An integrity or compliance model?

In a potentially balanced way, the Ten Pillars of Ethics and Integrity combine a strategy that both encourages ethics and creates compliance. When the latter is accomplished, what emerges may be termed a "compliance model" (anti-corruption). When the former prevails, the outcome is an "integrity model" (pre-emptive). A compliance approach is characterized by a workshop, investigative and legislation style creating accountability and assuming that misconduct is inevitably present in political activity. An integrity approach is characterized by an educative, expansive and preventive style stressing responsibility and assuming that most participants in the political process are motivated to act with propriety.

As to the ethical theory which may inform these contrasting approaches (Proctor & Sampford, 2002a, Chapters 2 and 4), the compliance model is more inclined to draw on deontology (which makes moral judgments based on a more absolute view of what is right and wrong) and consequentialism (which makes moral judgments in terms of a utilitarian calculation about the likely outcomes of certain conduct), whereas the integrity model is more inclined by virtue theory (which gives no account of the moral characteristics required by a parliamentarian, based on the underlying purpose of the parliamentary sphere, and is directed toward cultivating that character in both the individual and the institution). This said, it would also argue that the actual ethical conduct of political participants (i.e., political ethics) is informed not just by the virtues approach but, at times, by deontology, and, of course, primarily and inevitably, by utilitarianism (Proctor, 1980a, Chapter 9).

The compliance and integrity models in public life may both be flawed within an ethic of roles or role norms, which requires conduct that is consistent with the neat and distinct functions of members of parliament. However, it is the integrity approach that gives a more comprehensive account of the ethical norms for parliamentary ethics (even though aspects of the compliance model will continue to be employed, because no integrity system seeks to deal adequately with the accidental, unforeseeable or unforeseen which must be processed by the ministerial justice system). Seen through the lens of integrity, parliamentary ethics is comprised of role, role norms and role conduct, and it provides a clear conceptual basis for the connection between the personal and public dimensions of public life. Both compliance and integrity are essential, unthinkable, if ethics regimes are to be robust and sustainable. However, the integrity model provides a clearer moral compass for those who seek to negotiate the way through multiple and sometimes conflicting roles. Furthermore, it is consistent with this model to speak of politics as a vocation.

To summarize, a good governance management includes the valuable attributes of both a compliance and an integrity model aiming for a balance which provides against misconduct and promotes good conduct at the same time (Obr, 2005, pp. 107-108). The argument here is that an integrity model offers most for a parliamentary ethics program.

In reality, there will be a variety of compliance between ethics regimes. With respect to parliamentary ethics in Australia, i.e. it is regrettably that the role of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) has impacted the balance in that jurisdiction to compliance, despite the existence of ethical guidelines directed to the legislature. By contrast, I maintain that if Queensland ethics, initiatives in the parliamentary sphere they have followed an integrity model, though it's state's former Criminal Justice Commission (CJC), now Crime and Misconduct Commission (CMC),
has been the subject of a comprehensive study conducted by the University of Queensland. The key findings of the study suggest that, on average, new MPs receive approximately 10 hours of ethics training during their first year in office. This training includes lectures, seminars, and interactive workshops focusing on ethical decision-making, conflict of interest, and legal and procedural issues. The study also highlights the importance of ongoing support and resources for MPs, particularly during their first year in office, to better equip them to handle the complex ethical challenges they face.

In conclusion, while the provision of ethics training to new MPs is an essential component of maintaining high ethical standards in the legislative sphere, there is a need for continuous improvement and adaptation of training methods to better address the evolving ethical challenges faced by MPs. Efforts should focus on providing practical, scenario-based training to enhance MPs’ ability to apply ethical principles in their day-to-day decision-making. This will help create a more ethical culture within the parliamentary ecosystem, thereby strengthening public trust in the legislative process.
government will be protected from being accountable because, after all, integrity processes are really optional anyway.

Moreover, though this case provides evidence that a corrupt minister was caught by the system, it also raises the question: did Minister Nattrall or the Premier consult the Integrity Commissioner in any of these matters? The public will never know because the voluntary conventions ministers may have with the Integrity Commissioner are quite properly confidential. But we may conclude that, in the Nattrall case, this integrity measure had no impact on preventing political corruption.

The first Nattrall conviction coincided more or less with the twentieth anniversary of the presentation of the Fitzgerald Report (1989). On that anniversary Tony Fitzgerald broke his public silence about the costs of integrity failures in Queensland.

Ethics are always tested by circumstance. Secrecy was re-established by both claims that voluminous documents were 'Cabinet in confidence'. Access can now be purchased, paternity is now dispensed, rules and supporters are appointed and relied politicians exploit their political connections to obtain 'access' paid for deals between business and government. Neither side of politics is interested in these issues except for short-term political advantage as each enjoys or pickets hopefully for its turn at the privileges and opportunities which accompany power (ABC, 2009).

The following day Premier Ann Bligh* announced that Cabinet had approved the preparation of a Green Paper for a widespread public consultation on issues of integrity, accountability and ethics in addressing 'perpetuating influences' (ABC, 2009).

The Office of Integrity Commissioner*

Legally as a result of the Green Paper process, which coincided with a challenging period around integrity matters (Williams, 2010), the Bligh government has taken actions, including new and amended legislation over about twelve months (2009-10), which significantly strengthens the integrity system of Queensland (Queensland Integrity Commissions, 2010). Some refer to the public service at large* and to local government, whilst others will directly affect the Parliament: a revamped Parliamentary Committee system and legislation to strengthen the requirements for MPs' declarations of interests which are now published on the Parliamentary website. Leading the way in the revised ethics regime are the provisions, now in force, of the Integrity Act 2009.

The Integrity Act has three main elements: first, to move the provisions regarding the Integrity Commissioner (from the Public Sector Ethics Act) and to significantly enhance them. Two other objects established key compliance measures: first, a framework for regulating the lobbying industry in Queensland through a Code of Conduct to be developed by the Integrity Commissioner; a register to be managed by the Integrity Commissioner and by banning of access fees for lobbyists*; and, secondly, the new Act gave the Crime and Misconduct Commission jurisdiction over Government Owned Corporations, a matter which had been a glaring omission previously.

While the Green paper discussions were continuing, Premier Bligh requested the new Integrity Commissioner, Dr. David Solomon AM, to interview each government MP about their declarations of pecuniary interests to check whether they had conflicts of interest - a process which the Premier has indicated is to be followed annually. In addition, the Government has decided that the Commissioner should have access to the
confidential declarations of interests concerning the processes of MPs. Clearly, these changes (added to the new responsibility to monitor lobbying) begin to give the Commissioner some minimal powers of coercion and investigation, and represent a move toward a compliance aspect in the role.

In the Integrity Act, the capacity of the Integrity Commissioner as an adviser on conflicts of interest remains but is extended to advise more generally on ethics or integrity issues. As the case with the definition of a conflict of interest has been expanded to include relationships of trust, the range of persons designated as eligible has been expanded to include the Prime Minister and the Speaker of the House. The Act, amended by the Ethics Act 2006, requires the Commissioner to prepare an annual report and that report in 2007-2008 was an important step in providing more comprehensive information to the public.

Very significantly, the independence of the Integrity Commissioner is enhanced by making him an officer of the Parliament and giving him a position close to the senior executive in the Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee. In the previous model, the Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee was only an advisory committee, with the Commissioner excluded from discussions of the investigation and decision-making processes and procedures. The new model requires the Commissioner to prepare a report on the investigation and decision-making processes and procedures, and the report is required to be adopted by the Committee. The role of the Commissioner is now a more significant one in the Parliament.

The role of the Integrity Commissioner is now more significant and the role of the Parliament is also more significant in the process of ethics and integrity in the Parliament. The role of the Commissioner is now more significant in the Parliament and the role of the Parliament is more significant in the process of ethics and integrity in the Parliament.

Conclusion

Of course, parliamentarians today will always be subject to scrutiny by the public and by the media. The role of the Integrity Commissioner is now more significant in the Parliament and the role of the Parliament is more significant in the process of ethics and integrity in the Parliament.

The integrity approach, which is also a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act. This approach is also a feature of the Act, and the Act is a feature of the Act.

Notes

1. The definition of a conflict of interest has been expanded to include relationships of trust and the range of persons designated as eligible has been expanded to include the Prime Minister and the Speaker of the House.

2. The Act, amended by the Ethics Act 2006, requires the Commissioner to prepare an annual report and that report in 2007-2008 was an important step in providing more comprehensive information to the public.

3. The role of the Commissioner is now more significant in the Parliament and the role of the Parliament is more significant in the process of ethics and integrity in the Parliament.

4. The role of the Commissioner is now more significant in the Parliament and the role of the Parliament is more significant in the process of ethics and integrity in the Parliament.

5. The integrity approach, which is also a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act.

6. The Act, amended by the Ethics Act 2006, requires the Commissioner to prepare an annual report and that report in 2007-2008 was an important step in providing more comprehensive information to the public.

7. The role of the Commissioner is now more significant in the Parliament and the role of the Parliament is more significant in the process of ethics and integrity in the Parliament.

8. The role of the Commissioner is now more significant in the Parliament and the role of the Parliament is more significant in the process of ethics and integrity in the Parliament.

9. The integrity approach, which is also a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act, is a feature of the Act.
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