

Nigel Powell

A very very brief lesson from history

- Mid 80's - structurally, the situation now is not that much different to what it was then – our increased knowledge, our personal perceptions and our desire for having moved on just get in the way of us realising that.
- A lesson from the first parliamentary expenses inquiry about the power and the weakness of the law

Some aspects of the nature of corruption investigations

- No different to investigating any other relatively serious offence
- Except it is more likely to have more than one consenting adult involved, doesn't tend to be opportunistic and almost always is very much about powers and secrets
- An investigator doesn't want a perpetrator alerted that they have come to the attention of the authorities because of the obvious chance of disposal of evidence; cover ups etc etc
- Independence of thought and action paramount – two+ examples of where it is clear this is not as it ought to be.

What information and where does legitimate public disclosure of an investigation begin especially in the current media environment?

- Has to be rare that it is ever before charging that a persons name is used by authorities – the use of 'person of interest' etc has to stop – publicly it is about investigating a circumstance, situation etc etc anything more perverts the adversarial system.
- If the CCC and QPS are not on the same page about this it confuses the public and diminishes the CCC.

- Cognitive dissonance and ignorance about our governing systems and their functions are a big factor in any public dissatisfaction with the process
- Trite but the changes in the media landscape are taking place at a pace that rules and law are struggling to keep pace with – this is the foreseeable future
- tackling the challenges of free speech from an enforcement angle may have a short term desired result but ultimately it usually makes the situation worse – alienation etc

Does the motives of informants matter?

- Not at all - as long as the investigator has the wit to understand the context of the giving of information. Context is everything. There is an offence or there isn't - it's as simple as that – each case should be taken on its merits. Those investigators who can not see that and can not see that even serial complainers may be correct or at least onto something are in the wrong job.

Politically motivated complaints – a two edged sword, wielded by those who chose to be there, may not be a bad thing

- Placing oneself in the public sector (elected or appointed) comes with legitimately greater scrutiny of actions.
- While the motivation might be base it would be a relatively rare circumstance where an examination of any event wouldn't lead to ways of tightening rules, procedures etc to prevent misuse, bad but not necessarily corrupt behaviour or such like.
- Send in the systems experts
- Over time the systems become more robust - accountability and transparency improve
- There is a need to be proactive here - aggressively audit government (including

parliamentarians) processes

- The involvement of any law enforcement personnel in party politics is a blight on our democracy and fundamentally damages the relationship between the public and the law enforcement / administration community

The danger of a two tier consideration of actions

- Where you sit in society determines the level of equity before the law and the gap is getting worse.
- It would be fair to say that many allegations/complaints of corrupt behaviour feature prominent citizens to whom reputation, for whatever reason, is important.
- For perhaps different reasons the reputation of the previously convicted criminal is very important to him or her
- Corruption is a criminal offence. Corruption suspects can not be treated any differently to 'ordinary' criminal suspects without further dividing our society.

This is not a problem that will ever be solved by the law or rules but there is a way

- Laws, rules and regulation on their own do not change human behaviour in the long term
- They may ease the incidence but we have been passing laws about behaviour for centuries – we are still damaging, stealing, corrupting, assaulting and killing
- The reason there has largely only been a change of incidence is not because we haven't got the punctuation or wording quite right
- Education is the answer and the CCC should have a well funded broad based

innovative education function - It is playing the long game that gets results