that. I mean, you can point to, just a couple of weeks later, the headlines on the front of the Irish Independent, my name is on it, where it refers to the whistleblowers not being listened to and how reports that were published at that time was vindicating them.
419 Q. Yes. No, I can understand why you want to say that. You're independent and you were -- the paper was
A. Yes.

420 Q. Okay. But did any of the reporters that worked for you or to you come and relate that the Garda Press officer
was conducting a smear campaign?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever yourself see any evidence that Superintendent Taylor was conducting a smear campaign in 2013 or '14?
A. No.

422 Q. Ms. Harris gave evidence to the Tribunal, having volunteered an early statement to the Tribunal, and she gave evidence on Day 82. I think you have probably -you obviously have read her statements, you've given your own statements in response?
A. I have.

423 Q. And you have read her evidence, I take it?
A. Yes, that's correct.

424 Q. Well, just to go to the straight to the heart of it, 13:52 she's described the atmosphere and events of 2013, going into 2014, at page 111 of Day 82 , and she goes on to say, line 27:
"I make no secret of the fact that we had difficulties
at the begi nni ng. I was the editor, nonethel ess, and Fi onnan Sheahan was the political group editor. I commissi oned hi mto write a great number of articles in that period. Bet ween the end of August and the begi nning of October he had five maj or articles in the Sunday I ndependent. They woul d not have been there, I cannot emphasi se this enough, they would not have been there had I not commissi oned them and there were al so feat ures whi ch he suggested, he had ideas for features,
and I commissi oned those as well. So I had a very good working rel ationship with him

At the end of the conference, towards the end of September, everybody had left, he' d gone out the door, he turned back, cane to the office and said, because the Iast conversation had been about, at the conference, had been about Sergeant Maurice McCabe and he said he's a paedophile, MECabe's a paedophile. And । was -- । was shocked."

Now, you will have seen the sequence in which she has described it in her evidence, which you have read, and the context in which it arose. And you seem to have treated what she told the Tribunal as an allegation against you, but it's not at all clear from her evidence that she ever intended it that way. She was relaying information which she thought you had given to her in terms of this comment. And have you any recollection of saying that --
A. Sorry, if I may --
Q. -- to her?
A. I took that as an allegation that I was withholding information from this Tribunal, which I regard as a very serious act.
426 Q. We11, I don't want to joust with you over the response of the paper or any of the journalists in your paper.
A. But it's not about the paper or the journalists, my paper.

427
Q. No.
A. That was a personal allegation directed against me.
Q. Well, you may see it as such?
A. Well, I see it as such --
Q. Yes.
A. -- because not only was it made to this Tribunal but it was made in the Sunday Times not six weeks ago.
Q. Yes. We11, you see, look at paragraph 7 of your own statement. You didn't volunteer that to the Tribunal until you were invited to respond to Ms. Harris's statement, isn't that right?
A. That's -- are you basically saying that every single person who occupied Leinster House over the period of 2013 into 2014 should have made a submission to this Tribunal?
A. I'm saying --
Q. That's a fact, isn't it?
A. No. What I am saying is that there was only unfounded gossip, which has been said numerous times in this Tribunal, that it was circulating around Leinster
Q. Yes.
A. Is there any question about that? I can cite John McGuinness, Micheál Martin, Eoghan Murphy, I can cite
people who have appeared on TV and radio who have said it was everywhere.
434 Q. Yes. Well, they volunteered statements obviously at an early stage. You also obviously had --
A. Sorry, I would challenge your assertion there. I will refer you to some conversations that I can get you details of on Prime Time on RTÉ. I don't see people who were making statements on programmes like that before this Tribunal. So if every single person who occupied Leinster House heard tittle-tattle and was coming forward to this Tribunal and saying, I heard tittle-tattle but it -- I have no basis on fact whatsoever, I think you would be snowed under with paperwork here.
A. That's correct.
Q. And you received no briefing from any of the gardaí mentioned in the terms of reference?
A. That's right.

And you'd agree that is important evidence to have?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Now, what would you like to say about Ms. Harris's assertion, or allegation, as you're categorising it?
A. Well, what I would like to say is that what Ms. Harris accuses me of in terms of what she characterises as warning her off Sergeant McCabe, I would have to say, and I would contend, that I was in fact doing the
complete opposite. In the period of the third week in September of 2014, which she specifically cites --
439 Q. Yes.
A. -- on page 114 of her testimony, which is, I would say, around the third week in September, I commissioned -- I ${ }_{13: 57}$ assigned a reporter to cover the latest allegations around penalty points. There was issues around Bailieboro as well.
440 Q. Is that Mr. Ryan?
A. That's correct.

441 Q. Yes.
A. I put it on the agenda for the Sunday Independent that week, I put it on the news list for the Sunday Independent that week, I put it back on the news list for the Sunday Independent that week when it fell off
at the editorial end. I also updated the Sunday Independent across that week about progress of that. I updated them on exactly who Mr. Ryan was meeting, I updated them on what sources he was in contact with. I updated him on both news and analysis. And everything I've just said is backed up in its entirety by emails sent by me to Ms. Harris as deputy editor in the Sunday Independent. So I'm not relying upon any flawed recollection or memory here. This is all set out quite cleanly in emails on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of the third week of September in 2014.

442 Q. Yes. I mean, I haven't suggested that you are relying on flawed recollections. You have drawn the attention of the Tribunal to Mr. Ryan's articles?
A. Correct.

443 Q. And he did a piece on the new claims that the gardaí were facing and he did an analysis piece?
A. Yes, he did a --

444 Q. And as I understand it, you're drawing attention to those as reflective of your attitude to Sergeant McCabe, is that it?
A. I'm saying -- well, Mr. Ryan wrote them.
Q. Yes.
A. I'm saying that I specifically commissioned them. I started him on the road to cover those stories that week, from half past nine on the Tuesday morning, which is when the Sunday Independent begins its work. So I put it on the agenda before there was any meetings held in the Sunday Independent.

446 Q. Yes. No, I understand that, and you've referred to the various emails, etcetera. But just in terms of the timeframe, obviously Ms. Harris, as you will have seen, was cross-examined in terms of trying to pin it down to some date, but may I take it that you agree that there would have been different editorial meetings at which the subject of what ultimately became the articles was discussed --
A. Well, I --

447 Q. -- at meetings at which you and she had been present?
A. I would certainly agree with that. I found it quite curious that I am basically -- an accusation is being made against me but there is no actual precise date being offered. It's basically around about the third
week in September. So I have gone back through my diaries, my rosters, my news lists, my own emails, and I can give an account of where I was on several of those days.
448 Q. Yes.
A. So Ms. Harris went into great detail about how her main editorial conference happened on the Tuesday, when on the Tuesday I was down at the Labour Party conference in wexford. So I think we can rule me out there. On the Thursday, which is her second big meeting of the week, there's an email from her deputy editor to me saying he's at that meeting and he has asked me a question about something on that list. So we can rule me out of that one as well. The following Tuesday I can prove quite categorically that $I$ was in that meeting early but left it to attend another meeting about budget 2015 was coming up. And on the Thursday I was at the Ploughing Championships down in Ratheniska, County Laois. So that pretty much takes me out of the equation for four of the meetings during the period which Ms. Harris is referring to. Apart from that, I can only refer you to my emails, which show that I was actually advocating positive coverage towards Sergeant McCabe during the very week that she is talking about.
449 Q. Yes. But the point I was asking about was that these are the type of meetings that you and she would normally attend?
A. That's correct.

450 Q. In the normal course of events. And she has, to the
best of her recollection as she sees it, thinks that this happened sometime, you know, from the beginning of September up until possibly the first week in October?
A. Okay. If I may piece the timeline together for you there, Chairman.

451 Q. Yes.
A. For the first two weeks of September I was in Greece on holidays, so it would have been enormously difficult to have attended a meeting there. I've already told you about the third week in September and the fourth week in September. That is how I can account for it. I would also point out that Ms. Harris said during her testimony here that what actually turns up in the paper at the end of the week is reflective of what is actually discussed at those editorial conferences. There is nothing in the Sunday Independent on September 28th or October 5th regarding Sergeant Maurice McCabe. There is a story on September 28th regarding the Garda síochána ombudsman Commission which was in no way related to the penalty points affairs or Garda McCabe. On October 5th, I believe Mr. McDowell's column on Alan Shatter's appearance on the Late Late Show is around about the only thing that could be said to be anything to do with this entire issue. So if it was so heavily on the agenda in the fourth and, shall we say, fifth week of September, why was there nothing in the paper? And secondly, I can provide you from the political news list for that week which shows you there was absolutely nothing on the agenda in that fourth and fifth week of
that month. I can point to the third week, I can show you exactly what was being done that week and how it is reflected in the paper at the end of the week because I was directing that, and that was positive coverage towards Sergeant Maurice McCabe.

Okay, I understand what are you saying. But are you going as far as saying that you had no contact with her at all at any editorial meeting during the whole of that period?
A. No, of course I can't say that.

MR. MEGU NNESS: okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Sheahan. Would you answer any questions anyone else may have.

CHA RMAN There is just one matter, Mr. McGuinness. I appreciate from the tone of the answers that the allegation is denied?
A. Absolutely. Chairman, you made a point yourself the last day under Mr. Fanning's cross-examination, you were saying to have made the comments, you know, that were was -- what I have a problem with here is (a) I am not -- I'm (a) denying that I ever made any comments, and (b) I am certainly saying that I did not withhold any information from this Tribunal.

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAK I think it may be that I am being taken up wrong, Mr. Sheahan.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN Because, I mean, I think there is a distinction between discussing something on the basis
that one has an interest in knowing about it --
A. Sure.

CHA RMAN -- or an interest in the details. But on the other hand, saying, just for instance, in relation to any particular person, of course your man is an arsonist, you know that.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN That is very different and that is an actual allegation.
A. Sure.

CHA RMAN And that is what it is claimed that you said.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN so you treated it as an allegation. I think you're right to treat it as that.
A. I kind of had to. Something was being attributed to me which I not only reject from my own recollection, but, having gone through my own records and the emails that I have, and if I may add a footnote here, it's gmail; it's not any email inside Independent News \& Media I'm referring to here. Just to put that on the record. It's quite important.
MR. MEGU NESS: Your columnist may wish to ask you some questions.
MR. MEDOVELL: No, the columnist has no questions for you.
A. Okay. Thanks, Mr. McDowell.

CHA RMAN Yes, Mr. Lehane.

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

454 Q. MR LEHANE: Mr. Sheahan, my name is Darren Lehane, and I appear on behalf of Ms. Harris, and I have some questions for you arising out of your evidence.
A. Sure.
"At the end of $t$ he conference, towards the end of Septenber, everybody had left, he' d gone out the door, he turned back, came to the office and said, because the last conversation had been about, at the conference, had been about Sergeant Maurice McCabe and he sai d he's a paedophile, McCabe's a paedophile."

That is what Ms. Harris said you said. And you deny that?
A. That's correct. Sorry, Mr. Lehane, if I may, I don't just deny it; I say it is entirely contradictory to my actions in that third week of september, as is evidenced by my continual emails to her deputy editor. 456 Q. I will come back to your actions in a second. But just, you're denying saying that?
A. Yes, that's correct.

457 Q. Now, you've agreed, I think, in answering Mr. McGuinness's questions, that in your statement at paragraph 7, I think it was, you refer only to gossip about Sergeant McCabe in political circles, you don't
say anything about gossip about Sergeant McCabe in
media circles?
A. We11, I was predominantly based in Leinster House, Mr. Lehane, so, you know, if you heard stuff on the grapevine, it tended to be Leinster House where I heard 14:05 it, yeah.


A. I don't get you, Mr. Lehane, sorry.
Q. Your definition of political circles, as you've given there to the Chairman, is that political circles includes a wide gamut of people that includes journalists. I'm just saying for those of us who aren't privileged enough to operate in those political political circles (and this would include media circles)?
A. Chairman, I'm more than happy for Mr. Lehane to expand

461 Q. Okay. And just in relation the evidence of Mr. Mallon which has been put to you, you've had an opportunity to read Mr. Mallon's evidence before the Tribunal, have you?
A. I haven't read it in its entirety, no. Well, just in brief, and I think Mr. McGuinness has already said that, Mr. Mallon said that allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe were being discussed in a very open way throughout the Independent News \& Media group of newspapers. You wouldn't disagree with that, would you?
A. It depends what timeframe you're talking about.

463 Q. After the publication of, for example, the articles by Mr. Williams?
A. Well, the articles by Mr. Williams includes, I presume you're talking about there, the ones about Micheá Martin raising it in the Dáil, is that correct?
464 Q. No. We11, let's just break it down.
A. There was one article that he wrote in April, does anybody have the date of the one about it being brought up in the Dáil?

465 Q. Well, would you like to assist the Tribunal by telling us, so, when do you say -- what point in time do you say that the allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe the Independent News \& Media group of newspapers?
A. I couldn't help you there. I don't know.

466 Q. We11, do you want to try and give us a year?
A. 2013 into 2014. I don't know, Mr. Lehane.
okay. And when these allegations --
A. Mr. Lehane, I'm sorry, let me just assist you here. During my period in Leinster House, there was many, many stories that circulated about people not just involved in politics but related to it. There was a lot of stories went around. It's impossible to say when they started, where they came from, and so on. They cover a wide range and gamut and a lot of them were quite scandalous and you couldn't even repeat them 14:08 here without naming names. But it's impossible to say where a rumour starts.
Q. But again, you've put a date on it at some point in 2013 going into 2014?
A. Well, is that not what we're talking about here today?

469 Q. No, no. Now, Mr. Mallon also gave evidence that these matters were being discussed in a very casual way in offices over coffee, in corridors and at the water cooler in the Independent News \& Media group of newspapers; would you dispute that evidence?
A. We11, I wouldn't dispute him, nor would I dispute Ms. Harris when she said the matter came up at many editorial conferences and was repeated several times. Now, I wasn't present for those meetings that she is talking about, but it seems that it was widely discussed inside in Anne Harris's office.

470 Q. Now, when you first became aware of these allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe, and I appreciate your evidence that you hear lots of scandalous allegations
every day of the week in your job, but when you first became aware of these allegations, did you take a note of it?
A. No, Mr. Lehane, I didn't.

471 Q. Did you record it in your diary?
A. No, Mr. Lehane.

Did you send an email to anyone about it?
A. No, Mr. Lehane.

So there is no documentary record there to assist you to pin it down in terms of the date?
A. Mr. Lehane, there is a difference in journalism between hearing about rumour, gossip, innuendo and ephemera and actually receiving something even resembling hard facts or evidence or a briefing. I have national media awards sitting on my desk because I pursued stories as a journalist which started off with basic hard facts. So I know the difference between gossip, rumour, innuendo and ephemera and actual hard facts that are verifiable and can be chased down and put out there into the national media.
474 Q. I don't think anyone here, and I'm not in particular disputing your accomplishments as a journalist, but again, you didn't take a note of or a record of the first time you heard these allegations, even on the back of an envelope, to assist your further recollection?
A. Mr. Lehane, I'm quite clearly saying to you, nobody briefed me or nobody provided me with any information that I regarded as worth noting or worth pursuing in
any regard.
475 Q. Okay. But you'd agree with me that allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe were being discussed in a very open way throughout the Independent News \& Media group of newspapers and I'm just trying to tie you down 14:11 to a date that you've been unable to give me and also to the fact that you didn't take a note or record, just jot down on the back of an envelope or something to yourself saying, listen, this is something I want to inquire into and --
A. Mr. Lehane, I am sorry, let me just stop you there for one second. I have heard numerous urban myths about people over the years, numerous rumours about wife-beating, philandering, drink-driving, people being involved in all sorts of different scandals. I didn't take notes of all of those. You could spend your time above in Leinster House chasing around after every red herring if that is what you spent your time doing. I didn't spend my time doing that.
And you, through your counsel, criticise Ms. Harris for not being able to pinpoint the precise time at the end of September when she alleges that you made this statement to her, isn't that right?
A. She is making a very specific allegation against me, so I think I'm entitled to do that, yes.
477 Q. Just in terms of the specificity of the allegation, the allegation is that you described Sergeant McCabe as a paedophile, is that right?
A. That's correct.
A. Mr. Lehane --

Let me finish the question.
A. Mr. Lehane, these rumours were being discussed everywhere. I mean, if you have been paying attention to the testimony that has been before this Tribunal,
you will see most witnesses who get into this box do say that there were rumours out there. I don't think anybody is denying that.
CHA RMAN We11, I think what Mr. Lehane is asking you is this: There's a distinction between saying, look, there are people talking about this man on the basis that he's a paedophile and, on the other hand, you making a very definite statement to the effect -- wel1, you're quoted as saying, Maurice McCabe, he's a paedophile, Maurice McCabe is a paedophile. That is the words that are put into your mouth.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN So I think that is what Mr. Lehane is asking.
A. And my difficulty here, Chairman, is, I didn't make such a statement, so he's now asking me to take account of why am I upset about a statement I didn't make.
484 Q. MR LEHANE: I suppose I will put it a different way --
A. I mean, if Ms. Harris used some other language, I would be equally offended. I'm saying I didn't make the statement. I'm saying that the emails and the correspondence between me and her own deputy editor, who was sitting ten feet away from her, categorically show that that was not my mindset at that time.
485 Q. Well, let's leave your mindset aside for the moment Did you ever participate in any discussions concerning these allegations in Talbot House?
A. No, I didn't.

486 Q. Did you ever overhear anybody discussing these matters
in Talbot House?
A. In where?
Q. In Talbot House or Independent News \& Media headquarters?
A. No. Obviously, they have been discussed, obvious7y, in 14:14 recent times because there's been matters before this Tribunal and matters have been out there in the public domain, so, I mean, I'm not going to give a blanket 'no' to that. But not at the period that Ms. Harris is talking about, no.
A. Well, that's your opinion. My opinion would be different.
Q. And what way should somebody who is discussing these things in a casual way discuss them?
A. Sorry, Mr. Lehane, you're basically saying that there was some sort of proof/evidence that this was a statement of fact. That's what Ms. Harris has alleged here, that it was being stated as a fact. A paedophile isn't a legal time, insofar as $I$ know it. A paedophile is a term used to describe a condition for someone who has, I think, an interest in minors. It's not a legal term. And it is common and I think, I don't see how somebody could contradict this, that that word would be used in common parlance when discussing these kind of allegations, but you disagree with that, Mr. Sheahan.
A. I don't have my Collins Dictionary here handy, Mr. Lehane. I'm saying it's what I would regard as very strong language.
494 Q. Now, while we're on the topic of strong language, you, in addition to denying that you used the word "paedophile", have expressed yourself in very trenchant 14:16 means as to Ms. Harris's motivation for coming here, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you say that she is motivated, not to put it too finely, out of malice and a grudge against you, isn't that right?
A. Well, Mr. Lehane, I don't know that you read your client's article in the Sunday Business Post, but she basically describes people like me as men who furiously
took notes who had big swinging titles, who prevented her from meeting with her staff, who she opposed a managerial structure being put in place and $I$ was an intrinsic part of that. So I don't really think that she looked upon me terribly favourably. Now, the things that she said here before this Tribunal, they must have been edited out of her article in the Sunday Business Post four weeks ago. I can ring up the editor and ask him would he mind putting them back in. Because she sat before this Tribunal not two weeks ago and described me as a person with an encyclopaedic knowledge of politics, a latter-day Ted Nealon, a great fella altogether, but that is completely contradictory to what she said about me and colleagues of mine in the Sunday Business Post six weeks ago. So I have no desire here to get into any sort of mud-slinging. I have to say, I saw Ms. Harris's statement, I saw that she basically prefaced her remarks and her evidence that she was putting forward with her account of the managerial structures in Independent News \& Media and how she was fundamentally opposed to them.
496 Q. But just in terms of mud-slinging, you've just threatened, basically, to ring up the editor and ask -of the Sunday Business post, and ask them to put back in material that Ms. Harris was saying during the course -- just bear with me for a second --
A. I can only assume -- sure.

497 Q. -- during the course of your evidence to a Tribunal of Inquiry when somebody is giving evidence that you are
in conflict with, you're threatening?
A. Mr. Lehane, I can only assume that they edited out her comments about me, because she was more than effusive in her praise of me when she was before this Tribunal, but that is not reflected in her comments that she has made elsewhere, not just in the Sunday Business Post but in the Sunday Times as well, not -- about a week later.

So you're saying that Ms. Harris is abusing this Tribunal, established at great cost to the taxpayer, to 14:19 ventilate a private grudge against you?
A. Yeah, I'm basically saying that. I also think she is quite confused, because she can't actually specify when exactly she claims these comments were made. She says, over the course of her testimony, if you can pull up page 2 of my own statement there, if that is possible, she talks about the talk going on for well over a year, certain journalists coming into her office, she says varying accounts of the alleged case were heard, she said she heard varying accounts, it was said to her in the first half of 2013, around may 2013, the statements were made in her office, the editor's office, in my office at editorial meetings, this particular throw-up allegation was repeated several times. She goes on to say that -- when she's giving testimony to this
Tribunal, that there were many editorial conferences where was it was revealed. She also said in her original letter to the Tribunal that two people had made these allegations, then she rows back and said it
was only one, then there is another scenario where basically she starts rowing back on what she was saying about another individual. I don't get where exactly her specific and precise account of what was happening here is coming from, but I am saying I don't know what she is talking about. I can only isolate my comments about Ms. Harris to the third week in September, which she said this -- told this Tribunal these comments were made. And I'm saying, what she is saying is utterly at odds with my behaviour, my actions at that time.
499 Q. So if the members of the Oireachtas, in their wisdom, had decided to set up a public inquiry into, for example, a scandal involving the price-fixing of carrots, for example, and Independent News \& Media had run stories about this for a while, you're saying that Ms. Harris would have been into the carrot tribunal to ventilate a grudge against you, because that's what effectively you're saying here?
A. I don't understand the question.

500 Q. You're saying that Ms. Harris has come in here, made up lies about you and told those lies to a sworn tribunal of inquiry, inquiring into very serious allegations arising out of protected disclosures?
A. I am saying that she seems to be confused in her account, because I'm looking at the various accounts witness statement to the Tribunal and her testimony here two weeks ago, and it seems to vary quite a lot.
501 Q. Is she confused or is she lying? Because there is a
difference between the two.
A. I don't know, Mr. Lehane. You would have to ask her that.
okay. You said, or your counsel in cross-examining Ms. Harris said that her evidence is tainted by improper motive, that she is a bitter person and that her evidence is borne out of a grudge, and you stand over that, do you?
A. Well, Mr. Lehane, her article in the Sunday Business Post four weeks ago says that she was at war with INM. Her previous article in the Sunday Times a year earlier said that she had numerous battles with INM. Her statement of witness to this Tribunal points out how vehemently opposed she was to the managerial structures that were put in place at the time, and which are still in place, by the way. So I can only take it that, yes, she is disgruntled about her departure from the company.
503 Q. So you stand over that. You're saying that her evidence is tainted by improper motive, she's a bitter person and that her evidence is borne out of a grudge? Because that is what your counsel was instructed, presumably on your instructions, to put to her?
A. Yeah, my counse1 was instructed to come in and question Ms. Harris on the allegations that she was making.

504 Q. No, but you're standing over that?
A. Yes, I am.

505 Q. okay. And I have to put it to you, Mr. Sheahan, that you did make the statement that Ms. Harris says you
made to this Tribunal and that it is your account that, for whatever reason, seems to be borne out of a grudge. what do you say to that?
A. I can only repeat as followed: on half past nine on wednesday the 16th September I sent a letter -- or I sent an email to Ms. Harris's deputy editor, willie Kealey. In that, I assigned a reporter to work on Sergeant Maurice McCabe's latest whistleblowing allegations. I did that across that week. I worked on that story. I assigned him. I worked with him. I constantly updated Ms. Harris's deputy editor across that week. And yet, she is saying that, in that week, I was actually warning her off this story. I don't understand it. It's completely contradictory to my actions, as is outlined in those emails.
The Tribunal is fortunate to have had the evidence of Professor Colum Kenny, who gave evidence to the Tribunal that not every bit of gossip that is going around a newsroom or a building in which journalists congregate makes its way into the newspaper; would you agree with that?
A. Oh, no, absolutely not, no. People check out stories and they don't all get in print, that's correct. The libel and defamation laws are such that, very often, what people regard, chairman, as being perfectly receive legal advice on them and they basically come to the view that, no, we can't run this.
507 Q. So I have to put to you that the Tribunal isn't
entitled to draw the conclusion that your evidence must be correct, that you never said this, because your newspaper never published an article that was critical of Sergeant McCabe, it simply doesn't make sense?
A. Sorry, what is the question?

508 Q. It's, simply, your evidence is that your account is to be believed because, in a series of newspaper articles, which you have provided to the Tribunal, they're not negative against sergeant McCabe, isn't that right? You're saying this shows your actions in relation to Sergeant McCabe over this period?
A. Yeah. Not only that, but I would say the news articles you're referring to, I don't know which ones you're referring to, they're positive towards Sergeant McCabe, so I'm not clear where you're coming from there.
well, going back to Mr. Mallon's evidence again, these rumours are flying around Independent News \& Media about Sergeant McCabe, Professor Kenny has given evidence that not every bit of gossip or rumour makes its way into a newspaper. So I have to put it to you that simply because it doesn't appear in print, doesn't mean that, somehow, your account is correct in relation to not using the word "paedophile"?
A. The series of emails that I sent to Ms. Harris's deputy editor across that week also didn't appear in print, yet I am disclosing to him how this story is being covered, I am telling him of the sources that are being contacted, when they are being met, I am actually flagging it when it drops off the radar, because, at
the end of the day, it ended up down the back of the paper, and that was Ms. Harris's decision about where to place it. That is entirely contradictory to the notion that I was warning her off.
510 Q. Now, when you were furnished with Ms. Harris's statement, your solicitors wrote a letter to the Tribunal, which I wonder if it could be put up, it's at 3648, it's the first page. And you will see there -sorry, 3648. I want to give you a chance to have a look at it first, Mr. Sheahan, before I ask you a question in relation to it. So if you want to read it and tell me when you have.
A. Yeah, next page, please.

511 Q. And then the next page.
A. Sure, I have had a chance to read it.

512 Q. I don't want to pry into the relations between you and your lawyers, but was that letter written on your instructions?
A. It was.

513 Q. And staying on the second page there, you will see the reference in the second-last substantive paragraph:
"For the record, the statement made by ME. Harris concerning Mr. Sheahan being fal se and untrue, is not protected by any form of privilege against def amation under statute or common Iaw."

Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. That is what it says. okay.

CHA RMAN Mr. Lehane, I'd have my doubts about that. MR. LEHANE: I'm not making any comment on whether or not you would be entitled to maintain an action. I don't think you could maintain an action because Section 1 of the Tribunals of Inquiry Act speaks very clearly about the privilege that attaches to witnesses. CHA RMAN Yes. And then there is qualified privilege as well.
MR. LEHANE: Absolutely.
CHA RMAN Provided it is not malicious.
MR. LEHANE: Yes. Section 17, I think.
CHA RMAN But deliberately telling a lie is, of course, malicious.
MR. LEHANE: Yes. I think it is in Section 17 of the Defamation Act, I can't remember -CHAN RMAN No, you are right.
515 Q. MR. LEHANE: But the point is, Mr. Sheahan, Ms. Harris came voluntarily to this Tribunal, she provided information to the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

516 Q. When you were provided with this, and you didn't come voluntarily to the Tribunal and provide them with information, isn't that right?
A. Mr. Lehane, I don't believe I had any information that was worth submitting to this Tribunal.
517 Q. Well, in fairness --
A. We can go back over -- we have gone through that, paragraph 7.
Q. In fairness, you have given evidence both in your statement and here that you were aware from general discussions in political and media circles that there were allegations against Sergeant McCabe. Would you agree with me that it is not for you to make a qualitative assessment as to whether that is information of relevance to the Tribunal; it really would have been a matter for the Tribunal to make that assessment?
A. Well, I took that view that, much like many other people who heard these rumours, that, really, I had nothing of value to contribute to this Tribunal.
519 Q. And having not come voluntarily --
A. Sorry, Mr. Lehane, if I may just point out: I'm only here today because of what Ms. Harris says that she claims I said. I'm not here because Superintendent Taylor has named me as a journalist that he briefed. I'm not here today because I was in some way involved with any story in relation to Ms. D and Sergeant McCabe, and so on and so forth. So I'm only here today 14:29 because Ms. Harris has made an allegation against me.

520 Q. And not having come voluntarily to the Tribunal, Mr. Sheahan, your response, when faced with Ms. Harris' statement, is to threaten to sue Ms. Harris in defamation under statute or common law. That's your 14:29 response to Ms. Harris coming voluntarily to this Tribunal, to sue her?
A. Mr. Lehane, I think it's quite clear, Ms. Harris was headline-hunting here. I mean, it is quite remarkable,
and I'm not alleging anything here about how exactly it came into the public domain, but basically a couple of days after her statement is circulated to witnesses here, it suddenly ends up on the front page of the Sunday Times. It's a remarkable coincidence.

521 Q. Mr. Sheahan, I have to put it to you that Ms. Harris's account is correct, that your responses, both in the letter which you accept was written under your instruction, threatening to sue ms. Harris, and in your evidence today, shows that, for whatever reason, you seem to have a serious problem with Ms. Harris and are attacking her in the course of your evidence?
A. Mr. Lehane, I'm contradicting directly what Ms. Harris is saying about me. I'm using direct evidence, not flawed memory as in her case, to defend myself, and I think I'm entitled to do that. If I have a series of emails from myself to her deputy editor setting out what I believe was the correct course of action in terms of advocating a story that was entirely positive towards Maurice McCabe on the Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of the week where she says I was trying to warn her off, I think I'm entitled to do that.
522 Q. And yet you can't remember with any degree of specificity when you heard these allegations day one?
A. That's correct.

MR. LEHANE: Yes. Thank you very much.

THE WTNESS MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR M CHEÁL

## O H GG NS:

523 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Mr. Sheahan, Micheál O'Higgins on behalf of An Garda Síochána and the former Commissioners. Now, I'm not going to enter into a dispute you clearly have with Ms. Harris.
A. Sure.

524 Q. I'm just going to ask you one question touching on the issue of journalism.
A. Sure.

525 Q. And it's this, and this is a hypothetical now, if you'11 permit this for a moment: If it had been the case that the Commissioner or Superintendent Taylor or any senior guard had contacted you and besmirched Sergeant McCabe by reference to sexual abuse or some such outrageous allegation, can I take it you would not simply have received that blankly and taken no steps?
A. Are you saying where I would have gone from there?
Q. What would you have done?
A. Yeah, I mean, from there, you would take it, if you
were getting it from that senior level that there was some veracity to the allegation, first of all you would ask the individual concerned, you know, do they have any evidence, on what grounds are they making these allegations, what's the timeline, what investigations took place, what happened over that time, why was the person not prosecuted, were they prosecuted, were they convicted, and so on and so forth, you would go down that route.

527 Q. Yes.
A. Even at that stage, you mightn't be anywhere near publication, but at least you'd know you would have something. From there, then, you'd go forward and you would seek to check out these allegations, you'd seek to find was there a court case, is there any documentation, or whatever, that could support such an allegation.
528 Q. Yes.
A. I think, to be fair, I mean, this Tribunal has actually 14:33 shown not everybody who comes forward with information is acting on benign grounds. I mean, I'd look at the first interim report of the Chairman last November/December in that regard. So, I mean, there is a duty of care and there is a duty to you as a reporter 14:33 and as an editor to check such matters out for your readers if you are receiving what $I$ would regard as credible information.
529 Q. Right. We11, can I ask you this then: If you formed the view, having carried out those, what if I may say appear to be legitimate steps and obvious steps, if, having done that, you formed the view that the Commissioner, if we can proceed with the same example, was wrongfully running down the sergeant and was besmirching him deliberately, wouldn't that itself be a 14:34 really quite significant news story for a journalist?
A. Yeah, you're saying going in the opposite direction, that if you are basically saying that untrue allegations were being made by somebody in authority
against an individual, yeah, I would regard that as -again, you'd have to check it out, you'd have to be able to verify it, you'd have to be able to report on it.
But it would be a reasonably big or seismic story if you could prove it occurred and that it was done wrongfully in this fashion?
A. I would agree with that, yes.

MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Thank you.
MR. MLGU NNESS: Just one further matter.
MR. FREEMAN Just one or two questions.

## THE WTNESS MAS THEN EXAM NED BY MR FREEMAN

531 Q.
MR. FREEMAN Mr. Lehane, in his questions to you on behalf of Ms. Harris, I think there was a criticism of you on the basis that you had information of relevance to the terms of reference to the Tribunal --
CHA RMAK Mr. Freeman, you're actually appearing for this witness, isn't that right?
MR. FREEMAN Yes, that's correct.
CHA RMAN Yes. I'm sorry, maybe you will just tell me, because, I'm sorry, I do get mixed up, and also it helps for the transcript reference.
MR. FREEMAN Yes. Sorry, John Freeman for Independent 14:35 News \& Media.

532 Q. Mr. Sheahan, Mr. Lehane, I think, sought to criticise you for not volunteering information which he considered relevant to the terms of reference, and as
did Mr. McGuinness, I think, to some extent, and I think your statement to the Tribunal was of the 7th February of this year. Now, did the Tribunal investigators seek to meet with you at any time or for you to prepare a further statement?
A. No, not at all.

533 Q. okay. Thank you.
A. Nor was I asked for the emails which are referenced in paragraph 4, which I would say entirely contradict Ms. Harris's account.

CHA RMAN But, Mr. Freeman, it has to be appreciated that there's two of them, they have a lot to do. And the other thing is that, generally speaking, the choice that we made is that in the event that someone is working in a literary capacity, and that quite often includes gardaí or writing reports, it's up to them to put the information before the Tribunal. It's only in particular circumstances where $I$ have made a choice to say, look, it's appropriate you go out and interview this person. Now, this wasn't one of those. But it's certainly not in terms of drawing -- no inference can be drawn from a decision by the Tribunal not to have somebody interviewed.

MR. FREEMAN No, Chairman.
CHA RMAN It's logistical and it's also based on other 14:36 criteria as well. Nothing to do with are you telling the truth or not.

MR. FREEMAN No, Chairman. But just to the extent that it was suggested that the information in paragraph

7 of Mr. Sheahan's statement kind of hinted at further information which ought to have been disclosed, I think it was of some relevance.
A. Chairman, if anything -- I welcome the opportunity to appear here today. An allegation has been made against 14:37 me; it has not only been made against me before this Tribunal, but it's out there in the public domain. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. So I welcome the opportunity to present my defence. CHA RMAK I understand. Again, Mr. Freeman, there may 14:37 be a misunderstanding. There can be circumstances under which hearing gossip may lead to some conclusion. It would seem now, on the basis of the evidence that the Tribunal has before it, that there are hundreds, at least, of people who would have heard some gossip. on the other hand, what the Tribunal is inquiring into is briefing. Now, people make a choice based on that. I certainly can't say that there's any question of Mr. Sheahan withholding information, merely on the basis that people were talking about something. That's, I think, a different thing. But in the event that there was something there that could lead to inquiries which could lead to something else, I would certainly like to know about that. It doesn't seem that this is anything of that kind at the moment.

## THE WTNESS MAS RE- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NESS:

534 Q. MR. MtGU NESS: Mr. Sheahan, just a couple of other
matters. I think you will have seen and be familiar with the correspondence that issued on behalf of the Tribunal and on your behalf backwards and forwards, and you were, in fact, provided with each relevant statement and given an opportunity to respond to it, and you did so?
A. You mean Ms. Harris' s?
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah, I received, I would say it was the latter stage of last year, Ms. Harris's, her first letter where I'm not named, her second letter where I am named and then her subsequent statement.
Q. Yes. And I suspect you wouldn't have needed the prompting of any investigators to provide your own response to that?
A. Certainly not. I mean, my statement was as I issued back to you on the 7th --
537 Q. Yes.
A. -- of February.

538 Q. And can you help me with one further --
A. Sorry, there was actually -- not just the 7th February, because I consulted with my legal counsel at the time, we issued a fairly rapid response to that invitation at the time and then we fleshed that out.
539 Q. Yes. Thank you. One further matter --
A. If I may, I mean, the reason for the rapid response at the time was, there was a lot of shock amongst me and my colleagues to see my name being presented in this fashion, particularly as, you know, I didn't -- as

Ms. Harris points out, I didn't cover this area tremendously extensively. She herself says that in her own testimony. I think I covered as one of the big political stories of the time. But, I mean, we can't turn around now and say that this was the only story knocking around back in that period. There was, at the end of the day, the economic crisis.
540 Q. Yes.
A. Matters like Irish water, the stability of the government, they were also massive stories at the time. 14:40
541 Q. Yes. I was just going to ask you about this final matter. Sergeant McCabe told Mr. Guerin in the course of a private interview on the 1st April 2014 that he had received, through his counsel, a copy of an anonymous letter which he said had come to his counsel from the Irish Independent, and I was wondering could you assist us in that regard? There's a copy of it at page 6478 in volume 24 . Now, if we just go back to the first page of that letter, if we see the date at the top, it's dated $26 / 2 / 2014$, and it's a letter over several pages, but on page 6480 , if we could go there, it's entirely related to Sergeant McCabe and raises a number of diverse allegations, but this is, in a sense, at the heart of the letter here. And did you ever see that letter?
A. No. I first heard about it through our legal team a few weeks back, I think, when the Tribunal wrote about it.
542 Q. Yes.
A. What period are we talking about here?

543 Q. Well, Sergeant McCabe told Mr. Guerin on the 1st April of 2014 that he had received it in early March.
A. of?

544 Q. of 2014.
A. Right.

545 Q. So it seems to be very shortly after the purported date. And I'm just wondering in your capacity as a long-serving journalist and editor, at that stage obviously political editor, did you ever hear of the Irish Independent having received such a letter?
A. No, I didn't. And the first I heard of it was when Mr. Kelly, our solicitor, asked me himself about it a few weeks back when the Tribunal wrote to him. But, you know, I wasn't the editor at the time. As I say, I 14:42 was based in Leinster House predominantly.

546 Q. Yes.
A. I would say we do get a lot of correspondence in the mail. I would have to say in recent weeks in and around the recent referendum, that has intensified, you 14:42 would have to say.

547 Q. A11 right. Anyway, you have never seen that before --
A. No.

548 Q. -- until it came out at the Tribunal?
A. No.

MR. MEGI NESS: Thank you very much, Mr. Sheahan.
A. Thank you, Chairman.

549 Q. CHA RMAN Mr. Sheahan, it's just I'm sitting here now and this is the fourth direct conflict among journalists, one saying so-and-so said such-and-such to me --
A. Sure.

550 Q. CHA RMAN -- which is perhaps not indicative of a very sober state of mind on their behalf, and the other person in relation to whom the allegation is made saying, we11, that just didn't happen at all. So that's eight witnesses, and there's probably more as we11, I would need to go and check my notes. Is there anything in the world of journalism that I'm unaware of that might help me in any way as to why these completely contradictory allegations are flung up? Because I have had reference to bitterness, to careers, to jobs, to people leaving their posts. I don't know whether it's down to sick buildings or what it is down to, but is there any way you can assist me on this?
A. I can't, Chairman. I mean, all I can do is say this allegation was put to me by the Tribunal. I consulted all of my records, and I'm quite good at taking notes. I send a lot of emails. I have rosters, news lists and so on. I annoy my staff with the amount of correspondence they receive from me. So al1 I was able 14:43 to do in my own case was go through my own records. I was more than satisfied, based on my own recollection and the emails that I sent to Ms. Harris's deputy editor in the week that she is saying I was making
these allegations, that I said no such thing, and, in fact, I was acting in an entirely contrary fashion - in fact, advocating coverage in the Sunday Independent that was positive towards Sergeant McCabe. So I don't know where this has come from.

551 Q. CHA RMAN The allegation seems to be put in the context of - well, what I think I'm in a position to consider I ought to infer from it is, if it was true was, you were kind of saying why in heaven's name are you bothering with this fella, he's a paedophile, why were we following this up, why are we paying any attention to whistleblowers? And maybe you would just help me as to whether there was any such thought on your mind?
A. No, Chairman. In fact, if you go back to earlier on that year, you will find, in the wake of the row over the 'disgusting' comment, I wrote a piece, an analysis piece in the Irish Independent at the time pointing out that this issue was on the radar for about two years at that stage. There were people in Government, the then-minister for Transport, Leo Varadkar, who had, in effect, been adopting a contrary line to other people within the government, saying that there was some substance to the issues that were being brought forward. And my point at that time was, if it had been 19:45 dealt with properly at that time and it had been paid attention to, that a lot of these subsequent issues would potentially have been avoided. So that was my kind of mindset. You were seeing that the claims that
were coming forward were being tested within both the political system in terms of the inquiries that were being set up and were then being found to be accurate. So I don't think it was any question of it being a waste of time. If it was a waste of time, I wouldn't have assigned a reporter onto that job that week, I wouldn't have been pushing to get coverage into the Sunday Independent, I wouldn't have been putting it back on the agenda when it was falling off. So I'm just at a loss here.
CHA RMAN A11 right. Thank you very much for coming here, Mr. Sheahan.
A. Thank you.

THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MEGI NNESS: The next witness is Mr. Conor O'Callaghan. His statement, Chairman, is to be found at Volume 27 at page 604, and the correspondence relating to Three Ireland and the telephone issue is to 14:47 be found in volume 16 from page 4371 onwards.

## MR. CONOR O CALLAGHAN, HAM NG BEEN SVORN, WAS DI RECTLY

 EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS:552 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Mr. O'Ca1laghan, thank you. I think you work for vilicom Engineering Limited, is that correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.

553 Q. And you're the head of service delivery there. And you're an electronic engineer who has worked for vilicom for the last 12 years, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

554 Q. And I think Vilicom provide services for Three Ireland (Hutchison) Limited and Three Ireland Services (Hutchison) Limited, together known as Three Ireland?
A. That is correct, yes.

And you are responsible for assisting Three Ireland in relation to requests which relate to the provision of data, primarily under the 2011 Data Retention Act, isn't that correct?
A. That would be correct, yes.
Q. Now, in connection with that, I think you became aware of Tribunal correspondence that had been directed to Three Ireland in respect of a number of different phones, and I think you were consulted by Mr. Creghan, who dealt with the correspondence as such, you were consulted in relation to all of the replies, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.

557 Q. And you reviewed the responses at the time and you have reviewed all the call data retrieved since, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, I would.

558 Q. Now, we're not going to go through all of the correspondence, but just to start at the beginning of it and then to ask a few just broad questions to confirm different matters. If we go to page 4371,
that's in volume 16. Mr. o'Callaghan, if you care to take the volume out if you find it more convenient to look at the paper version, please do so. This is the first letter written in respect of two of Superintendent Taylor's phones, which was -- and the Tribunal was anxious to know, if one looks at the third paragraph, for instance, whether any record exists at this point in time as to the substance of any texts sent to or by these phones. You see that?
A. I do, yes.

559 Q. And then if we go to the next letter, which related to another two of Superintendent Taylor's phones, at page 4373 , if we go down to the bottom there, there's a number of queries relating to two of Superintendent Taylor's phones that couldn't be located, and the queries are set out there and over the page. And I think you will have understood immediately that was an attempt to assess whether the phones were active, whether they could be traced, whether the call records could be provided for those and whether there was any possibility of recovering texts from those?
A. That is correct, yes.

560 Q. And that was dealt with by Three in the first response at page 4375. And if we just if we look at the response there, the first paragraph sets out the issue in relation to texts:

[^1]sent to or recei ved by all of the above handsets. We regret to informthe Tribunal such data is not available. Three does not retain the content of SMS messages for any longer than is necessary to del iver the messages and, accordingly, has no such data on hand 14:51 in respect of any gi ven handset."

It also goes on to a suggestion about the previous request that had been made. But just in terms of that first issue, as I understand the position, an SMS message sent from a handset through any network, no record of that is kept by the network on the network or in any form of call data by the telecommunications carrier, is that right?
A. That is correct.

CHA RMAN That is except for the metadata, I presume, Mr. McGuinness, the fact that a text was sent --

MR. MEGU NNESS: The fact --
CHA RMAN -- which we've had a lot of evidence.
A. Just the call data record itself rather than the contents.

CHA RMAN And, on that, just if I could just clarify that, you don't -- do you know the way sometimes on your phone you get something like you have used so many megabytes or gigabytes, or whatever, it doesn't record the length of the text either?
A. No.

561 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: In any event, Three wrote back, and we will just look at the letter at page 4377, the Tribunal
was asked to provide the billing account numbers, this is at the indented portion:
"Billing account numbers for each phone, the CTN" -that is the cellular telephone number -- "and IMEI s in respect of which it is sought to establish the current net work stat us, the IMEI of each handset in respect of whi ch it is sought to establish the last date of activity, the mobile tel ephone CTN in respect of which it is sought to establish the last date of activity, precise dates in respect of whi ch the data is sought in respect of each handset mobile number account and the CTNs and IMEI s bet ween which it is sought to ascertain the extent of any contact by either voice call or SME. "

And I think Three was responded to in that respect by the Tribunal at page 4379. And the position is set out there in relation to billing. I think Three -- just to be clear, Three provide the phones to An Garda Síochána in a large group account, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. It would have been legacy Three Ireland Services.
562 Q. Pardon?
A. It would have been Three Ireland Services Limited.

563 Q. And they obviously bill An Garda Síochána for those, and the customer, An Garda Síochána, is entitled to, and did, receive the billing records, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.

564 Q. And, in fact, the company retains the billing records for a period of six years from the date of the last year preceding that, isn't that right?
A. Yes. It's six years beyond the accounting year in question.

565 Q. Six years beyond the accounting year. And that is for the purpose of compliance with company law, tax acts --
A. That is correct.
Q. -- etcetera, etcetera. But in any event, those were provided ti An Garda Síochána in respect of the phones that are relevant to this inquiry, all the former Commissioners' phones, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.

567 Q. And if we see at the next page, 4381, there was an appendix to this which set out Superintendent Flynn's report relating to all of the handsets that the former Commissioners and Superintendent Taylor had held in the respective periods, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.

568 Q. Now, obvious7y, that letter we have looked at and the previous letter, the Tribunal were anxious to try and locate any handsets hadn't previously been located by An Garda Síochána or by any of the members concerned. And ultimately, I think, following clarifications that we don't need to go into, a search was done pursuant to 14:55 an order of the Tribunal to try and retrieve any data which would show whether any of the phones there were still active or on the network or being paid for by the Garda subscriber account, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, Chairman, that is correct.

569 Q. And ultimately, pursuant to the order made by the Tribunal, a lot of data was retrieved, and if we could go to page 6641, this summarised the searches that were carried out pursuant to the order, isn't that correct, and the results of them, and included the documentation relating to the searches?
A. That is correct, yes.

570 Q. And at that stage there were searches conducted by reference to the IMEI numbers and the CTN - cellular telephone numbers - in respect of all of those phones that the Tribunal was seeking?
A. That is correct, yes.

571 Q. And if one goes to page 6643, this is a table setting out the IMEI numbers relating to the phones that were sought, including variations of those, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.

572 Q. And I think no subscriber details were found?
A. No.

573 Q. And they were found not to be active on the network?
A. Correct.

574 Q. There was an issue also raised as to whether some of the handsets had been associated with a different CTN cellular telephone number - isn't that right?
A. That is correct, yes.

575 Q. And a search was done against those to see were they active on the system, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct also, yes.

576 Q. Some of those were found to be active, and the IMEIs were provided to the Tribunal in respect of those?
A. That is correct, yes.

577 Q. And those were found to be other phones assigned to other members of An Garda Síochána, as per a response
A. Absolutely, yes.
Q. Right. So, in summary, therefore, it hasn't -although the searches have been done, there is no method of establishing the content of any texts through 14:58 any searches that can and have been done by Three and verified by you?
A. Yes, that is correct.

579 Q. And no phones have been enabled to be located through that process either?
A. No.

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN So the basic line is, together with the Forensic Service of Northern Ireland, we have done everything we possibly could in terms of retrieving data?
A. Absolutely, yes. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Is there any issue about that?
MR. MEGU NESS: I don't think so.
CHA RMAN Al1 right.
MR. MEGU NESS: If you would answer any questions anyone else may have.
MR. MEDOVELL: No questions, Chairman.
MR. DI GNAM No questions, Chairman.

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you very much, Mr. O'Callaghan. CHAN RMAN Thank you for coming.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MEGU NNESS: The next witness, Chairman, is Mr. Ray Burke.

MR. RAY BURKE, HAV NG BEEN SVORN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED
BY MR. MEGU NESS:

MR. MEGU NNESS: Mr. Burke's statement is to be found in Volume 20 at page 5420.
580 Q. Mr. Burke, I think you're employed as a chief news editor of RTÉ news, is that correct?
A. I was unti 12 days ago, I retired on age grounds.

581 Q. We11, congratulations, if that is appropriate. I think your duties comprised identifying and prioritising stories in the country that you would make a judgement about in respect of coverage, assignment of reporters and correspondence and overseeing the material -- the intake of any material relating to those stories?
A. Yes, every day.

582 Q. Yes. You've set out in your statement how that process takes place. I don't intend to take you through that, but you clearly seem to have identified the coverage of the forthcoming o'Higgins report at the time as a significant and important and newsworthy story, is that right?
A. Yes, I did.

583 Q. And in terms of covering that, how did you set about deciding to cover that, and who did you assign and what happened?
A. I asked Paul Reynolds and I asked all of our political staff to try to get their hands on the o'Higgins Commission report. I knew that it had been delivered to the Minister for Justice, I think ten days or two weeks before we published our reports on it. I was keen that we get the full report so that we could publish it.

584 Q. Yes.
A. As I said in my statement, a couple of stories had appeared in other media outlets with very selected excerpts from it. I wanted to get the whole document as soon as possible.

585 Q. Yes. Did you know whether it had, in fact, been circulated to other parties, apart from the Department at that time, or had been issued for release to other parties?
A. Pardon?

586 Q. Did you know whether the report had been issued to parties other than the Department at that time?
A. I didn't, no. But it would stand to reason that it would have been delivered to parties other than the Department.

587 Q. Were you in charge then of having your team search for this report and try and get a copy of it?
A. I'm the news editor, my job is to get news stories.

588 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, of course, it was one of several stories that I would have been urging them to pursue at the time.
589 Q. And did you get some copies, a copy or some copies of the report?
A. No, I did not.

590 Q. Well, did your reporters do that?

591 Q. And how many did they get?
A. I don't know.

592 Q. You don't know?
A. No.

593 Q. Did you never ask them?
A. I believe Paul Reynolds had one copy.

594 Q. Okay. I'm not sure if you heard his evidence 15:03 yesterday. I think he was suggesting that he had at least two, if not just two?
A. My recollection of what he said yesterday was he had bits of at least two. A chapter from somebody, a chapter from somebody else, was the impression I got from what he said yesterday.

595 Q. A11 right. Perhaps I've misunderstood --
CHA RMAN I thought the whole point, Mr. McGuinness, I was thinking the same thing you were thinking.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Was that he was intent on getting as many copies as possible to make sure that he was actually getting the final version as opposed to a draft version which was -- 596 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: We11, he certain7y seems to have been keen to have a second one so that he could verifiably be in a position to be certain that --
A. That makes sense from what he said.

597 Q. -- what he was reporting?
A. Yes.

598 Q. Now, you say in your statement that you were mindful this is on page 5421 - you were "mindful that crime correspondents are sometimes suspected of reporting critically on the Garda force or at least the top ranks of the force and I was keen that nothing in Paul's report would be open to a charge of bi as in favour of the Garda establ ishment and theref ore bi as agai nst the serving garda who had made the allegations that the O Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on was establ i shed to i nvesti gate. "

And then you say:
"(The charge of being a cheerleader for the establishment is not uni que to crime reporters. All specialist reporters are subject to the suspicion that, over time, they are capt ured by the establishment or that they go native in di plomatic word parlance)."

So was this your own view or was this the RTÉ view? who established that this should be the view?
A. I'm saying it's my view.

599 Q. Your view. And who did you suspect would be making
this accusation or looking suspiciously on RTÉ reports?
A. I think it has appeared in newspapers more than once that Paul Reynolds would write or would publish stories that favoured the Garda establishment. Claire Daly, TD, on our own programme on News at One on May 9th, the 15:05 date which is the subject of this term of reference, spoke about people like Paul Reynolds favouring the Garda establishment and therefore disfavouring whistleblowers.

600 Q. Yes.
A. It's not unheard of. And as I said, it applies to al1 specialists correspondents: health correspondents, business correspondents, the agricultural editor, the same danger exists.
601 Q. Now, did you read any of the reports yourself?
A. No, I did not.

602 Q. So you didn't supervise whether what Mr. Reynolds was including in his draft was accurate itself?
A. Correct.

603 Q. Okay. You were just relying on him?
A. I say in my statement, I didn't see the report myself, I was relying on Paul.
604 Q. Yes. And you do say in your statement at page 5433:
"I recall Paul Reynol ds asking me during one of our
tel ephone conversations on Friday, May 6th or Saturday, May 7th, if the report's findings that Sergeant McCabe had uttered an untruth could be described as hi mhaving told a lie. I replied that a del iberate untruth could
be described as a lie. I made an editorial decision to use the word 'lie' in our reports."

Now, had you seen the paragraph that Mr. Reynolds was, as it were, relying on in relation to that?
A. Not at that point. But I clearly recall sitting at my desk at home and talking to Paul on the telephone and Paul saying to me: It says that he uttered an untruth, can I say that that is a lie, that he lied? I thought about it and I said, Paul, a deliberate untruth is a lie, you can use the word 'lie'. That was either on Friday night or Saturday morning.
Q. Okay. So you authorised that, in a sense?
A. Correct. And I say that in my statement.

606 Q. Yes. And were you concerned that that might be, as it 15:07 were, tilting the balance against what Mr. Justice O'Higgins had said, tilting it against Sergeant McCabe a bit unfairly?
A. It's simple English. It's a plain word. Both words mean the same thing, actually.
A. But I think Paul said something similar yesterday. Our job, as journalists, is to deliver our stories in simple English. If we don't understand them, the people who are reading and hearing the stories won't understand them.

608 Q. Okay. We have seen that dictionaries were reached for at some stage. Were they reached for at this stage?
A. I didn't actually reach for the dictionary when I was
talking to Paul on the telephone on Friday night or Saturday morning. I reached for my dictionary on Monday morning when $I$ fielded a phone call from Sergeant McCabe.
609 Q. Okay. Well, just before we get to that stage, it would 15:08 appear that you obviously were sent a draft of, you know, his principal story, and you sent an email back on the 8th May to him. If we could look at page 5785. Now, this has been copied to a number of people as we11, Kevin Bakhurst and Hilary McGouran. But I see the subject is "O Hi ggi ns 2, News at One". But this appeared to relate to his initial coverage as well, is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

610 Q. You're saying there:
"Very well done. Sorry about del ay. Re Kevin's point on the error on paragraph 4, a couple of smallish thi ngs. "

And then you say how it should start. And then you say, number 2 :
"At the News at One piece I thi nk we will avoid any accusation of bi as. If you started by saying the
O Hi ggi ns Cormission had said that former Corminssioner Martin Callinan is entitled to have his reputation vi ndicated and that the allegations made agai nst himby Garda whi stlebl ower Sergeant Mattie MECabe were
unf ounded and deeply hurtful. I think a lead-in like that above does not put the boot into McCabe strai ght away. "

It seems to be an odd thing to have in an editorial document, am I wrong about that, or would you normally express a story about putting the boot into somebody?
A. I don't know how you would define what is odd in an editorial discussion. We work in a newsroom, we use common, colloquial English.
611 Q. Yes.
A. I explained at some length in my statement in two or three paragraphs why I was suggesting to Paul that instead of making his first sentence a charge against Sergeant McCabe, that he, in fact, should make it the vindication of Martin Callinan, that his sentence should be positive, not negative, that his sentence should go one way and not the other way.
612 Q. Okay. Well, it suggests that you clearly had decided that the way he had, in fact, first written it was putting the boot into Maurice McCabe straightaway and that you're saying don't do it straightaway, put it a bit further down?
A. No, no.

613 Q. I mean, is there any other interpretation --
A. No, no, I am saying, Paul, your first sentence is too bald, too bald, $I^{\prime m}$ not at all saying -- well, I did actually say, yeah, your criticism of Maurice McCabe should be further down, should not be in the first

614 Q
A. I also say, by the way, do I not --

615 Q. Yes.
A. -- that for us to carry a report which did not include the finding that Maurice McCabe was wrong in this instance, would be an incomplete report.
616 Q. Yes.
A. Would be an inaccurate report.

617 Q. No, I can see that point of view. But in terms of headlining it, as it were, the first bit was to relate to the Commissioner being vindicated is that right?
A. We're talking about the 1 pm story now?

618 Q. The 1pm.
A. Yes, yes.

619 Q. Can I just ask you for your involvement? Presumably you don't regard it and you don't get involved in either sourcing documents or taking briefings from outside RTÉ?
A. I can do, but -- I can do, yeah, or I could do.

620 Q. Did you receive any briefings from An Garda Síochána in relation to this?
A. Never.

621 Q. Do you know of any briefings that Mr. Reynolds received --
A. No.

622 Q. -- from gardaí in relation to this?
A. No.

623 Q. Have you any reason to believe that briefing material
was submitted by Commissioner o'Sullivan to Mr. Reynolds, directly or indirectly?
A. Absolutely not.

Can I give you a two-part answer?
A. What we have heard about Nóirín O'Sullivan is that she is a woman who has disdain for journalists. I think it's a slander on her to say that she would try to influence us. Secondly, more seriously, I think it is a slander on everybody who works with me to say that we would be manipulated or used by anybody to govern our coverage, to influence our coverage. I think it's an insult.
okay. But as news editor, was it a story that had come to your attention that Sergeant McCabe was suing RTÉ over what they had broadcast relating to Mr. Kean?
A. On the Marian Finucane show?
A. I can't be sure, to be honest.

629 Q. Okay. Would that not be something that you'd remember, perhaps?
A. If it was brought to my attention, I probably would, but it may not have been brought to my attention in the first place.
MR. MEGU NESS: Okay. would you answer any questions anyone else may have.
A. I will.

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

MR. MEDOVELL: Just briefly, Mr. Burke. This was
clearly an important story in which you took a personal interest, isn't that right?
A. I take a personal interest in every story. It was an important story, a very important story.
631 Q. Yes. And there's no trick in this. You had sent out your staff in every direction to see could you get a copy of this report?
A. Yes.

632 Q. That was your idea?
A. Yes, I'm the news editor.

633 Q. Yes.
A. I don't want to be -- I didn't want to be reading the contents of the O'Higgins Commission report in a rival publication.
634 Q. Yes. I follow that. Sorry, I hope I'm not sounding 15:14 aggressive; I'm only just asking some questions for information. So you were the driving force behind RTÉ looking for this report and subsequently dealing with it in your broadcasts, is that right?
A. I was probably one of the driving forces. Other editors may have been urging people similarly.
Q. We11, is there anybody else --
A. Prime Time.
A. Pardon?
Q. Is there anybody else who was playing the same role as you in respect of this story?
A. Not in the newsroom. But Prime Time may have been pursuing it, the investigations unit may have been pursuing it, I don't know. But in terms of the newsroom, that's my job.
638 Q. I see. Do I take it from what you have just said now that if Prime Time was hunting for it, they weren't going to tell you about it?
A. Probably not.

639 Q. And you weren't going to tell them about your efforts to get it either, is that right?
A. I didn't have regular contact with Prime Time people. CHA RMAN I didn't understand they were rivals. I don't mean that in any mean way, but --

MR. MEDONELL: That is the point.
CHA RMAN You'd much prefer News to have it than Prime Time to have it, is that the idea?
A. No question.

CHA RMAN Al1 right.
640 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: And therefore as between yourself and the daily news and the Sunday news programme was there a bit of rivalry as well?
A. What programmes are you talking about?

641 Q. The one o'clock programme on the Sunday?
A. The This week programme?

642 Q. Yes.
A. No, not particularly. That is a newsroom programme.

15:16
A. Correct
-- or whether it was to be kept for the daily news programme on the following Monday?
A. Correct.

645 Q. And who was making the decisions on that?
A. Paul and I between us decided that it would be better to keep it for Monday and have a proper go at it, rather than do bits of it on Sunday, bits of it on Monday. If we did bits of it on Sunday we'd be providing it to the Monday morning newspapers. And it would be rushed. And it would deny us the opportunity to use graphics and stuff like that. For those reasons, plus the reason that you saw yesterday that Paul had other family business on the Saturday.

646 Q. Yes.
A. And that it was my Saturday as well. We agreed between us, let's do it, let's hold it for Monday, let's not give a bit of it to This Week programme on Sunday. There was no internal competition in that sense.

647 Q. I see. Would the afternoon Drive Time programme that Mr. Boucher-Hayes participates in, would that be a
rival programme or part of the same establishment as yourse1f?
A. That would fall more into the rival than the same estab1ishment.

648 Q. I see.
A. Sometimes.

649 Q. We11, I presume sometimes you collaborate on matters.
A. No, I mean --

650 Q. It's not daggers drawn presumably?
A. No, no. There is quite a degree of cooperation between 15:18 the news desk and the Drive Time programme, but in terms of getting a scoop and getting something first, then there's no question. I would want the newsroom to have it before Drive Time.

651 Q. Now there's a question which I'm slightly mystified by and maybe you will help me and the Chairman with. why with such an important document and a number of copies or at least one complete copy and a number of fragments, in the possession of Paul Reynolds, why wouldn't you cast your eye on it yourself to see whether the coverage he was proposing was balanced?
A. A 360-page report? I have been working with Paul Reynolds day in and day out for 23 years, I trust him. Say the Moriarty Tribunal report is published and it runs to thousands of pages there would be a team of reporters writing up stories from it, I wouldn't necessarily pour over every paragraph of every volume in the newsroom and double-check with every single reporter did they really say this, did they really say
that, can you show me where it says this. I might do that with a rookie reporter. I would be insulting Paul Reynolds if I said, Paul, show me the page where it says this. It would be insulting to Paul and a waste of my time.
652 Q. It's not that there's any suggestion that you wouldn't trust him to be accurate with a quotation. I mean, the question I was putting to you was: why would you not look at the whole report yourself to see is this a fair and balanced approach we're taking?
A. 360 pages, on a Saturday or a Sunday? Do you think I've nothing else to do? I don't mean to be smart. Like, I process maybe 70 stories per day.
653 Q. Yes?
A. Maybe 30 of them get published, 40 of them don't. I had other duties to think about. Yes, this was a really, really important story and our coverage of it showed that but could I afford to drop everything on Saturday and Sunday and lock myself away and read 360 pages and then satisfy myself that paul's summation of those 360 pages was good enough to be published? In the real world that's impractical.
654 Q. I see. So am I right in thinking that nobody looked over Paul's shoulder at the report itself in RTÉ at all?
A. That's correct, yeah. Certain7y not before Monday morning.

655 Q. And therefore --
A. I think it is quite possible that during the course of

Monday that some of the television editors and possibly some of the TV presenters, maybe Brian Dobson, might have looked at certain pages of the report with paul. But certainly prior to our publication on Monday morning I don't believe anybody in RTÉ, certainly not me, none of us looked over Paul's shoulder at the report or what he was writing from it.
656 Q. You were conscious at the time of the perception of some people and I presume you think they're mistaken in this, that crime correspondents of newspapers and the media generally can become captured by their best sources, you were conscious of that perception at the time, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

657 Q. And in that context did it not occur to you that you
might just take a look at the report yourself to see what impression it would make on you as a layman as well as taking Paul Reynolds' detailed work on it and allowing him to compose the various question-and-answer interviews for himself?
A. No, I didn't think it was necessary.

658 Q. And you weren't curious, were you?
A. I'm paid to be curious. I was -- I didn't meet the degree of curiousness that you seem to suggest that I should have.
659 Q. Who agreed the idea that there would be a mock interview where the interviewer puts questions to Paul Reynolds and he answers them on a prearranged basis, a fully scripted basis?
A. Your question?

660 Q. Who came up with that idea, that that is how you would --
A. This is normal practice now. And I think it was something that we introduced after the infamous case involving the $B B C$, where the scientist who later took his own life provided information to a BBC journalist, the BBC journalist did a live unscripted report on BBC radio about the British government sexing up a report on nuclear weapons in Baghdad or something.
Q. Yes?
A. And a11 he11 broke 1oose. The BBC director general had to resign, the journalist had to resign. You'11 recall it was a major controversy.
CHA RMAN Yes, you're talking about Dr. Kelly.
A. Dr. Kelly.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. As a result of that, the $B B C$ and ourselves introduced a practice where if, for instance, Paul Reynolds was going to be interviewed live on Morning Ireland that the questions and answers would effectively be scripted in advance.

662 Q. MR. MEDONELL: And just for curiosity sake, and just a full picture, does the interviewer get a copy of the answers that he will be getting from Paul williams -sorry, from Paul Reynolds in advance?
A. A copy of the questions?

663 Q. And the answers?
CHA RMAN Do you have an idea of what he is going to
say?
A. Yes, I would say so, yes, yes.
Q. MR. MEDONELL: So in a sense, although it appears to be a live interview, it's entirely scripted?
A. Yes.
Q. I see.
A. That wouldn't happen with everyone. But that happens with really important ones and it did happen in this instance I'm pretty sure. You could see that that did not happen -- sorry, to interrupt you. You could see that that did not happen on the TV interviews, for instance, with Paul Reynolds, they were not scripted, they were ex tempore.
666 Q. In relation to the amendments that you proposed, it was to avoid any possible perception that there was bias on 15:25 the part of RTÉ, is that right?
A. That was part of my urging Paul to amend his copy. 667 Q. Yes. And when you made your reference to putting the boot in, I think in your statement to this Tribunal you amplified that by saying the following, in your letter you said:
"I was conscious that this copy was for a lunchtime report to be published after five hours of broadcasts and onl ine reports in whi ch Sergeant MLCabe was going to be promi nently mentioned in what was likely to be the top story of the day from 7:00am In essence, I was suggesting that the broadcast start with the Commi ssi oner. I was suggesting to Paul not to begin
hi s one o' cl ock news broadcast and report whi ch he hi mself would voice with a criticismof Sergeant McCabe that would be an unfair reflection of the overall O Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on report. "

Now you didn't know, you hadn't seen the overall report, isn't that right?
A. Correct.
Q. But you were conscious that if he started off with the criticism of Sergeant McCabe it would give the impression that he was being unfair or biased?
A. After five hours of our broadcasting and publishing non-stop the first tranche of information from the report.
669 Q. And then you said:
"I was --"
A. Which gave a balanced overview of the report --

670 Q. I see.
A. -- as we saw it.

CHA RMAN But it may be a bad report, Mr. McDowe11, it may be that $I$ might have said something different if I was a journalist and I'm not trained in that regard.
MR. MEDONELL: But that is not for this Tribunal to second guess. I fully accept that point.
CHA RMAN I know. But if it turns out to be utterly viscous, utterly biased, there may be that there is an inference $I$ can draw from it. But that might indeed be against Mr. Reynolds, not against Garda Headquarters.

But it is kind of hard to know if it is within the range of what is acceptable, you know the whole legal notion of a measure of appreciation. I mean, one may not like things that are written about one --
MR. MEDONELL: Exactly.
CHA RMAN -- but that doesn't necessarily raise an inference that people are in a conspiracy.
MR. MEDOVELL: Exactly, Chairman. I fully accept that point.
671 Q. But you said:
"I was si mply saying to Paul, Paul make Martin Callinan not Maurice McCabe the subject of the first sentence of your report. I wanted the report to start with the Gar da Commi ssi oner not the Garda ser geant. A more I ongwi nded versi on of my foot ball anal ogy --"

This is putting the boot in.
"-- could have been, Paul, I'm not asking you to avoid tackling Sergeant McCabe, l'mjust saying don't do it in the very first minute of the match."

That was your attitude, was it; that the script as appeared to you looked as if he was doing a slide tackle in the first minute of the match under the nose of the referee?
A. Yes. You have the proposed script in front of you, don't you?

CHA RMAN I'm not sure you actually really listened to that question, Mr. Burke.
A. Pardon?

CHA RMAN I'm not sure you actually really listened to that question. It carried stronger resonance than perhaps you realise.
A. Forgive me.

CHA RMAN That is not a criticism of you. But a slide tackle means taking the ankles out from under a footballer. One sees it happening, it's malicious.

You're not going for the ball, you're going for the person, you're doing it under the eyes of the referee.
A. what is my wording?

CHA RMAN So I think the inference in the question is: Was what presented to you so bad that you immediately came to the conclusion look, Mr. Reynolds is clearly not in favour of Maurice McCabe and I need to change this and tweak it a bit, so even if he thinks that way it doesn't look that way. That is the implication of the question.
A. Not quite. It's also, as I said, for five hours we have been publishing and broadcasting reports on the contents of the O'Higgins Commission report, not all of which reflected well on Maurice McCabe. We're now coming with a new tranche of information drawn from the 15:30 O'Higgins Commission report, let's not start it by saying Maurice McCabe got something else wrong. Let's start it by saying Martin Callinan has been exonerated. It's also a basic journalism rule: You don't say 'a
man has been arrested by Gardaí', which is passive, you say 'Gardaí have arrested a man', which is not passive. MR. MEDONELL: I see. Could I ask you then whether you or your news group made a conscious decision not to give the report Mr. Boucher-Hayes?
A. Absolutely not true. I know nothing about that. I was interested to hear Mr. Boucher-Hayes say here that he had a full copy of the report prior to our publication. I was also interested to hear at this Tribunal the Irish Examiner reporter, Michael Clifford, say that he had a full copy of the report prior to publication.
A. I didn't hear any of them being asked the source. There was some desultory discussion about Mr. Mooney having it in advance of RTÉ. But the other two people, Mr . Boucher-Hayes nor Mr. Clifford was asked one question about the source of the report.
CHA RMAK No, and I don't think there's any point in asking that question because it seems to me that there's a very strong argument in favour of journalistic privilege there, isn't there?
A. That's wonderful, but Mr. Reynolds was asked repeatedly 15:32 for his source.
CHA RMAN No, I don't think he was. I think he was asked to rule out a particular source which was Garda Headquarters.
A. I think a number of attempts were find --

CHA RMAN And in particular Nóirín O'Sullivan.
MR. MEDONELL: He was not asked about a source. He was specifically told, at least by me, that I understood
fully that he would not be revealing his source. CHA RMAK I think that is correct. But am I learning anything new at this point?

MR. MEDONELL: Could I ask you just simply to indicate why you weren't content to use the term untruth and why you wanted to -- why you personally wanted to use the word lie in the text and advised Mr. Reynolds to do that?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did it strike you as more balanced than the material which had gone out earlier in the day?
A. I don't agree it was more balanced.

CHA RMAN We11, I'm not going to be awarding 'Journalist of the Tribunal', Mr. McDowell.
Q. MR. MEDONELL: Now could I ask you -CHA RMAN I'm rising, by the way, at four o'clock.
MR. MEDONELL: Sorry, one last question.
CHA RMAN Please.
A. It's plainer English. It's simpler English.

679 Q. But you hadn't seen the report and you hadn't seen the paragraph from which it came?
A. Correct. But Paul had read the paragraph to me, over
the phone.
680 Q. I see. And you prefer the word lie?
A. Yes.

681 Q. Could I suggest to you that you must have been aware at the time that you made these editorial decisions that Sergeant McCabe had instituted proceedings against RTÉ arising out of remarks made by Gerald Kean on the Marian Finucane programme?
A. I don't think I was. I've already answered that. But I don't think I was.

MR. MEDOVELL: Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN Is there anything else? was there anything from the Garda side.

MR. WFELAN No questions.
CHA RMAN Yes. And was there anything you wanted to follow up on, Mr. Gillane?

MR. G LLANE: No, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Yes.

WTNESS WAS RE- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS AS FOLLOMS:
682 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Mr. Burke, just one matter. You made reference there to other journalists who have given evidence not being asked about the source of their version of the report, but I think you will understand that terms of reference [k] only relates to the
broadcasts broadcast by RTÉ and it doesn't relate to either publications or other broadcasts relating to other media?
A. I understand.

683 Q. You wil1 understand that. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

CHA RMAN Mr. McGuinness, the point was? I'm sorry, Mr. Burke got that, I didn't quite understand the point.
MR. MEGU NESS: There appeared to have been an
implicit criticism or rebuke of the Tribunal that we hadn't pursued other journalists about the source -CHA RMAN Oh!
MR. MEGU NNESS: -- of their copy of the leaked
O'Higgins Commission report and I was simply asking Mr. Burke to reflect and agree that it was only RTÉ who comes within the terms of reference [k].
CHA RMAN Well, it is only. You are absolutely right.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN It is attempted to influence broadcasts on RTÉ on the 9th May 2016. So it is very specific to that. Thank you for reminding me.
A. I apologise if I was seen to imply rebuke of the Tribunal.
MR. MEGUNNESS: Not at all. I may have misunderstood you.
CHA RMAN I'm sure it's only the start of an avalanche which is going to begin as soon as the report comes out. So, don't worry.
MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Thank you.
A. Thank you.

THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAN who usefully can we get through, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NNESS: we have one witness left.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: One witness left today, Chairman, and I think we will get through him.
CHA RMAN Yes, I think we will.
MR. MEGUNESS: Mr. John Barrett.
CHA RMAN I think so too, yes.
MR. MtG LLI CUDDY: Chairman, Tony McGi11icuddy, representing Mr. Barrett, instructed by John Quinn of Noble Solicitors.
CHAN RMAN Thank you, Mr. McGillicuddy.

MR. JOHN BARRETT, HAV NG BEEN SVDRN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NESS AS FOLLOVS:
684 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Mr. Barrett's statement to the Tribunal investigators is to be found in volume 24 at page 6395. Mr. Barrett, can I ask you to look at page 6408, which is a copy of Sergeant McCabe's protected disclosure? And the second paragraph, there's a number of Roman numeral parts in the first paragraph which relate to the reasons why Sergeant McCabe was on work related stress leave. The third one is there, referring to:
"A di sgraceful series of broadcasts on RTÉ on the 9th

May 2016 purporting to leak an account of the unpubl i shed O' Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on report in whi ch I was branded as a liar and irresponsi ble."

It then goes on to say:
"I am now satisfied on impeccable authority that these RTÉ broadcasts were pl anned and orchestrated by the Commi ssi oner, Nói rín Ơ Sulli van, personally using briefing material prepared at Garda Headquarters."

Now, can I just ask you to address the substance of this. Have you any information that the RTÉ broadcasts which the Tribunal has heard were planned and orchestrated by the Commissioner?
A. No, I don't. I don't have any such information.

685 Q. It is suggested that she did it personally, you have no knowledge of that?
A. No knowledge of that.
Q. Okay. It's suggested that she was using briefing material prepared at Garda Headquarters in relation to the report. I think you were aware of the forthcoming O'Higgins report at the time in May of $2016 ?$
A. Yes, I was aware of the O'Higgins process and Commission. Commissioner preparing for it, either after the final report had been received and subsequent or prior to any statement issued by the Commissioner?
A. No. My earlier statement to the Tribunal makes clear I had no engagement bar a very peripheral support for one of my chief superintendents who was gathering material at the very beginning of the formation of the o'Higgins Commission. Chief Superintendent Ward.
Q. Yes. The first part of the protected disclosure there that I read to you, related to series of broadcasts in respect of which Sergeant McCabe was branded a liar and irresponsible. Did he complain to you about that at the time?
A. At what time?

689 Q. The time of the broadcasts?
A. No. I didn't meet him until the 31st May, some three weeks after the broadcast.
690 Q. Yes. Did he complain about those broadcasts to you on the 31st May?
A. No. I have no recollection at all of it being a subject of complaint. It's not covered in the minute that I wrote of that meeting.
691 Q. Yes. I think you've previously given evidence of this but just to be clear what you're referring to, at page 6411, that commences a six-page minute that you prepared relating to that meeting on the 31st?
A. That is correct.

692 Q. And correct me if I am wrong, you on the occasion of a subsequent visit to Sergeant McCabe, on the 23rd August, produced that six-page minute and carefully read it over to himself and his wife Lorraine?
A. That is correct.
 Sergeant McCabe in relation to Commissioner Callinan.
Q. Yes. I think on the occasion of your second visit, the one I referred to earlier there, on the 23rd August,
A. No. The minute is rather clear in that the plain subject of the minute was what was revealed to me by you also kept a minute of that and that's to be found at page 6417 onwards?
CHAL RMAN I'm sorry, Mr. McGuinness, I beg your pardon, I am just getting a wee bit mixed up. If you
wouldn't mind giving me the years as well.
MR. MEGU NESS: This is all in 2016.
CHA RMAN Yes. Earlier visit, namely August, as compared to May.
MR. MEGU NESS: The 31st May is the first visit -CHAL RMAN Yes.

MR. MEGU NNESS: -- and the first minute we referred to --

CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGUI NESS: -- both the signed and unsigned 15:42 version.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: Then the second visit is later in the year, in the autumn, in August on the 23rd August and that's the occasion when you read over the first minute 15:42 and they signed it.
A. That's correct.

699 Q. But this is then the minute that you actually then subsequently made of that meeting --
A. That's correct.

700 Q. -- with them, on that day, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

701 Q. And I think that minute is also a subsequently signed minute that is signed by Sergeant McCabe and his wife, Lorraine?
A. That's correct.

702 Q. I don't need to, I think, go into the detail of that, but there's no mention or discussion apparent in the minute of Mr. Reynolds, the RTÉ broadcasts of the 9th

May or any complaint about them or any suspicion as to who had been involved in any leak from HQ or any leak from HQ at all?
A. No. That is a lengthy minute again, sir, it's eight pages, Chairman, and there's no minute -- there's no mention as you said.
Q.

Yes. Subsequent to that, as we know, Sergeant McCabe made his protected disclosure, I referred you to a portion of that, but that was at the end of September and I think you had two more meetings in the immediate aftermath of that on Monday, 3rd October and Wednesday, 5th October --
A. That's correct.

704 Q. -- that you provided minutes of --
A. That's correct.
Q. And you went down to discuss the matter face-to-face with Sergeant McCabe?
A. The report was on the This week programme on Sunday, September 25 th, and it suggested that $I$ had in some way circumvented protocol and used section 41 , which is a 1egal impossibility --

707 Q. Yes?
A. -- and Clare Daly was interviewed on that programme and the suggestion was that in some way I had circumvented Garda authorities and given to the Minister. So that was not true and I was quite angry about that being reported.
Q. We have seen other emails and drafts of statement, etcetera, in the papers, and I am sure you have seen them as well. I think, it was also revealed to you at that stage by Sergeant McCabe about the arrival of the Tusla letter?
A. Yes. He had received a letter in January I think of that year.
Q. But can you confirm whether on that occasion there was any mention by you or by Sergeant McCabe of the RTÉ broadcasts?
A. No.
Q. Any complaint about them?
A. I asked very specifically on what date I am alleged to have said this --

711 Q. Yes?
A. -- and the response, as I understand it, is that it was either the meeting on the 23 rd or the meeting of the 31st May. I have no recollection whatsoever of dealing with this issue.
712 Q. Yes. Perhaps we will just go to what Sergeant McCabe has said about that, because obviously it's important. I think during the course of the Tribunal investigators' interview of you, you were referred to -- it's encapsulated at page 6398 where Sergeant

McCabe was asked to identify the "impeccab7e authority" referred to in his protected disclosure, and he says at line 52 on page 6398:
"I am Sergeant MECabe, amreferring to John Barrett, 15:46 HRM He told me and Lorrai ne that it would have come fromblock 1 at the front, Nói rín O Sullivan's office."

What is your evidence in relation to that?
A. I didn't make such a remark, is the clarity of it. I ${ }_{\text {15:47 }}$ have no written record despite having taken very considerable records of that and that's not the way I would describe it had I done so in any event.
713 Q. Yes. Sergeant McCabe obviously gave evidence in public before the Tribunal and part of his evidence relating to you, and this issue is quoted on the next page at 6399 at line 64 there on that page. It starts:
"Q. You claimthat John Barrett tol d you that it would have cone fromblock 1 at the front, Nói rín O Sullivan's office?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. When did John Barrett say that to you?
A. He told us that in our house, me and Lorrai ne were there when he told us. I would have the date in a diary, but it was -- well, it was obvi ously after this, after the broadcast. But he said, it would have come
fromblock 1."

Now, I suppose, there's one thing just to note in passing before I ask you the next question. There's no reference there to material prepared personally by Nóirín o'sullivan, but Sergeant McCabe obviously was aware presumably of your visits to his house in May and August and October 2016. Was it when Sergeant McCabe first gave that you discovered that he was in fact referring to you as the impeccable authority?
A. I don't know when $I$ became available -- aware of this to be frank.

714 Q. Yes?
A. But it was put to me and I have sought to address it with the investigators.
715 Q. Yes. Sergeant McCabe's solicitors, Mr. Costello's firm, at page 7588 make reference to the diary that Sergeant McCabe has and an extract of which was produced. But have you seen this letter --
A. Yes.

716 Q. -- on the 23rd April?
A. Yes. I saw it in the course of the meeting we had with the Tribunal investigators and I think we reviewed it. I saw the hard copy of it at that point.
717 Q. Yes. And just to read it there. It says:
"I refer to your letter of the 11th April 2018 concerning my client's evi dence gi ven on the 5th March 2018. My client has checked his 2016 di ary and the
onl y entry to a meeting with Mr. John Barrett at his home is for the 23rd August 2016 and I attach a copy of that di ary entry.

My client bel ieved that this was the meeting where Mr. Barrett made reference to the RTÉ Mbrning Irel and broadcast. The meeting where Mr. Barrett referred to the RTÉ broadcast was in fact on the 31st May 2016, but is not recorded in his di ary."

So two slightly perhaps apparently contradictory things there, on first view of it. It appears to be definitively saying really that this is the occasion when you refer to the broadcast, i.e. being on the 31st May 2016.
A. No. I didn't. I mean, I have no recollection whatsoever of the broadcast or of me making any reference to it. And I will just make the point that the two minutes that we are talking about here are carefully constructed, they are lengthy, I think they run to somewhere between 220 to 250 1ines, they are very focused on the principal issues we discussed on both occasions and on no occasion was this mentioned in any line of those two minutes.
CHA RMAN A11 right.
MR. MEGU NESS: May I just ask you three more questions?
A. Surely.

718 Q. One is on page 6436, this is part of your, as it were,
your own chronology that you prepared and we received an extract from it earlier when you gave evidence before Christmas I think, or was it in the new year, but you've recorded a whole series of interactions with Sergeant McCabe here but this, at the bottom of page 6436, relates to texts --
A. Yeah.

719 Q. -- that you sent to Sergeant McCabe. And there's one there on May 27th, 2016 which obviously postdates the broadcasts but predates your meeting of the 31st may, 2016. You see that:
" $M$ hope you're keeping well in all the hail of media goi $n g$ on at present."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

720 Q. "You and your family have been in my thoughts over the I ast few weeks. We're long overdue coffee and a catch up. I was out of the loop --"

I think it should be.
"-- for a couple of critical weeks. Tony MELoughlin and Lorrai ne have been keeping ne in the loop, sol'm up to speed now. How are you fixed for chat next week? Let me know and we will make a plan."
A. Yeah.

721 Q. Were you conscious of how Mr. Reynolds had reported the matter and RTÉ had reported the matter on the 9th May?
A. I wasn't specifically conscious of mr. Reynolds or of
any one broadcast, other than the time and occasion when I met Sergeant McCabe and his wife at his house for first time, 31st May, the Dái 1 debates on that matter of the O'Higgins Commission report were ongoing. That was the background against it. I think I referenced that in the minute. The issue was very topical and very visible in the media. So not a specific report.
722 Q. Yes. You see on the next page you make reference in your own chronology --
A. Sure.

723 Q. -- to your meeting on the 31st May, page 6437. And there's, I suppose, two sides to it, literally, there. And looking at the entry on the right-hand portion of the page, if you scroll down a small bit there, on the right-hand side it says, where this is your own description I think:
"This a seminal meeting and the initial minute of this meeting is self expl anatory. It occurs in the aftermath of the publication of the O Higgins Commi ssi on report. It occurs at the MLCabe family home on foot of an invitation. It was at this meeting that I learned of the specifics of the information allegedly shared by former Commi ssi oner Callinan and Deputy John MKGui nness. ...this meeting and the visible di stress whi ch I saw exhi bited by Ser geant McCabe to tel ephone the number of the Deputy Commi ssi oner SCM in the i mmedi ate aftermath, did not get him then called

Superintendent John Keegan. We agreed to meet the deputy on my return from Donegal, Thursday morning June 2nd, 2015."
A. That's correct.

724 Q.
I'm not going to ask you about the one on the left-hand side, but obviously you had prepared this chronology in advance of either learning about or being interviewed about Sergeant McCabe's --
A. Yes.
-- assertion?
A. This was from my February appearance before the Tribunal.
Q. Yes. I mean, one thing strikes me, that in the context where you have referred to the media storm as it were --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

727 Q. -- where you are going to see him I think for the first time since 9th May, would it not have been logical, in the sense of the most opportune and the earliest moment to be discussing what might have been published about him?
A. The meeting focused very definitively on the answer that was given to me. The moment that I will remember I think probably forever is when I asked what was the vile -- what was behind the word vile that was used by Deputy McGuinness in his discussion and revelation. And I didn't know what that was going to beget and then sergeant McCabe and Lorraine outlined to me what it is that was actually alleged. And that's the focus of the
minute. That was the focus of the discussion. That was the principal matter. The background to it was simply, and what I'm referring to there, is a certain generally for Sergeant McCabe as I found him. He was clearly exhibiting considerable stress and distress -- 15:55 Yes?
A. -- from the whole issue.

CHA RMAK All right. We11, it's three minutes to four, Mr. McGuinness.

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN So, that is it?
MR. MEGU NESS: They are all the questions, Chairman, that I want to ask.
CHA RMAN we11, I think you are, no, absolutely right. We will leave till Thursday, Mr. McDowell. I mean, you 15:55 won't have much to ask, I assume, but you certainly have to spend five or ten minutes on it, and that is the reality.
MR. MEDONELL: I have to put my client's case to him. on the Browne v. Dunn principle I must do that.
CHA RMAK No, I know that. Unless you want to just put the case and we will all go home.

MR. MEDONELL: I can do it in five minutes.
CHA RMAN You might. And there's other questions that need to be asked by the Garda Commissioner's team as well, $I$ mean, isn't that the plain reality?
MR. MEDONELL: It is probably more sensible to put it off until next week.

CHA RMAN I think it is, Mr. Dignam?

MR. DIGNM I don't anticipate being very long. I don't know what Mr. McDowell is going to put.
CHA RMAN I know, but even still. Look, we will leave it until next Thursday.
MR. MEDONELL: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RNAN So thank you, Mr. Barrett. I'm afraid you have to come back. Ladies and gentlemen, and Mr. McGuinness in particular, let's just try and go through where we stand now in terms of the future, to use that numinous word.
MR. MGGI NESS: Chairman, we have prepared for sittings next Thursday and Friday and we have, I think, a number of witnesses lined up for each day and then we are making further inquiries as a result of which it's possible that more statements, very limited number, may 15:57 be generated and circulated. And I think the next issue that will arise after Thursday and Friday, whenever the Tribunal can next sit - and it's not quite clear yet, Chairman, when that will be - will be an opportunity for parties who have an interest in the issue of journalistic privilege and the claims that have been maintained by relevant witnesses to take the opportunity, if they so wish, to make any submission in relation to that.
CHA RMAN Yes, as to what I ought to do.
MR. MEGU NNESS: As to what they wish you to do or what you ought to do and the basis upon which you ought to do it. So I think the parties are live to that. And I'm sure those that wish to prepare for that have
prepared for that.
CHA RMAN Yes. But that doesn't need to be very long. I mean, in the opening statement which you made, Mr. McGuinness, the relevant principles are set out and we all know what the most recent decision of the European Court of Human Rights is, so it doesn't need to be long. And I have indicated the points. Is it possible to take that on Thursday or Friday?
MR. MEGUI NESS: No, Chairman. There won't be time and we have told --
CHA RMAN I think we finished with journalists now, have we? Apart from the fact that there's some fact checking to be done in relation to some and that I understand is actively being done at the moment.
MR. MEGI NESS: No, Chairman, we have assembled our 1ist of witnesses for Thursday and Friday -CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. MEGU NESS: -- and it won't be possible to squeeze that in. And we have effectively very clearly represented to parties that that won't be dealt with next Thursday and Friday.
CHA RMAN Well, we could represent that it could be done on Thursday. I mean, are there going to be more journalists?
MR. MEGU NNESS: I'm just, Chairman, informing you of the current position.

CHA RMAN I know you are, Mr. McGuinness, and I am always grateful for that. But, look, I have difficulties of my own, which is that $I$ have a full
schedule from now on and that is a problem.
MR. MEGU NESS: Well, I am sure --
CHA RMAN You know, it really is a problem.
MR. MEGI NESS: -- we will be able to work that --
CHA RMAK I'm not going to -- if necessary let's sit
in August. If that is what people want, let's do it. Other than that, $I$ think it's a question of squeezing things in when we can and people being concise. Because believe me, I will sit in August.
MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, I think people do understand 15:59 al1 of the constraints and whatever number of extra sitting days are needed beyond next Friday, I think, I am confident we will be able to fit them in between now and the end of July without any difficulty.
CHA RMAN Yes. I appreciate that, Mr. McGuinness. And look, the point of this dialogue is that everybody knows where we stand. I have to dispose of the issue of journalists privilege before $I$ do anything else. That is it. People have to make their mind up as to whether they have a submission to make to me. And I think that is appropriate when we get to the point where we say well, there are no more journalists, that issue isn't going to arise again. Now I don't need any lengthy written submissions on that, I don't need any lengthy oral submissions, but I would very much appreciate, Mr. McGuinness, if you and Mr. Marrinan and Ms. Leader would provide me with the kind of guidance that is provided to a trial judge in a criminal trial. In other words, to try and keep me right as to the
relevant principles. That would be immensely helpful to me.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, Chairman, of course.
CHA RMAN Then as I understand it, the week after next, it may be that there are three days where we can sit here, but if it was to facilitate trying to draw this to a close it may be that we can move to the four courts, and I'm making inquiries in that regard. Unfortunately I'm away with the Supreme Court Monday and Tuesday, I'm sitting on wednesday, and then basically a full schedule is then kicking off. So what do you think is the most helpful thing to do? Again it's better we have this dialogue now because parties need to know.
MR. MGGU NESS: Yes. Well, obviously you, Chairman, will be very anxious to obtain all of the remaining evidence of relevance from any witnesses that we can -CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: -- we can procure and we are trying to procure some other ones. I'm not going to discuss that 16:01 in any public way.

CHA RMAN I know.
MR. MEGU NESS: So it has to run to its natural and proper conclusion in that regard.
CHA RMAN All right. We11, I don't think anyone should book any holidays for August then on that basis so. We will see how it goes.
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[^0]:    "I amcurrently on work-rel ated stress due to a di sgracef ul series of broadcasts on RTÉ on the 9th May

[^1]:    "Your letters inquire as to the availability of data rel ating to substance or content of text, SME messages,

