

An Chartlann Náisiúnta National Archives

Reference Code:	2021/47/85

Creator(s):

Department of Foreign Affairs

Accession Conditions: Open

Copyright:

National Archives, Ireland. May only be reproduced with the written permission of the Director of the National Archives.

<u>Wednesday, 29th January 1992</u> R v Brian Nelson

SB FROM AS 12.00

3

Ц

5

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

Witness 'Colonel'

(Contc) Cross-examination by MR B KERS:

ó Ο. Weil new, in characterising those as errors of judgment, on 7 what material did you rely in reaching the view that these 3 offences to which he has pleaded guilty could be put down to errors of judgment on his part? Shat was the material that 0 you used to reach that judgment? A. The material I used 10 were the reports on our own files, the reports that the 11 handlers had received from Brian Welson, his description of 12 13 how events had unfolded and what he had done. He was, to my mind, very nonest in that. He achitted things that he had 14 done wrong. He dian't try and nide them from us to the oest 15 of my knowledge and, therefore, I base my opinions only on 16 the written records, my Lord, that we have and the very -17 18 extensive records we have recording our meetings with him. Well. before you came to Court today, knowing that you were, 19 Q. presumably knowing that you were going to be asked for your 20 21 judgment about his involvement, did you refresh your memory from those records? A. It would have been difficult for 22 23 me to come into Court without having done so because after 24 all it's really two years since I had any real sight of these records. 25 26 0. ī see. A. I have to say that in the time that I had I

27 was able to do that only on a cursory basis.

28 Q. I see. A. And what I did was that I looked through the
29 files very quickly and a summary of the files just to remind
30 myself of the general trend in the case.

So the judgment that you bring to bear on his invoivement 1 0. and the evidence that you give is based on a cursory 2 reminder through the flies before you gave evidence, is that 3 right? A. Yes, but a reminder is a reminder. I still 4 had a lot of knowledge in my brain and I still remembered 5 ó the case. There were instances and dates and places and 7 times that I couldn't remember and that was the sort of 3 thing that would concern me. Even now if you ask me for detailed answers I would have to refer to the flies to be 9 able to give a truthful and nonest answer. But my feeling 10 for the case, my feeling for Brian Neison was as a result of 11 12 living with his case over a three year period.

Weil, you use a telling word there when you say your feeling 13 Q. for Brian Helson and your feeling for the case, do you 14 15 accept the possibility that your feeling for Helson has clouded your judgment about this? A. Pernaps I misled 16 17 you when I talk about feeling, I mean an overall assessment 18 really. My overall assessment of the case and of his performance. That is based -- you've got to remember that 19 20 over that period we received iots of reports from Brian Kelson. we discussed his case often and, therefore, in my 21 22 mind I would have formed opinions as I went along. When I talk about feeling for a case I really, I'm really 23 24 indicating what I believe to be the general run of the case, 25 his general motivation and the way in which the information 26 was passed over.

Q. Did you know, for instance, in relation to the murder of
Terence McDaid, did you know that Weison had made statements
about that to investigating police officers? A. I was
made aware of that by the investigating officers, yes.

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

1 0. Sut no doubt you're not privy to the information that Nelson gave to the investigating officers? A. No. I'm not. no. 2 Do you know that McDaid, Mr McDaid was murdered on the 10th. 3 Ο. of May 1983? A. I couldn't swear that I already knew 4 that, if you tell me that's the date then I'm sure it is. 5 б 0. Do you know or can you confirm that the last meeting that Nelson nad with his handler before the murder of Mr McDaid 7 8 was the 19th of April 1988? A. If that is what is on 9 our record then I'm sure that is the case.

Q. Do you know that between the last meeting on the 19th of
April 1983 and the 10th of May 1938 Nelson conducted
surveillance and established visual sightings of Decian
McDaid on several occasions? A. I'm sure that that
would have been reported on our records and, as I've already
indicated, he did and we did indicate that Decian McDaid was
under threat.

17 Q. No, I'm putting to you that after the 19th of April 1938.
13 the last meeting with the handler before the murder of
19 Mr EcDaid on the 10th of Hay, after that meeting ne
20 conducted surveillance and established visual signtings of
21 McDaid. A. Yes, but there's a Declan McDaid and Terence
22 McDaid.

Quite so, but no information was relayed to the handler 23 Q. about his activities during that time, that's what I'm 24 25 suggesting to you. A. My Lord, I would have to check my own records to be absolutely sure whether he reported this 26 or not. I feel sure that in all cases where he was 27 induiging in intelligence activity he would tell us about 28 it, but without consulting the records I couldn't at this 29 30 moment say.

36

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

Q. But the question is, how sound is that conviction that you expressed? This is the point that I want to put to you, Colonel. You see, I understand that from your earlier evidence that you had understood that Mr Nelson told nis UDA associates that Mr McDaid, that is Declan McDaid, did not live at Newington Street. is that right? A. The accress at which Terence McDaid was killed he said that that address was not Declan McDaid's address and he was intent on, he was being asked what the address for Declan McDaid was, he was passing on information to us that there was a threat to Declan McDaid and, therefore, he was establishing that his terrorist associates knew where Declan McDaid lived and he reported that to us.

Would your judgment about this matter change, Colonel, if 14 ۵. 15 you discovered, as I suggest to you was in fact the case. 15 that Nelson admitted to police officers that between the 17 time of his last contact with his handlers and the murder of Terence NcDaid that not only had he conducted surveillance 18 19 and established signtings of Decian McDaid, but had reached the view himself that he was living at four Newington Street 20 and that he told Winkie Dodds that he was sure that he was 21 22 living at Newington. A. I have no recollection, my 23 Lord, of that on our files and I would have to consult them to be sure of giving a truthful answer, but I certainly, 24 25 what I remember from our files is that he did not know of 25 the, he did not know that that attack was going to take place and he did not know that that address was the one that 27 28 they were interested in.

29 Q. But what I suggest to you, what I've just suggested to you30 is quite contrary to the impression that you had about the

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

1

S

4

5 10

7

9

10

12

13

his handlers? A. In the events which led up to the conspiracy from what he told us afterwards and we recorded on files, it is clear that there were possibly occasions when he might have telephoned us. I do believe that he may well have tried to telephone us, that the telephone box was broken, that ne didn't wish to do so from his home because his sons were in the vicinity and these are reasons which actualiy I accept in part. I've said there were errors of judgment and I do believe in this particular case he could well nave made more of an effort to contact us beforehanc. SB TO AS 12.10

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

Wednesday, 29th January 1992

R.v. Brian Melson

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

3	AD Fil	UN 55 12:10
4		WITNESS COLONEL
5		(Cont'd) Cross-examination by MR S KERR:
6	Q.	Now, you say that you accept these explanations in part, do
7		you accept that it was an excuse or an acceptable excuse
8		that ne didn't telephone you, didn't make contact with his
ò		handler from his own home? A. I think that it may have
10		been difficult for him to do so. I think probably ne could
11		have done and that was an error of judgment.
12	Q.	Well you see, I have to suggest to you that it goes far
13		beyond an error of judgment and the evidence for that comes
14		from the words of Hr Nelson himself because when he admitted
15		his involvement in this, he told the interviewing officers
16		he couldn't phone his handlers from the house because his
17		sons were knocking about the house which, in reality, was a
18		poor excuse. Those are his words and I have to suggest to
19		you that there is no acceptable excuse for his failure to
20		contact his handlers in relation to what he knew was planned
21		for Mr Maskey? A. Weil, when you say he knew what was
22		planned there was a lot of comings and goings that night as
23		I remember from his files, nothing ever actually came of it.
24		Now, there were occasions, and I think he has aiready
25		entered a guilty plea to this offence, he has already
26		entered a guilty plea so he obviously accepts his guilt in
27		this matter and I have to go along with that. He is the man
28		who makes the plea. What I'm saying, in mitigation, and
29		remember I have been asked to give evidence in mitigation,
30		I'm saying that he aidn't get it right all the time, but he

1

Q. You see, it's not simply a question of not getting it right, 2 I have to suggest to you, that his failure to contact his 3 handlers in relation to Maskey and his admitted Ц 5 particication, not only in contacting people whom he knew to б be killers, but also in helping -- in returning to a number 7 of people and going to see whether Mr Maskey was still at 3 the Gregory Restaurant, that that all admits of only one interpretation and that is that ne was a willing participant 9 10 in the constiracy to murder Mr Maskey? A. I can't comment on whether he was a willing participant or not. If 11 12 I were to give an opinion on that it would be based on what 13 he told us on the files. I can't say that, only he can say whether he was a willing participant or not. He has pleaded 14 15 guilty, he entered a guilty plea to this offence. What . a saying in mitigation is there were a lot of other things ne 16 17 did and there were a lot of other potentially life-saving 18 information that he gave and lives were saved, so how do we balance this off against this particular incident? 19 20 ۵. Well, you see, what I'm suggesting to you is that you don't oalance it off by seeking to diminish or characterise his 21 errors of judgment, his obvious criminal activity in the 22 offences to which he has pleaded guilty and that's what you 23 24 have sought to do? A. No, I haven't sought to diminish 25 his guilt in any of these cases that he has already entered 26 a guilty plea for. I have said it's a very understandable situation when you're living day to day when your life is at 27 risk and you're putting your life on the line. It's a very 28 understandable situation where you get drawn into activities 29 that you shouldn't get grawn into and that is the Position 30

got it right an awful lot of the time.

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

that we place these people at when we're running those agents. I'm not seeking to diminish his guilt in this thing. He has entered a guilty plea he accepts that he was wrong.

Do you know that in the case of Gillen, the conspiracy to 5 0. 6 murder Srian Gillen, that he went of his own accord to carry 7 out a reconnaissance of the bar which Gillen frequented? A. Again. I can't necessarily recollect that from the files 3 I'm sure I could confirm it if I had. If you're telling he 9 10 that's what he did and you have evidence on which to base that, fine, if did he that but he was an interligence 11 12 officer for the UDA I've already said that he carried out 13 the surveillance. In fact, in that particular case we were 14 highly dublous about the whole of the information. He were highly dubious that Wr Gillen was ever going to drink in the 15 16 Sports Bar in Lisburn, he may have done but we were highly 17 dubious of all of that stuff and as I have already said me 18 reported on about twelve occasions before that incident that 19 Mr Gillen was being targeted and warnings had been issued. 20 0. Do you know that he collected a home-made submachine gun for use in the proposed murder? A. No, I don't and I'm not 21 22 sure that anybody does because my recollection of that 23 particular incident was that he got into the car with someone else and there was a bag or some sort of receptacie 24 25 in the car and he asked what was in the receptacle and he 26 was told there was a machine gun ne did not see a machine 27 gun to the best of my knowledge. He was told there was one 28 in the receptacle. He was not then in the position to actually get out of the car. 29

30 Q. And is it not right. Colonel. that of the handlers under

42.

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

1

your command, at least two of the handlers under your command expressed concern to you about the activities of Nelson? A. We have very extensive case files and handlers when they write their notes. write it in a variety of ways. They not only recording the information that was given they're recording all sorts of personal details about the source they're recording all the details about how the meeting took place and where it took place and when it took place and they are recording anything that is of real relevance. And so, we were aware, yes, through the handlers notes when they had worries.

- And an aspect of that worry was, wasn't it, that ne was 12 0. going beyond what was required of him as an acent and 13 particizating willingly in these events, isn't that right? 14 15 A. I don't believe that that was, in my reading of the 16 files. that actually it was said like that. I believe that 17 what the handlers were saying was: We must watch him, he's 18 getting nimself into a situation nere where he's been grawn 19 into terrorist activities, he's allowing himself to become a little too entrusiastic. They were saying this and they 20 were telling him and they were saying to him: Look you have 21 22 to watch this, you condition not get yourself drawn in out remember protect your own position as well. We go back to 23 24 the very difficult situation and the very fine line that I talked about earlier on between him looking after himseif 25 26 and at the same time allaying the suspicions of his 27 associates and at the same time trying to get information from them. 28
- 29 Q. Well, is it not right that ne was reprimanded on occasions30 because he had gone beyond that line that you have

43

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85

1

3

Ц

õ

6

7

9

described? A. Yes absolutely we would not have been --1 2 we would have been remiss in our duties if we had not cone 2 30. But notwithstanding the fact that he was reprimanded ne 4 Ģ. continued to cause concern on the part of the handlers, õ 6 isn't that right? A. Because he continued to be in a very difficult situation. ne continued to be in the same 7 3 situation I nave referred to time and time again ģ MR B KERR: Thank you. LORD JUSTICE KELLY: Mr Boal, re-examination 10 11 MR BOAL: No thank you. my Lord. 12 LORD JUSTICE KELLY: Thank you very much. (THE WITNESS WITHDREW) 13 MR BOAL: It would be the intention of the witness to leave not 14 only the Court but the country, my Lord, would that be with 15 15 the agreement of the Court? LORD JUSTICE KELLY: Yes, of course. 17 13 AS TO SB 12:20 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

©NAI/DFA/2021/47/85