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## OPEN NG STATEMENT BY THE CHAL RMAN

CHA RMAN Now, good morning, everybody, and, if I can find my notes, welcome to this sitting of the Disclosures Tribunal, which is to deal with the term of reference that was postponed for later consideration after the work of my distinguished colleague member, Mr. Justice Charleton, was completed. Those inquiries and the subsequent reports are well-known to everybody here and to the wider Irish public.

This part of the Tribunal's work is entirely separate from the investigations carried out by Judge Charleton, and we are embarking on new explorations of matters defined by the final term of the -- terms of reference of the Tribuna1. More on that in a moment.

The agenda appears in our notice that we published.

And let me just begin by introducing the Tribunal's legal team, and we have Mr. Diarmaid McGuinness, Senior Counse1; Mr. Patrick Marrinan; Ms. Sinéad McGrath, who 11:02 is a junior counsel, a barrister; and Mr. John Davis, a solicitor; and we have Ms. Ciara Ní Ghabhann, legal researcher. You may see Mr. Philip Barnes, who is our office manager, moving around, and if issues arise or
there are things you want to ask, consult Mr. Barnes. Mr. Curran is the sound engineer. If anybody has hearing aids or difficulties getting into the audio loop, he is the man to check out, but otherwise the thing should work, we hope. Ms. Downes -- Aoife Downes 11:02 is the stenographer.

So, now, let's proceed.

The Disclosures Tribunal was established by Ministerial Order on the 17th February 2017 to inquire into definite matters of urgent public importance that were set out in 16 Terms of Reference listed from (a) to (p). The instrument appointed Mr. Justice Charleton as the Sole Member and it directed that the inquiry be carried out in two modules, the first dealing with terms from (a) to (o) and the second dealing with term of reference (p).

The first module concerned Sergeant Maurice McCabe, Garda Keith Harrison and Tusla. Mr. Justice Charleton completed his inquiry into these matters and submitted reports on the 30th November 2017 and the 11th October 2018.

The instrument of appointment and the resolutions on which it was founded envisaged that the second module of the inquiry, dealing with issues under ( p ), might be carried out by a judge other than Mr. Justice Charleton
if he indicated a wish for that to happen when he had inquired into terms (a) to (o). The judge notified the Government that he did wish to be replaced for term of reference ( $p$ ) and new resolutions were in due course passed by Dáil Éireann and Seanad Éireann providing for 11:04 my appointment as a member of the Tribunal.

Because Mr. Justice Charleton had a continuing role dealing with costs in relation to terms of reference (a) to (o), the amending resolutions provided that he remain as overall chair of the Tribunal, and he then appointed me as chair of the inquiry into term of reference (p). These various resolutions and instruments appear on our Tribunal website.

Now, term of reference (p) is as follows:
"To consi der any ot her compl ai nts by a nember of the Garda Sí ochána who has made a protected disclosure prior to 16th February 2017 alleging wrongdoing within the Garda Sí ochána where, following the making of the protected di scl osure, the garda making the protected di scl osure was targeted or di scredited with the know edge or acqui escence of seni or members of the Gar da Sí ochána. "

In this opening statement, I want to say a word about the inquiry generally, publish the Tribunal's interpretation of term of reference ( $p$ ) and make some
general comments and refer to upcoming hearings.

Public inquiry function:

In a judgment of the Supreme Court in July 1998, Chief 11:05 Justice Hamilton said that:
"... the principal function of such Tribunals has been to restore public confidence in the denocratic institutions of the State by having the most vi gorous possible enquiry consistent with the rights of its citizens into the circunstances which give rise to the public di squi et."

The Court also said:
"The essential purpose... for which a Tribunal is established under the 1921 Act is to ascertain the facts as to the matters of urgent public importance which it is to enquire into and report those findings to parliament or the rel evant Mnister."

The Chief Justice outlined the stages of a tribunal of inquiry as follows:

> "(1) A prel iminary i nvesti gati on of the evi dence avail abl e;
(2) The determination by the Tribunal of what it consi ders to be evi dence rel evant to the matters into
whi ch it is obl iged to enqui re;
(3) The service of such evi dence on persons likel y to be affected ther eby;
(4) The publ ic hearing of witnesses in regard to such evi dence and the cross-exami nation of such witnesses by 11:07 or on behal f of persons affected thereby;
(5) The preparation of a report and the making of recommendations based upon facts established at such publ ic hearing."

In this inquiry, the steps in the full consideration of a complaint begin with the additional task of determining admissibility. Then there is the work of assembling documentary materials, using the legal process of discovery as necessary, identifying relevant 11:07 witnesses and obtaining statements and defining the issues, before embarking on preparations for hearings with all the procedural measures the law dictates for the protection of rights.

These observations may help to explain why tribunals are lengthy and costly, no matter how efficiently they are administered. The visible element of an investigation, when public hearings take place, represents a small fraction of the body of work that they do. The task of this Tribunal in preparing for hearing of an admissible complaint may be likened to a legal firm preparing the cases of all the litigants in a multi-party and multi-issue case.

It will also be apparent that the Tribunal is dependent on the cooperation of participants and other parties and witnesses in carrying out its work. This includes compliance with discovery of documents requests or orders, providing statements and responding to queries, as well as facilitating Tribunal investigators in conducting their interviews.

Term of Reference (p) and Interpretation:

The Tribunal gets its jurisdiction from the terms of reference and only from them. It has no inherent or independent capacity to investigate or, in the words of term of reference (p), to consider any complaint unless 11:09 it comes within the reference term.

In the judgment cited above, the Supreme Court adopted a passage from the 1966 Salmon Report in England about the interpretation of the terms of reference as a correct statement of the law and practice applicable to tribunals of inquiry in this jurisdiction. And the quote from the salmon Report is as follows:
"The Tribunal should take an early opportunity of expl ai ning in public its interpretation of its terns of reference and the extent to which the inquiry is likely to be pursued. As the inquiry proceeds, it may be necessary for the Tribunal to explain any further
interpretation it may have placed on the terns of reference in the light of the facts that have emerged."

That is the end of the quote.

The Tribunal's interpretation of its mandate under reference ( $p$ ) is explained in this statement, and it may be summarised as follows:

The essence of this reference is that the Tribunal is to consider complaints made by persons who, as members of An Garda Síochána, made protected disclosures before the relevant date and who allege that they were thereafter targeted or discredited with the knowledge or acquiescence of officers of superintendent rank or higher.

A complaint in the meaning of paragraph (p) is a written communication made to the Tribunal by an individual who maintains that he or she was victimised in the specific manner described in (p).

An essential condition of admissibility under heading (p) is that the garda concerned made a protected disclosure prior to the date when the Tribunal was established. Any later events are excluded for consideration by this body as a matter of jurisdiction.
what is a protected disclosure? This is the kind of
report of wrongdoing that is the subject of the Protected Disclosures Act, 2014. The reference at (p) is to a disclosure as defined in the Act. If a report does not come within the statutory definition, it is excluded because the Tribunal does not have any jurisdiction to consider it. The Act specifies the content of the disclosure and the persons and bodies to whom it is made and it is not intended to set out or summarise its provisions in this introductory statement. The legislation should be consulted for the 11:11 full terms, the interpretation of which may require to be determined in a particular case. Subject to that reservation, for present purposes it is sufficient to say that a protected disclosure includes a report to an appropriate person or body by a garda of wrongdoing in 11:11 the force that constitutes an offence in law or a failure to comply with the general (not merely a contractual) legal obligation and that came to the garda's attention in course of work. The 2014 Act provides safeguards for whistleblowers whose reports of 11:12 wrongdoing comply with these statutory conditions. It is noteworthy that the 2014 Act applies to a qualifying disclosure whether it was made before or after the legislation was enacted.

An important limitation on any consideration by the Tribunal is that the focus of the mandate, and therefore the Tribunal, is not on the wrongdoing reported in the disclosure, no matter how serious the
allegations, but rather on the conduct towards the garda subsequent to the disclosure. while these matters may not in particular circumstances be sealed off in discrete compartments and there may be some elements of overlap, the focus of any inquiry is clearly defined in term of reference (p).

Another essential jurisdictional requirement under term of reference ( $p$ ) is that the targeting or discrediting directed towards the whistleblower after the disclosure 11:13 was condoned or tolerated or known about by senior members of the Garda Síochána. The Tribunal notes the context of (p) in relation to the other terms of reference of the Tribunal, the majority of which directed an investigation into grave allegations of misconduct against senior Garda management in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe. We may take it that the Oireachtas was concerned to ascertain whether there were other gardaí in a similar situation to Sergeant McCabe who maintained that they were victimised because 11:13 they spoke out about wrongdoing in the force and that senior officers knew about it or acquiesced in it. So members who made protected disclosures reporting serious malpractices and were subsequently targeted or discredited with official or senior condonation were intended to be covered.

In his opening statement of the first phase dealing with reference (a) to (o), Mr. Justice Charleton
defined "discredit" within the meaning of the inquiry as including the fostering of disparagement, mistrust, suspicion, disbelief or otherwise to convey or cause reputational damage in a personal and/or professional sense. "Targeted" meant abuse or criticism directed at 11:14 a person. He also defined "senior members of the Garda Síochána" as being officers of the rank of superintendent and above, as well as anybody acting in those capacities. The Tribunal adopts those definitions for this phase.

The gardaí to whom reference (p) applies, i.e. individuals whose complaints may be considered by the Tribunal, are persons who, as members of An Garda Síochána, made protected disclosures before the 16th February 2017 and who allege that they were thereafter targeted or discredited with the knowledge or acquiescence of officers of superintendent rank or higher. While a close literal reading of term of reference ( $p$ ) may suggest that complaints could only be 11:15 received by the Tribunal from serving gardaí, the Tribunal is satisfied that it has construed the true intention of the oireachtas and that such a narrow interpretation would be unreasonable and impracticable and inconsistent with the intention of the legislature. 11:15 Therefore, the Tribunal is considering complaints from both serving and retired members of An Garda Síochána.

However, there is no reason to think that the

Oireachtas intended that this module of the Tribunal should embark on a historical investigation of every case of a garda who believed he or she was victimised because of making a complaint of serious misconduct. If a major historical inquiry was envisaged, it would have been charted in more than a brief, final term of reference and in clear language. This view is supported by analysis of the debates in the Houses on the resolutions establishing this inquiry. The warrant contained in the terms of reference does not require or justify an open-ended consideration of complaints from serving or retired gardaí.

In a public statement in November 2017, the Tribunal called for receipts -- for receipt of complaints, stating:
"The Tribunal is al so carrying out a scoping exercise on termof reference (p) as to any targeting or di screditing of any garda ' who has made a protected di scl osure'. The Tri bunal is calling for any garda who made such a protected disclosure prior to 16th February 2017, who has not al ready done so, to provi de a statement to it by the latest 18th December 2017."

Term of reference (p) does not specify a time frame for complaints. However, the Tribunal is in existence to address urgent matters of public importance and is obliged to complete its work expeditiously. It is
therefore impractical for the Tribunal to issue a general invitation for new submissions of complaints to add to those already notified, but neither can it be said that the door is closed in all circumstances.

It remains to refer to a key component of the mandate set out in term (p), which is "to consider". The terms of reference as a whole mandate the Tribunal "to investigate" specified matters in 13 terms of reference and "to examine and consi der" in two terms of reference. on only one occasion, that is in reference (p), is the simple verb "to consi der" employed. It is apparent from the context of this Tribunal and from the meaning of the word that "consider" allows for an investigation of a complaint but does not require that.
"Consi der" in context implies a wide discretion as to the mode of examination and indeed it is a decision for the Tribunal whether to proceed with the complaint, even if it complies with the admissibility requirements 1:18 of reference (p). Issues of justice, practicability or expediency may make it inappropriate to proceed with the complaint. For example, many of the persons involved may be deceased in a case that depends on personal recollection and testimony. It may be impossible to conduct a thorough consideration of a complaint for a variety of reasons. On the other hand, it might be possible to consider a complaint in a compact, focused format.

Consideration of some cases will focus primarily or exclusively on admissibility questions. The Tribunal interprets its function under (p) as giving a wide discretion as to what complaints to examine and as to the mode of consideration, while being alert at all times to the stringent constitutional and legal requirements of fair procedures.

Procedures:

The Tribunal has pub7ished its scheme of procedures which, as stated therein, are not rigid canons to be applied in all circumstances, irrespective of practicality or justice. They may have to be altered in particular circumstances where they might otherwise be unfair or unreasonable or unsatisfactory. To revert to Chief Justice Hamilton speaking for the Supreme Court in the seminal case cited above, he referred to the constitutionally protected guarantee of basic fairness and procedure and endorsed the following authority:
"The requi rements of nat ural justice must depend on the circunstances of the case, the nat ure of the inquiry, 11:20 the rules under whi ch the tribunal is acting, the subject matter that is being dealt with and so forth."

Questions of relevance of issues, evidence and
witnesses will, as far as possible, be addressed in private session in advance of hearings in order to respect the rights of persons affected.

Genera1 comments:

As mentioned in the interpretation, it is a cardinal principle of inquiries that the terms of reference define the jurisdiction of the tribunal. It is not a matter of choice; the inquiry simply doesn't have any legal competence to investigate matters outside its terms of reference.

It is understandable that some persons making complaints to the Tribunal may be disappointed to find that it is not possible to investigate their grievances because they are not within the Tribunal's remit and therefore inadmissible. Gardaí whose complaints are considered admissible may also be unhappy because some substantial or significant part of their allegations is 11:21 not the subject of investigation or a public hearing. Legal advisers will no doubt apprise their clients of the legal constraints on a public inquiry such as this. If we were to trespass outside our limited zone of jurisdiction, it would be open to anybody affected by the investigation to get an order from the High Court prohibiting it, but fear of litigation is not a factor. The reality is that no tribunal would intentionally engage in a process which it was not authorised to do.

I recognise that it may be difficult for parties to exercise the necessary restraint in this matter and for lawyers to resist the urgings of their clients, but it is not a matter of choice. The person making the complaint may well be disappointed that the original allegation is not being examined to establish the truth one way or the other. The Tribunal, however, does not have the legal capacity to embark on such an investigation. That is not what the Oireachtas has specified in the terms of reference. It is important, I think, to make this clear so that there is no misunderstanding.

There would be serious potential injustices if the consideration of a complaint trespassed into unauthorised areas. If criticisms are made of persons, the Tribunal has the dilemma of how to respond in a manner that reflects fairness as well as legality. Suppose, for example, that criticism were to be
levelled in respect of an inadmissible allegation against persons not involved in the Tribunal's consideration, the Tribunal is not permitted to embark on an inquiry into the matter. If the Tribunal report offers a view on the criticism, it will have done so on the basis of inadequate evidence. The factual basis of the complaint may be strongly, even vehemently, held by the complainant, but that doesn't make it admissible; moreover, engaging with the inadmissible element or
having a battle over admissibility is fraught with unsatisfactory outcomes.

Considerations of admissibility also apply to the preliminary analysis of complaints. If the case as put 11:23 by the person applying to the Tribunal cannot fit within the term of reference, then it is not legally possible for it to be considered. The Tribunal does not apply a test of validity or credibility to a complaint in order to decide admissibility. The Tribunal does not adopt an overly-technical approach at this preliminary stage and will direct further inquiries to be made, if necessary, by assigning Tribunal investigators to interview the complainant in order to clarify any doubtful point on admissibility. The Tribunal also takes the view that in a doubtful or debatable case, it may be appropriate to seek legal submissions on the question of admissibility.

The terms of reference assign the tasks that the
Tribunal is required to accomplish. It is for the Tribunal itself to identify the specific issues it will address in achieving this objective.

The Tribunal's legal team -- this is the present
position, where we are -- the Tribunal's legal team is preparing for the first cases that will be the subject of public hearings. We are anxious to proceed as expeditiously as possible, bearing in mind the
importance and urgency of the issues, but it is imperative not only to respect fair procedures but also to be sure that all appropriate preparatory inquiries have been made. The measures outlined in the scheme of procedures previously published on the Tribunal's website are designed to ensure that participants in the Tribunal's work are afforded all necessary facilities.

This is not an occasion for applications for legal representation. The Tribunal deals with applications for legal representation by correspondence as far as possible. If it becomes necessary to have a hearing in public on such an issue, that will be arranged in due course with a specific agenda. Anybody seeking legal representation in respect of any part of the Tribunal's 11:26 work, who has not already done so, should write to the Tribunal setting out the reasons why representation is sought and the nature of the representation requested.

We have received applications for legal representation and are dealing are them on an individual basis in correspondence. The granting of representation and the consequential right of audience before the Tribunal does not in any way determine the level of representation that any part wishes to have. That is a 11:26 matter for each party. It is further not an order for costs in respect of any party. The grant of legal representation does not mean that costs will automatically be paid, and any application for an award
of legal costs must be made at the conclusion of the Tribunal in accordance with the relevant legislation.

Timescale and schedule:

The Tribunal is planning to embark on considering the first complaint in late June 2019. Other cases will follow later in the year and, as I anticipate, into 2020.

The Tribunal will also address issues of admissibility as we proceed and notify persons who made complaints, of the decisions. we will proceed with our mandate as expeditiously as possible, consistent with observance of fair procedures.

And thus ended the opening statement.

Mr. McGuinness, where do we stand or what do we do next?

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you, Chairman. The position is, Chairman, that the first case that you indicate that will be listed for public hearing is that of a complaint made and made for consideration by the Tribunal by Garda Nicholas Keogh.
CHA RMAN yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: And the preparations are continuing in terms of the taking of statements, the obtaining of documents, the interviewing of witnesses, so as to
enable the matter hopefully proceed to a public hearing in the last week in June, if possible, and on -sitting on, if possible, into the month of July to try and conclude the hearings relating to the consideration of his complaint. I should say that an essential part of the preparation for that is one that envisages, as part of the Tribunal's preliminary inquiries, the holding of a case management meeting --
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: -- in procedural terms. This
obviously will take place in the context of the Tribunal's preliminary inquiries, rather than being a public sitting or a sitting at all of the Tribunal. It is intended to seek the submissions of Garda Keogh obviously, but also the submissions and views of other parties in relation to issues which are raised from a consideration of his protected disclosure and, more particularly, of course, from a consideration of the complaints of targeting or discrediting. So it follows that we will be required to put on notice persons who are, as it were, implicated in the complaint or whose conduct is in any way called into question by virtue of the complaint --

CHAN RMAN If they are in some way involved?
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, yes, indeed. And the purpose of
it is -- I think naturally flows on, Chairman, from your identification of the limits of the jurisdiction of the Tribuna1. It cannot obviously, as you have stated, inquire into matters that are not mandated, but
it's regarded as an essential step by the Tribunal team to have this case management meeting of a procedural nature which will hear the views of parties on their perspective of what the relevant issues are, what is or is not or may be admissible or what is relevant or what 11:30 witnesses might be considered to be relevant to the issues raised by Garda Keogh's complaint.
CHA RMAN And the procedures document envisages, isn't that right, that parties will make a suggestion?
MR. MGUM NESS: Indeed, Chairman. The purpose is, if we achieve this, is considered to be of great value to the Tribunal because it will enable us and all the parties to know the basis upon which the Tribunal will be approaching the public hearing.
CHA RMAN A11 right.
MR. MEGU NESS: And it will enable you to consider all issues relating to what are the proper issues that will go forward for public hearing and the relevance of any matters that might be --
CHA RMAN Are you suggesting a date for the case management meeting?

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, we are proposing to have the meeting scheduled for Tuesday the 30th April, and we envisage formally putting Garda Keogh and any other relevant parties on notice who are in any way implicated in the matter, allegedly, and who may have an interest in making submissions to the Tribunal about the extent of the issues or the relevance or irrelevance of some issues. So we intend to progress
that, Chairman, by writing letters in the immediate future to Garda Keogh and the relevant parties, so as to achieve that objective.
CHA RMAN yes.
MR. MtGU NESS: That, when achieved, will allow us
11:32 then to settle on the process of the extraction of all the relevant documentation from the discovery, the preparation of witness lists and the preparation of books of documents to be served on all relevant parties.

Insofar as other complaints are concerned, the Tribunal received, at its establishment, a number of complaints from members and from retired members. These obviously could not then be considered in the context of term of reference ( $p$ ) having been parked, as Mr. Justice Charleton noted it. So the position in relation to other complaints, Chairman, is that they have been received at different periods, from different members, obviously, and with different levels of documentation, ${ }^{11: 33}$ and have necessitated a different range of inquiries, and those preliminary inquiries are continuing in relation to those other complaints, and I don't think it's either appropriate to identify the complainants myself at this stage or to provoke any discussion about 11:33 the contents of those complaints while our preliminary inquiries are still continuing.
So I think, Chairman, that's as much as I need to say. CHA RMAK very good. We11, now, Ms. Brennan, you
appear for Garda Keogh, is that correct?
ME. BRENNAN Yes, Chairman, I appear with John Rogers, Senior Counse1, Patrick O'Brien BL, and I am instructed by John Gerard Cullen. We appear for Garda Keogh. We have noted the comments of counsel for the Tribunal, and we will work to -- we will work to meet whatever timetable is set, we will try and do what we can.

CHA RMAN Yes. Thank you very much. Now, Mr. Dignam, you appear for the -- for whom?
MR. DI GNAM I suppose, in shorthand, Chairman, I appear for An Garda Síochána and quite a number of members of An Garda Síochána.

CHA RMAK But not all of the people involved, is that right?
MR. DI GNMM Not a11 --
CHA RMAN Not all of the members of the Garda Síochána who are involved, I suppose, is the best term, or concerned in the matter in some shape or form, is that right?
MR. DI GNMM Yes, that's right, Chairman. And
obviously the legal team of the Commissioner of an Garda Síochána is available to any members, but some wil1 choose to avail of independent representation, and that's their prerogative, obvious7y, Chairman. I also noted the comments of Mr. McGuinness, and we will work to whatever timescale the Tribunal sees fit.
CHA RMAN Yes. Okay. And, Mr. McGuinness, we are in contact with the people who are not represented by Mr. Dignam, is that right?

MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes, we have received correspondence from, I think, Reddy Charlton McKnight. Mr. Hegarty was the solicitor, who has vast experience of dealing with other gardaí, and we have received a list of clients who are represented by Reddy Charlton, and I think a solicitor is here from --

CHA RMAN I am sorry. Thank you.
MS. QU N: Paula Quinn from Reddy Charlton. CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks, Ms. Quinn. Very good. So anything else then to deal with, or can 11:35 we bring matters to a conclusion?

MR. MEGI NESS: I think so, Chairman. I should just, I suppose, note for the record that the Tribunal did write to parties who had made submissions of complaint to the Tribunal, informing them of the existence of the 11:35 sitting and saying that they were, of course, free to attend but there was no obligation on them to attend. CHA RMAK Yes, they don't have to -- they didn't have to -- they were welcome to show up but they didn't have to.

MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes. There may be some here or not, but I am not inviting anyone in particular to make any submission or appearance, unless they feel it necessary. So, if -- other than that, Chairman, I have nothing further to say.
CHA RMAN okay. So basically that is the opening statement and the preliminary comments about the complaint made by Garda Keogh, which we propose to embark on in the first instance and we will proceed
from there. Thank you very much. So, what we will do is, we will announce a date for the public hearing, which will be the opening of the Garda Keogh complaint consideration, we will announce that as soon as possible, but obvious7y, in the meantime, the management -- the management occasion will proceed. A11 right. Thank you very much. THE TRI BUNAL THEN AD OURNED.


| 16:16, 16:25 | 24:18, 24:23, | [1] - 19:4 | course [5]-6:4, | decision [1] - | disclosure [14] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| citizens [1] - | 14:29 | 19:8, 23:6, 23:11, | Court [5] - 7:5, | 21:13 | 11:3, 11:7, 11:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 12 \\ & \text { clari } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { completed [2]- } \\ & 4: 11,5: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:15 } \\ & \text { considering } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 15,9: 18,16: 19 \\ & 17: 26 \end{aligned}$ | define [1] - 17:9 defined [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:23, 11:29, } \\ & \text { 12:2, 12:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 19:15 | compliance [1] - | - 13:26, 21:6 | covered [1] - | 4:18, 11:3, 12:6, | 14:22, 22:17 |
| clear [2]-14:7, | 9:5 | considers [1] - | $12: 26$ | $13: 1,13: 6$ | disclosure' [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:12 } \\ & \text { clearly [1] - } 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { complies [1] - } \\ & \text { 15:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7:29 } \\ & \text { consisten } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { credibility [1] - } \\ & 19: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { defining [1] - } \\ & 8: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 14:21 <br> Disclosures |
| clients [3] - | comply [2] - | 7:11, 21:14 | criticism [3] - | definite [1] - | $-4: 8,5: 10,11: 2$ |
| $17: 22,18: 4,26: 5$ close [1] - 13:19 | 11:17, 11:21 | constitutes [1] - <br> $11: 16$ | $13: 5,18: 20$ | $5: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { disclosures [3] - } \\ & \text { 10:12. 12:23. } \end{aligned}$ |
| close [1] - 13:19 closed [1] - 15:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { componer } \\ & 15: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 11:16 constitutional | criticisms [1] | $\begin{gathered} \text { defi } \\ \text { 11:4 } \end{gathered}$ | $13: 15$ |
| colleague [1] - | concerned [5] - | [1] - 16:7 | 18:17 | definitions [1] - | DISCLOSURES |
| $4: 10$ <br> COMMENCED | 5:20, 10:24, | constitutionall | cross [1] - 8:5 | 13:10 | [2] - 1:4, 1:5 |
|  | 12:18, 24:12, | $y$ [1] - 16:20 | cros | democratic [1] - | discovery [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-4: 1} \\ & \text { comments [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | $25: 18$ <br> conclude [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { constraints [1] - } \\ & \text { 17:23 } \end{aligned}$ | examination [1] 8:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7:9 } \\ & \text { dependent [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8: 15,9: 5,24: 7 \\ \text { discredit }[1] \text { - } \end{array}$ |
|  | $22: 4$ <br> conclusion [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { construed [1] - } \\ & 13: 22 \end{aligned}$ | Cullen [1] - 25:4 | 9:2 | $13: 1$ |
|  |  |  | CULLEN [1] - | described [1] - | discredited [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:25, 26:27 } \\ & \text { Commissioner } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:1, } 26: 11 \\ & \text { condition }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 13:22 <br> consult [1] - 5:1 <br> consulted [1] - | $2: 10$ <br> Curran [1] - 5:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:21 } \\ & \text { designed [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 23,10: 14 \\ & 12: 25,13: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] - 25:21 <br> COMMISSIONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:23 } \\ & \text { conditions }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:10 } \\ & \text { contact }[1]- \end{aligned}$ |  | 20:6 | discrediting [3] |
| $\mathbf{R}_{[1]}-2: 14$ communicatio |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contact [1] - } \\ & 25: 28 \end{aligned}$ | D | determination $[1]-7: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & -12: 9,14: 20, \\ & 22: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\mathbf{n}_{[1]}-10: 19$ | 11:21 <br> condonation [1] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 25:28 } \\ \text { contained }[1] \end{array}$ | damage [1] - | determine [1] $20 \cdot 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { discrete [1] - } \\ & 12: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $15: 29$ | condoned [1] - | content [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:4 } \\ & \text { DANIEL [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | determined [1] - | discretion [2] 15:17, 16.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { COMPANY [1] - } \\ & 2: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:11 } \\ & \text { conduct }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:7 } \\ & \text { contents [1] } \end{aligned}$ | 2:26 | 11:12 <br> determining [1] | 15:17, 16:5 discussion [1] - |
| compartments | 12:1, 15:26, | 24:26 | date [4] - 10:13, | - 8:13 | 24:25 |
| $\text { [1] }-12: 4$ | 22:22 | context [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 25,23: 20 \\ & 27: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Diarmaid [1] - | disparagement |
| competence [1] | conducting [1] - | 12:13, 15:13, | DATED | $4: 24$ | [1] - 13:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & -17: 11 \\ & \text { complainant }[2] \end{aligned}$ | 9:8 confidence [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 17,22: 11, \\ & 24: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $1: 10$ | DIARMAID [1] - 2:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { disquiet [1] - } \\ & 7: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| - 18:28, 19:14 | 7:9 | continuing [4] - | DAVIS [1] - 2:7 | dictates [1] - | distinguished |
| complainants | CONLON ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - | 6:8, 21:27, 24:22, | Davis [1] - 4:26 | 8:18 | [1] - 4:10 |
| [1]-24:24 | 2:30 | 24:27 | DAY [3]-1:9 $1: 10,4: 1$ | different [4] - | document [1] - |
| complaint [23] - | CONOR [1] - $2 \cdot 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contractual [1] - } \\ & 11: 18 \end{aligned}$ | deal [2] - 4:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:19, 24:20, } \\ & 24 \cdot 21 \end{aligned}$ | 23:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 12,8: 27,9: 15, \\ & 10: 18,14: 4, \end{aligned}$ | consequential | 11:18 convey [1] - | $26: 10$ | 24:21 <br> difficult [1] | [1] - 8:14 |
| 15:15, 15:19, | [1] - 20:23 | 13:3 | dealing [7] - | 18:2 | documentation |
| 15:23, 15:27, | consider [10] | cooperation [1] | $5: 16,5: 17,5: 28$ | difficulties [1] - | [2] - 24:7, 24:20 |
| 15:28, 18:6, | 6:18, 9:15, 10:11, | - 9:3 | 6:9, 12:28, 20:21, 26:3 | $5: 3$ | documents [3] - |
| 18:16, 18:27, | 11:6, 15:10, | correct [2] - | 26:3 <br> deals [1] - 20:10 | DIGNAM [4] - | $9: 5,21: 29,24: 9$ |
| 19:10, 21:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 12,15: 14, \\ & 15: 17.15: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $9: 21,25: 1$ | dealt [1] - 16:27 | 2:15, 25:10, | DONAL [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:24, 22:5, } \\ & \text { 22:21, 22:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $23: 16$ | correspondenc | debatable [1] - | 25:15, 25:20 | done [3] - 14:23, |
| 23:7, 26:14, | consider" [1] | 20:22, 26:1 | 19:17 | $25: 8,25: 29$ | $18: 25,20: 16$ |
| $26: 28,27: 3$ | 15:7 <br> consideratio | costly [1] - 8:22 | debates [1] - 14:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dilemma [1] - } \\ & \text { 18:18 } \end{aligned}$ | door [1] - 15:4 <br> doubt [1] - 17:22 |
| -6:18, 10:11, | $[15]-4: 9,8: 11$ | 20:27, 20:28, | deceased [1] - | direct [1] - 19:12 | doubtful [2] - |
| 13:13, 13:20, | 10:27, 11:26, | 21:1 | $15: 24$ | directed [4] - | $19: 15,19: 16$ |
| 13:26, 14:11, | 14:11, 15:26, | Counsel [2] - | December [1] - $14: 24$ | $5: 15,12: 10$ | Downes [2] - 5:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:15, 14:27, } \\ & \text { 15:2. 16:5, 17:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:2, 16:6, 18:16, } \\ & \text { 18:23, 21:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $4: 25,25: 3$ | DECEMBER ${ }_{[1]}$ | $12: 15,13: 5$ | DUBLIN [5] - |
| $17: 18,19: 5$ | $22: 4,22: 17$ | counsel [2] $4: 26,25: 5$ | - 1:10 | [2] - 17:15, 18:6 | 2:28, 2:32 |
| 21:12, 22:19, | 22:18, 27:4 | COUNTY [1] - | decide [1] - | disbelief [1] - | due [2] - 6:4, |
| 24:12, 24:13, | considerations | 2:12 |  | 13:3 | 20:13 |



| inquired [1] - | introducing [1] - | 22:27 | legally [1] - 19:7 | 4:29 | meaning [3] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:2 | 4:23 | jurisdictional [1] | legislation [3] - | mandate [5] - | 10:18, 13:1, |
| inquiries [9] - | introductory [1] | - 12:8 | 11:10, 11:24 | 10:6, 11:27, 15:6, | 15:14 |
| 4:11, 17:8, 19:13, | - 11:9 | justice [3] | 21:2 | 15:8, 21:13 | meant [1] - 13:5 |
| 20:3, 22:7, 22:12, | investigate [4] - | 15:21, 16:15 | legislature [1] - | mandated [1] - | meantime [1] |
| 24:21, 24:22, | 9:14, 15:9, 17:11, | 16:24 | 13:25 | 22:29 | 27:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:27 } \\ & \text { inquiry [19] - } \end{aligned}$ | 17:16 <br> investigation [8] | JUSTICE [3] | LEITRIM [1] - | manner [2] - | measures [2] - |
|  |  | 1:7, 1:12, 2:2 | 2:12 | 10:21, 18:19 | 8:18, 20:4 |
| $5: 15,5: 22,5: 28$ | $-7: 26,8: 24$ | Justice [10] - | lengthy [1] - | MARRINAN ${ }_{[1]}$ - | meet [1] - 25:6 |
| 6:12, 6:28, 7:3, | $12: 15,14: 2$ | 4:11, 5:14, 5:21, | 8:22 | 2:6 | meeting [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 24,8: 11,9: 22, \\ & 9: 27,9: 28,12: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:15, 17:21, } \\ & \text { 17:26, 18:10 } \\ & \text { investigations } \end{aligned}$ | 5:29, 6:8, 7:6, | letters [1] - 24:1 | Marrinan [1] - | 22:8, 23:2, 23:21, |
|  |  | 7:23, 12:29, | level [1] - 20:24 | 4:25 | 23:23 |
| 13:1, 14:5, 14:9, |  | 16:18, 24:16 | levelled [1] - | materials [1] - | MEMBER [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:25, 17:10, } \\ & 17: 23,18: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-4: 16} \\ & \text { investigators [2] } \end{aligned}$ | justify [1] - | 18:21 | 8:14 | 1:12, 2:2 |
|  |  | 14:11 | levels [1] - 24:20 | matter [12] - | Member [1] - |
| 17:23, 18:24 <br> INQUIRY <br> [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & -9: 7,19: 14 \\ & \text { invitation }[1]- \end{aligned}$ |  | light [1] - 10:2 | $8: 22,10: 27,$ | $5: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:1, 1:8 } \\ & \text { insofar }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  | K | likely ${ }_{[2]}-8: 2$, | 11:29, 16:27, | member [3] 4:10, 6:6, 6:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:12 } \\ & \text { instance [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 26:22 | KAVANAGH ${ }_{[1]}$ | likened [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 24,20: 26 \\ & 22: 1,23: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { members }[13]- \\ & 6: 24,10: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| 26:29 <br> institutions [1] - | involved [5] 15:24, 18:22, | $\begin{aligned} & -2: 4 \\ & \quad \text { Keith }[1]-5: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { limitation [1] - } \\ & 11: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 25:18 <br> MATTERS $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:12, 12:23, } \\ & 13: 6,13: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 7:10INSTRUCTED | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 24,18: 22 \\ & 22: 24,25: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { KEOGH }_{[1]}-2: 9$ | limited [1] - | $1: 5$ | 13:27, 24:14, |
|  | 25:17 | Keogh [8] - | 17:24 | matters [12] | 24:19, 25:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[2]-2: 10,2: 16} \\ & \text { instructed }[1]- \\ & 25: 3 \end{aligned}$ | Irish [1] - 4:13 irrelevance [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 25,22: 14, \\ & 23: 24,24: 2,25 \end{aligned}$ | limits [1] - 22:27 | 4:17, 5:12, 5:22, | 25:16, 25:22 |
|  |  | $25: 4,26: 28,27: 3$ | list [1] - 26:4 | 7:19, 7:29, 12:3, | MEMBERS [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:3 } \\ & \text { instrument [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:29 } \\ & \text { irrespective }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | Keogh's [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { listed [2] - 5:13, } \\ & \text { 21:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:28, 15:9 } \\ & \text { 17:11, 22:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 2: 14,2: 21 \\ \text { mentioned }[1]- \end{array}$ |
| 5:14, 5:26 <br> INSTRUMENT <br> [2] - 1:9, 1:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 14 \\ & \text { issue }[3]-8: 29, \\ & 15: 1,20: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 7 \\ & \text { key }[1]-15: 6 \\ & \text { kind }[1]-10: 29 \end{aligned}$ | lists [1] - 24:8 <br> literal [1] - 13:19 | $\begin{gathered} 23: 19,26: 11 \\ \text { Maurice }[2]- \\ 5: 20,12: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:7 } \\ & \text { merely }{ }_{[1]}- \\ & 11: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| [2] - 1:9, 1:10 instruments [1] | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15:1, 20:13 } \\ \text { issues [15] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { knowledge }[3]- \\ 6: 24,10: 14, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { litigants [1]- } \\ & 8: 28 \end{aligned}$ | MCBRIEN ${ }^{11]}$ - | might [5] - 5:28, |
| $\begin{aligned} & -6: 14 \\ & \quad \text { intend }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 29,5: 28,8: 17 \\ & 15: 21,16: 29 \end{aligned}$ | 13:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { litigation [1] - } \\ & \text { 17:27 } \end{aligned}$ | McCabe [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 28,16: 16, \\ & 23: 6,23: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:29 } \\ & \text { intended }[4]- \\ & \text { 11:8, 12:26, 14:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 19:22, 20:1, | $\begin{gathered} \text { known [2] - } \\ 4: 12,12: 11 \end{gathered}$ | LITTLE $_{[1]}-2: 19$ loop [1] - 5:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 20,12: 17 \\ & 12: 20 \end{aligned}$ | mind [1] - 19:29 <br> Minister [1] - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 11,22: 16 \\ & 23: 4,23: 7,23: 17 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | MCCOURT [1] - | 7:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:14 } \\ & \text { intention [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:28, 23:29 } \\ & \text { itself }[1]-19: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | M | $2: 31$ <br> MCGINN [1] - | MINISTER [1] 1:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 23,13: 25 \\ & \text { intentionally }{ }_{[1]} \\ & -17: 28 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $2: 25$ | Ministerial [1] - |
|  | J | $14: 7$ | MADE [1] - 1:4 | McGrath [1] - | $5: 10$ <br> misconduct [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & -17: 28 \\ & \text { interest [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | John [3] - 4:26, | last [1] - 22:2 | MAIN [1] - 2:11 <br> maintained [1] - | $4: 25$ <br> MCGRATH ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { misconduct [2] - } \\ & 12: 16,14: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23:27 |  | $\text { atest [1] - } 1$ | 12:20 | 2:6 | mistrust [1] - |
| Interpretation | $25: 2,25: 4$ | law [3] - 8:18, | maintains [1] - | McGuinness | 13:2 |
| [1] - 9:10 <br> interpretation | $2: 10$ | $9: 21,11: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:20 } \\ & \text { major [1] - 14:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[15]-4: 24,21: 19,} \\ & 21: 21,21: 27, \end{aligned}$ | misunderstand <br> ing [1] - 18:13 |
| [8] - 6:29, 9:20, | Judge [1] - 4:16 <br> judge [2]-5:29, | lawyers [1] - | majority [1] - | 22:10, 22:25, | mode [2] - |
| 9:26, 10:1, 10:6, | 6:2 | legal [20] - 4:24, | 12:14 | 23:10, 23:16, | 15:18, 16:6 |
| 11:11, 13:24, |  | $4: 27,8: 14,8: 28$ | MALONE [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 22,24: 5, \\ & 25: 25,25: 27 \end{aligned}$ | module [3] - |
| interprets [1] - | $7: 5,9: 18$ | 11:18, 16:7, | 1:30 <br> Malone [1] - | $26: 1,26: 12$ | 5:20, 5:27, 14:1 modules [1] - |
| 16:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:3 } \\ & \text { June [2] - 21:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 17:23, 18:9, | 1:25 | 26:21 | 5:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { interview [1] - } \\ & \text { 19:14 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 19:17, 19:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { malpractices [1] } \\ & -12: 24 \end{aligned}$ | MCGUINNESS [2] - 2:5, 2:15 | moment [1] - |
| $19: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:2 } \\ & \text { junior }[1]-4: 26 \\ & \text { jurisdiction }[7]- \\ & 9: 12,9: 22,10: 27, \\ & 11: 6,17: 9,17: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 19:26, 20:9, | man [1]-5:4 | McKni [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:19 } \\ & \text { month [1] - 22:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| - 21:29 |  | $20: 20,20: 27,$ | management [6] | 26:2 | moreover [1] - |
| interviews [1] - |  | $21: 1,25: 21$ | - 12:16, 22:8, | MCKNIGHT [1] - | 18:29 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:8 } \\ & \text { INTO [1] - 1:4 } \end{aligned}$ |  | legality [1] - | $23: 2,23: 21,27: 6$ | 2:22 | morning [1] - |
|  |  | $18: 19$ | manager [1] - | mean [1]-20:28 |  |


| MORRISSEY ${ }_{[1]}$ | 24:17, 25:5, | 10:15, 12:22, | parked [1] - | point [1]-19:15 | 9:28 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -2:16 | 25:25 | 13:7, 13:18 | 24:16 | position [3] - | process [3] - |
| most [1] - 7:10 | notes [3]-1:27, | official [1] - | parliament [1] - | 19:26, 21:21, | 8:15, 17:29, 24:6 |
| moving [1] - | 4:7, 12:12 | 12:25 | 7:21 | 24:17 | professional [1] |
| 4:29 | noteworthy [1] - | Oireachtas [4] - | part [6]-4:15, | possible [11] - | - 13:4 |
| MR [24]-1:12, | 11:22 | 12:18, 13:23, | 17:20, 20:15, | 7:11, 15:28, 17:1, | progress [1] - |
| 2:2, 2:4, 2:5, 2:6, | nothing [1] - | 14:1, 18:10 | 20:25, 22:5, 22:7 | 17:16, 19:8, | 23:29 |
| 2:7, 2:9, 2:15, | 26:25 | ON [4]-1:9, | participants [2] | 19:29, 20:12, | prohibiting [1] - |
| 2:15, 2:30, 21:21, | notice [3]-4:21, | $1: 18,2: 12,4: 1$ | $-9: 3,20: 6$ | $21: 14,22: 2,22: 3,$ | 17:27 |
| 21:27, 22:10, | $22: 20,23: 25$ | one [3]-15:11, | particular [4] - | $27: 5$ | proper [1] - |
| 22:25, 23:10, | notified [2] - 6:2, | 18:8, 22:6 | 11:12, 12:3, | postponed [1] - | 23:17 |
| 23:16, 23:22, | 15:3 | open [2]-14:11, | 16:16, 26:22 | 4:9 | propose [1] - |
| 24:5, 25:10, | notify [1] - 21:12 | 17:25 | particularly [1] - | potential [1] - | 26:28 |
| 25:15, 25:20, | November [2] - | open-ended [1] | 22:18 | 18:15 | proposing [1] - |
| 26:1, 26:12, | 5:23, 14:14 | $-14: 11$ | parties [10] - | practicability [1] | $23: 22$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:21 } \\ & \text { MS [8] - 2:6, 2:9, } \end{aligned}$ | number [2] - | opening [5] - | $9: 3,18: 2,22: 16,$ | $-15: 21$ | PROTECTED [2] |
|  | 24:13, 25:11 | 6:27, 12:28, | 23:3, 23:9, 23:13, | practicality [1] - | - 1:4, 1:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2: 16,2: 17,2: 21, \\ & 2: 26,25: 2,26: 8 \end{aligned}$ | Ní [1] - 4:27 | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 17,26: 26, \\ & 27: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 25,24: 2 \\ & 24: 10,26: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 16:15 | Protected [1] - |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2: 26,25: 2,26: 8 \\ \text { multi }[2]-8: 29 \end{array}$ | 0 | OPENING [3] - | party [3] - 8:29, | 9:21 | protected [13] - |
| 8:29 |  | opportunity [1] - | passage [1] - $9: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 26,19: 5,19: 12, \\ & 22: 7,22: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:24, 10:29, } \\ & \text { 11:14, 12:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $8: 29$ | $25: 3$ | order [5] - 17:2, | passed [1] - 6:5 | 24:22, 24:26, | 13:15, 14:20, |
| must [2] - 16:24, | $\begin{gathered} \text { O'BRIEN [1] - } \\ 2.9 \end{gathered}$ | 17:26, 19:10, | Patrick [2] - | 26:27 | 14:22, 16:20, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:9 } \\ & \text { O'MARA }[1] ~-~ \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 19:15, 20:26 } \\ \text { Order [1] - } 5 \text { : } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 4:25, } 25: 3 \\ \text { PATRIC } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { preparation [4] - } \\ & 8: 7,22: 6,24: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 17 \\ & \text { protection } \end{aligned}$ |
| N | 2:31 <br> o) [1] - 6:2 | orders [1]-9:6 | 2:6, 2:9 | preparations [2] | 8:19 |
| ```named [1] - 1:27 narrow [1] -``` | objective [2] - | $18: 6$ | PAULA [1] - 2:21 | preparatory [1] - | $14: 23$ |
|  | $19: 23,24: 3$ <br> obligation [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OSMOND [1] - } \\ & \text { 2:18 } \end{aligned}$ | people [2] - $25: 13,25: 28$ | $20: 3$ <br> preparing [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { provided [1] - } \\ & 6: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:18, } 26: 17 \\ & \text { obliged [2] - 8:1, } \end{aligned}$ | OTHER [1] - 1:5 otherwise [3]- | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { periods [1] - } \\ 24: 19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8: 26,8: 28,19: 27 \\ \text { prerogative }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { provides [1] - } \\ & 11: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 16:24 <br> naturally [1] - | $14: 29$ <br> observance [1] - | 5:4, 13:3, 16:16 outcomes [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { permitted }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 18:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $25: 24$ <br> present [2] - | providing [2] - 6:5, 9:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:26 } \\ & \text { nature }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $21: 14$ <br> observations [1] | 19:2 <br> outlined [2] | person [4] 11:15, 13:6, 18:5, | $11: 13,19: 25$ <br> previously [1] - | provisions [1] 11:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16: 25,20: 18 \\ & 23: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -8: 21 \\ & \text { obtaining }[2]- \end{aligned}$ | $7: 23,20: 4$ | 19:6 | $20: 5$ | provoke [1] - |
|  |  | outside [2] - | personal [2] - | primarily [1] - | $24: 25$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { necessary [7] - } \\ 8: 15,9: 29,18: 3, \end{array}$ | $8: 16,21: 28$ <br> obviously [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:11, 17:24 } \\ & \text { overall [1] - 6:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:4, 15:25 } \\ & \text { persons [12] - } \end{aligned}$ | ```16:2 principal [1] -``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { public [22] - } \\ 4: 13,5: 12,7: 3, \end{gathered}$ |
| $20: 12,26: 24$ | 22:11, 22:15, | overlap [1] - | 8:2, 8:6, 10:11, | 7:8 | $7: 9,7: 13,7: 19$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:12, 26:24 } \\ & \text { necessitated } 1 \text { [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $22: 28,24: 14$, $24: 20,25: 21$, | 12:5 | 11:7, 13:14, | principle [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 4,8: 9,8: 24, \\ & 9: 26,14: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { necessitated [1] } \\ & -24: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 25:24, 27:5 | overly [1] - | 15:23, 17:3, | 17:8 | $9: 26,14: 14$ |
| need [1] - 24:28 | 25:24, 27:5 <br> occasion [3] - <br> 15:11, 20:9, 27:6 | 19:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:14, 18:17, } \\ & \text { 18:22, 21:12, } \end{aligned}$ | private [1] - 17:2 <br> procedural [3]- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:28, 17:21, } \\ & \text { 17:23, 19:28, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | overlytechnical [1] - | 22:20 | $8: 18,22: 10,23: 2$ | 20:13, 21:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 4,15: 2 \\ & \text { next }[1]-21: 20 \\ & \text { NICHOLAS }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | October [1] - | 19:11 | perspective [1] - | procedure [1] - | $22: 1,22: 13$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 23 \\ & \text { OF }_{[8]}-1: 1,1: 8, \end{aligned}$ | P | PETER [1] - 2:4 | 16:21 <br> procedures [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 14 \\ & 27: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2:9 <br> Nicholas [1] - | $2: 14,2: 21,4: 1$ |  | phase [2] | 16:8, 16:10, | publish [1] - |
| $21: 25$ |  |  | $12: 28,13: 10$ | $16: 12,20: 2,20: 5,$ | 6:28 |
| NOREEN [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:16 } \\ & \text { offers [1] - 18:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { p) }[6]-5: 14, \\ 5: 18,6: 13,10: 21, \end{gathered}$ | Philip [1] - 4:28 place [2]-8:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:15, 23:8 } \\ & \text { proceed [9] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { published [3] - } \\ 4: 21,16: 12,20: 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2:30 <br> NORTHUMBER |  | $12: 6,15: 21$ | 22:11 | $5: 8,15: 19,15: 22$ | purpose [2] - |
|  | OFFICE [1] - | $\operatorname{PAGE}_{[1]}-3: 2$ | $\text { PLACE }_{[1]}-2: 23$ | 19:28, 21:12, | $22: 25,23: 10$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { LAND }_{[1]}-2: 32 \\ \text { note }[1]-26: 13 \\ \text { noted }[3]- \end{gathered}$ | ```2:18 office [1] - 4:29 officers [4] -``` | paid [1] - 20:29 | placed [1] - 10:1 | $21: 13,22: 1$ | purpose.. [1] - |
|  |  | paragraph [1] - | planning [1] - | 26:29, 27:6 | 7:17 |
|  |  | 10:18 |  | proceeds [1] - | purposes [1] - |




