University of Mississippi

eGrove

Association Sections, Divisions, Boards, Teams

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) Historical Collection

10-15-1984

97th Annual Meeting and Plenary Session, Monday, October 15, 1984, Atlanta, Georgia

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/aicpa_assoc



Part of the Accounting Commons

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS 97TH ANNUAL MEETING

and

PLENARY SESSION AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Monday, October 15, 1984 Regency Ballroom, Hyatt Regency Hotel Atlanta, Georgia

--00-

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN LEE: Good morning, and welcome to the 97th annual meeting of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

I'd like to ask Alan Poole, if he's here, to step forward; Alan is the Chairman of the Annual Meeting Hospitality Committee, and I would ask him to express a word of welcome to — on behalf of the people of Georgia, and Atlanta; Alan?

MR. POOLE: Good morning; you are officially welcome again to Atlanta and Georgia; we hope, after the opening reception last night, that we can top that and continue to make things to be really nice for you. We realize that we almost out-did outselves last night, but, we will continue to try to please you while you're here.

We have a committee of, gosh, some 100 people—probably 50 people, and maybe 25 who have worked regularly for the last couple of years to help put this together.

It is our pleasure to have you here in Atlanta, and in Georgia, and if there's anything at all we can do to make your stay pleasant and more comfortable, we'll be glad to do so.

We extend to you our most hospitable

Southern hospitality.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you, Alan, and if last night's function was any indicator of what the rest of this is going to be like, it will be absolutely magnificant.

Joe Frank Harris is the 78th Governor of the State of Georgia; at the time of his election, he was an 18 year veteran of the Georgia House of Representatives, and for the last eight years of that term he served as Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee which overseas the House version of the State budget.

By virtue of that experience, Governor Harris is thus acknowledged as the leading expert on State finances.

As Governor, he has implemented a State program to administer the Federal Job Training Partnerhip Act, which won one of two top national awards from the National Alliance for Business.

In his first year in office, Governor Harris created the Economic Development Council of State agency and department heads to oversee the development of the first long-range economic development plan for the State.

Would you help me to receive, warmly, this morning, Governor Joe Frank Harris.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR HARRIS: Chairman Lee,
distinguished leadership of the American Institute of
Certified Public Accountants, ladies and gentlemen; I
appreciate the opportunity of being here this morning,
and I commented on the way in to my good friend, Don
Edwards, who many of you know, that you get started
early, and I have an opportunity to welcome many
groups to Atlanta, but, I don't remember one,
recently, that has had everybody seated and in place,
and ready to go at 8:30 or 8:45 in the morning, so, I
compliment you and commend your leadership for the
discipline that you're exemplifying here this morning.

Recently, I was in Austin, Texas, and many of you have had opportunities, probably, to visit there, but, I visited the L.B.J. Library, and you know, former Presidents of the United States, they all have libraries that are built in their honor, to store their records, and soon we're hoping to have a Jimmy Carter Library here in Atlanta, if we can get a driveway into it, we're having a little controversy about the road precedent.

But, I was visiting that L.B.J. Library,

and walking through, and looking at some of the history that was made during his term of office; it had a little booth that came in view that had, L.B.J. Humor, and a button to push, and being human, I had to push the button and listen to what came out.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, he was telling a story that was taken from one of his speeches about a University of Texas football player, during the term of Darrell Royal, who was an outstanding coach for many years, as you know, and this football player was outstanding, but, did not receive a pro contract, and he went on to tell the story that this player went to the Washington Redskins as a walk-on, and the coach was questioning him, said, well, what are you good at--what can you do; and, he said, well, coach, I can run 100 yards in 9.2 seconds; he thought, well, that's outstanding, very few people can do that; he said, what else do you do well; he said, well, I'm a punter; he said, I can kick that football 75 years--I've got an average of almost 75 yards every time I punt; and, he thought, well, that's great; he said, well, you told me all the good things about you, he said, do you have any negatives; he said, well, my friends say that I'm prone to exaggerate things sometimes.

Let me say to you this morning, and I'm

not going to exaggerate it at all, but, we're deeply grateful that you're in Atlanta, Georgia, and in the State of Georgia, and here among us for your convention; we're glad you're in Georgia; we're proud of what's happening in Georgia; we've become globalized, or, internationalized, you might say, over recent years because of our having the busiest airport in the world, here in Atlanta; having the second fastest growing port facility on the Eastern Seaboard at Savannah, Georgia; last year our containerized freight grew over 33 percent; we're building the fifth container berth there, and we're very fortunate in Georgia—we're blessed.

I say to our people here that every day could be a Thanksgiving Day in Georgia, because we have so much to be thankful for; just for an example, the last quarter's collections of revenue in Georgia increased over last year, the same month, 22 percent; we are blessed, and we're having tremendous growth, and increases in our programs without a tax increase in Georgia, which 48 of our 50 States have had in the last three years, and Georgia has not had a major tax increase in over 30 years, so, we've been very fortunate.

And, I know you can see some of the growth

that's among you, and around you, as you're traveling on your arrival here in Atlanta. So, we're very glad.

Last year in Georgia we had 89,000 new jobs; we had capital investment and expansion in Georgia of over six billion dollars—unprecedented; this year we're going to top that, and we're doing that because of three elements, I think, that are very important in our State, and I know it's important in the States that you come from; one, particularly, of the quality of life that we have in Georgia, the Sunbelt climate, and the excellent opportunities for recreational facilities, and the improvement, and the standards of living that we've had over the past 20 years, in Georgia, which we're extremely proud of.

The second element is the pro-business attitude that we have exemplified within the citizens of our State to the business community within our State, which you're a part of in the over 5,500 accountants in our State, or CPAs that belongs to this Association, are a part of the economy in our State very much so. So, we're proud of the pro-business attitude.

Then, number three, the work ethics of the people; we still have that old southern hospitality; we extend the hand to others, and that's something

that has been exemplified for years in our State, which we're extremely product of. So, we are making progress in our State. We're committed to the improvement of our economy; we're totally committed and an extreme high priority in our administration to improvement of our educational facilities; we have over \$180,000,000 of research on-going in our three major institutions within our State. That's unprecedented for the State of Georgia.

Then we have a research consortium that is partly funded by private sector monies, and partly matched by State money to fund centers of excellence within our institutions for research, and we're continuing to do that and committed to the future of the research consortium within our State.

We've got a lot to be proud of, and the population in Georgia has grown over a million people in the last 10 years; two million people in the last 20; we're projected to grow over one million people in the next 10 years, and certainly, we're going to continue to work toward the growth and progress that we feel that — if we provide the proper leadership that the State is going to have.

Let me say again, that we're extremely pleased that you would chose Georgia for your

 convention; you have an excellent program, I was looking over the program that you have planned, and the facilities that you're among is some of the best in the world, and so, we're pleased that you're here, and we want you to come back to Georgia to visit any time.

"Nobody threats you better than Georgia", that's our motto in our State, and we certainly are working very hard to live up to that.

But, we welcome you, not only to come back as a visitor; with the kind of momentum we have in Georgia, we feel that if you would look at Georgia, and invest in Georgia, that you'd find the bottom line, and return on your investment is probably going to be greater than you can find in any other State in the United States.

So, we welcome you, and we're glad you're here, and we appreciate you letting us come by and visit with you for a few moments this morning.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you, Governor Harris, for those welcoming words in, what I might add, is the great tradition of hospitality that Georgia so richly deserves, particularly, Governor Harris coming on such

short notice to be with us this morning.

We are pleased, and fortunate in having with us a number of distinguished visitors from abroad; our guests come from Australia, Canada, England, France, Mexico, The Netherlands, The Philippines, Scotland, and South Africa.

It's been my privileged to meet these people as I represented the Institute in their countries, and it's a personal pleasure to bid them welcome on behalf of the Institute this morning.

I regret that our schedule does not allow you to hear, individually, from these gentlemen, but, I know from my personal experience, that you would be interested in what you have to say; however, I would be remiss if I did not, at least, introduce them to you at this time; please hold your welcome until I have introduced them all, and gentlemen, would you please rise as I can your names.

First, from Australia, Geoff Kelleher,
Deputy President of the Institute of Chartered
Accountants in Australia.

From Canada, Bill Grace, newly elected President of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants, and with him is Ken Fincham, the Executive Director of the Institute.

From England, I want you to meet Alan
Hardcastle, President of the Institute of Chartered
Accountants in England and Wales, and John Warne, the
Institute's Secretary.

From France we have Edouard Salustro,

Chairman of the Institute's International Affairs

Committee; Edouard came a little late and perhaps

didn't make it quite so early this morning—he arrived

late last night.

From our neighbords to the south, in Mexico, Victor Aguilar, who is the President of the Mexican Institute.

From the Netherlands, and a special pleasure to introduce to you, my partner, Jan Bosman, President of the Netherlands Institute.

From Scotland, Bill Morrison, President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland.

From South Africa, Ken Mockler, the Executive Director of the South African Institute of Chartered Accountants.

In addition, we have two guests who do not represent their native countries, but, who, in a sense, represent the world of accountancy; they are Washington Sycip of the Philippines, President of the International Federation of Accountants known as IFAC;

and, Bob Sempier, the Executive Director of that organization.

Please, now, if you will, join me in welcoming our distiguished guests.

(Applause.)

Thank you, gentlemen, for being with us.

There is a special group of members whose presence I'd like to acknowledge; those who are attending their first annual meeting; our meetings are held in various parts of the country to make it possible for members who are unable to commit to travel great distances to attend, when the location is convenient to them.

Members attending their first Institute meeting have been given a red penant for their badges; we urge you to wear those, and we urge all of the old timers to make a special effort to make them feel welcome.

If you spot somebody with one of those red penants, you'll recognize him as a new member, or, at least, a member attending for the first time; please say, hello, or, if your disposition suggests, as mine does, "howdy".

Although it's not necessary to outline the two day annual meeting program, since the printed

programs are included in the registration kits, I should remind the members that all of the sessions marked, CPE, are recommended for credit under voluntary, or required CPE programs at the State level.

Those who seek credit should observe the requirement that they attend the sessions from start to finish, and complete an attendance form, a copy of which should be returned to the Institute Division of CPE at the end of the meeting.

I should note that we've introduced a few changes in our usual program which will have — we hope this meeting more meaningful to you. A number of members have suggested that the update technical standard sessions be replaced with a deeper treatment—an indepth treatment for subject matters.

You'll see from your program that we've scheduled mini-conferences for all non-Plenary session events. This format was endorsed by members last year, and so we've repeated it again.

Also, as we did last year, President Phil Chenok will conduct a panel of technical committee chairmen, who will give us the last word on developments in their areas of responsibility. This session also received good reviews last year.

And, we have a first this year, our first national accounting exposition, which we've called, Accountants World. This show responds to requests from many members who have gone to such shows at State levels. Exhibitor response to this, our first show, has been excellent; they've come a long way to see us, and I hope that each of you will stop by to see them.

As you can see from the material in the program, the range of exhibits is vast, and all related to accounting.

Our program has been arranged to allow ample time for you to visit the show; we believe that you will find there is a tremendous savings in time when you up-date yourself here, rather than to take the time from your busy office schedules at home.

The success, or failure of the show is measured by the flow of traffic, or the lack of it; please be sure to stop by and give us your views on whether you want us to continue it.

We want, as always, to be responsive to the needs of the membership; in that connection, you'll find in your registration material, an evaluation form for this meeting; it's been folded so that it will fit into your program; please take it

 with you during the meeting, and note your evaluations while they are fresh in your mind; please complete it, and return it to us at the Institute, we want to respond to your views and will, if we know what they are.

Those of you who have attended annual meetings previously, will not a later than usual number of Institute staff present. Many will be staffing the Institute booths at the Accountants World. They are here to tell you about the many facits of the Institute's operation, and it's broadrange of member services.

Not a person here, and I include myself, can recite all of the services available to us from the Institute. Stop by that booth, or those booths, and learn how much more you can get for your dues dollar, and if you have a chance to visit with our staff, apart from the AICPA booth, I hope you will give them the benefit of your thoughts.

As I told Council on Saturday, at our meeting, our staff is a tremendous resourse, and I hope you'll take the opportunity to get to know them better.

We hope that you will like this new format, and again, invite you to comment on it after

__

the meeting; if we see that further change is desirable, we will make it.

A copy of the Annual Joint Message from the Chairman, and President Phil Chenok, together with the audited financial statements for the year just ended, have been given to each of you as registrants, and additional copies are available at the registration desk.

These also will be — will appear in the Journal of Accountancy, which is mailed to all members.

As was reported in the CPA letter, Council has adopted a policy in regard to the conduct of its meeting, and the meetings of membership which provide as follows:

Resolved: Any motion, or amendments to motions on which actions of the assembly is desired should be delivered, in writing, to the Chairman of the meeting. At the very least, it should be delivered in writing when made. Preferably, it should be submitted sufficiently before the meeting so that copies can be made for distribution prior to the meeting.

However, this general policy will not preclude the making of any motion at any time

1

(so long as it is in order), and, so long as it is reduced to writing, and delivered to the Chairman, when made.

The assembly, or the Chairman, can, at any time, waive that policy favoring the submission of motions in writing.

This meeting will be conducted pursuant to that policy.

I have not received any copies of proposed motions in connection with this meeting; the Council intended its policy to foster full consideration of issues, and to promote reasoned, knowledgable voting on any motion made.

It is my desire, and it has been, and I hope the desire of future chairmen as well, to have before each person, before being asked to vote on a motion, the actual text of the motion to be voted on.

The secretary informs me that we have a quorum, and I'd like now, to call on John Hessenius, Partner of Main Hurdman, the Institute's auditors, to come to the podium and present his report; John?

MR. HESSENIUS: Thank you, B.J.

On behalf of Main Hurdman, I'm pleased to report to you on our examination of the Institute's financial statements for the year just ended.

Those financial statements, and our opinion, are contained in the Annual Report, which, as you just heard, will be a part of the Journal of Accountancy in the November issue.

Our opinion is unqualified, and our examination was performed in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards.

No restrictions were placed on the scope of our examination, and all information was given to us as requested.

We met twice during the year with the Audit Committee, and reviewed, in depth, with them our audit scope, and our findings, and recommendations for improvement in internal accounting control.

I'll be pleased to answer any questions you may have with respect to either our examination, or the Institute's financial statements.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Are there any questions for John?

(Negative response.)

Well, John, it looks like there are none, and that means the report was everything we've come to expect from Main Hurdman, and we thank you very much.

I need a motion to receive the report of the auditors; I have a motion and a second; all those

in favor, please say, aye.
(Audience responded.)

Opposed?

(Negative response.)

Motion carries. Thank you very much, John.

I'm pleased to announce too, that at the Saturday meeting of Council, Main Hurdman was reelected auditors for the Institute, and the affiliated entities for the year 1984 and '85.

It's now my pleasure and privilege to introduce winners of several awards for achievement in the Uniform CPA examination.

The award winner have been recognized in the annual meeting program, and were presented with their awards at a breakfast this morning.

I'd like to call the winners to stand as their names are mentioned; first, George Kamperschroer; George is the winner of the Sells Gold Medal for the highest grade total on the November, 1983, exam.

John Allen Fuerst, winner of the Sells Gold Medal for the May, 1984, exam.

Jeffrey Kinrich, winner of the Sells
Silver Medal for the second highest grade total on the

November exam.

À

And, Todd J. Sladky, winner of the Sells Silver Medal for the May, 1984, exam.

The Sells Bronze Medal has been awared to a candidate achieving the third highest grade total; the winner for November, 1983, was Judith Ann Barnett, and for the 1984 exam, Virginia K., Metzger.

Congratulations to all of the winners; you certainly have made a significant start on your professional careers, and we wish you the very best in the years to come.

Included in the registration packet is a booklet entitled, The Public Service Award Program for Certified Public Accountants. The AICPA Public Service Committee, established this program four years ago to give recognition to CPAs who have attained a high level of public service, and to inform the public that CPAs participate in, and contribute to their communities.

This year, 34 CPAs were honored by their respective State Societies for such distinguished public service. They serve their community in many ways, from establishing a home for the aged, to being a volunteer firefighter, to serving on the city council.

The AICPA applauds their accomplishments, and encourages all members to become active in public service.

The gold medal is the highest honor bestowed by the American Institute to a member whose influence on the profession as a whole is distinguished when compared with other contemporary leaders. It was in 1944, that the Institute established the gold metal for distinguished service to the profession, and several members who have achieved that honor are present today, and I'd like to ask them to stand and be recognized by this assemblage, please.

In 1964, the medal was awarded to Andrew Barr.

(Applause.)

In 1975, to Leroy Layton, and Louis Kessler.

(Applause.)

In 1978, to Sam Derieux.

(Applause.)

And, in 1982, to Mike Chetkovich.

(Applause.)

Thank you, very much.

And, it is my -- it is with a very special

sense of pleasure that I asked Sam Derieux, Chairman of this year's Awards Committee, to the podium to present the gold medal award for this year. Sam?

MR. DERIEUX: Thank you, B.Z.

As B.Z. has pointed out, this gold medal award was established in 1944; there is no requirement that any medal be given in a particular year, and, indeed, in some years none has been given, and other years, there have been more than one.

This year's award is given posthumously to William R. Gregory, and it's a privilege for me to be able to present that award to his wife, Virginia, and his daughters, who are going to join me in just a minute up here.

I would like to read now, from the scroll, which will be presented:

"Bill Gregory rose so fast in the ranks of the profession's leadership that he eclipsed many of us in his achievements, and in his thinking.

His service on the State level peaked when he became president of the Washington Society of CPAs in 1967, and represented that State on the AICPA Governing Council; from that time on he served continuously on AICPA committees.

His interest spanned the whole spectrum of the professional program, from the trial board, to continuing professional education, whose executive committee he chaired with distinction. He was the first chairman of the Accounting and Review Services Committee, which broke new ground in establishing standards for reviews and compilations.

His interest in the profession, as a whole, but, with particular attention to the needs of local practitioners from which he came.

His even-handedness was shown in his conduct of an unprecedented special meeting of the membership on July 11, 1980, called at the petition of a few hundred members. The proposals at that meeting did not carry, and a divisiveness which could have existed, was laid to rest.

It was as chairman of the AICPA Board of Directors that Bill Gregory made his greatest contribution; he was deeply concerned with the practicing CPAs, in their zeal from growth and new business, were losing their prime focus as independent objective professionals. He recognized that the relaxation of ethical rules

on advertising and solitation were in the public interest, but, he also recognized that excesses in these activities could lead to compromises in the adherence to professional standards.

He traveled extensively in office, calling on every audience to rededicate itself to the standards of this profession, adherence to standards, exercise of individual responsibility, independence of attitude, and self-restraint. He dramatized that mission when, in conducting the annual members meeting in 1980, he challenged the members present to stand, and physically proclaim their dedication to these principles.

Bill Gregory died a short six months after leaving office; his work for the profession only partly completed, but, he left us with a legacy of solid accomplishments; he challenged CPAs to rededicate themselves to the highest levels of professional behavior and service to our public.

For his farsightedness, for his hard work for the profession he loved, and for his leadership in rededication to professionalism, AICPA gratefully has granted to William R. Gregory its highest award, the gold medal for

distinguished service."

Virginia, if you, Cathy, Joan, Nancy, Wanda, and son-in-law David, would please come up so I can present you with these awards.

(Applause.)

Virginia, that is the scroll, and this is the gold medal, which I know you and your family shall cherish.

MRS. GREGORY: Thank you.

MR. DERIEUX: As I mentioned, it's a particular pleasure and privilege for me to present this because, if I may be permitted a few personal references, Sarah Francis and I, shared many experiences with Virginia and Bill, from the occasion on which they had the honor of being presented to the Queen of England, to a difference experience when Bill was flying in one of these kites over Acapolco Bay, and the motor boat pulling that kite conked out, and Bill was dunked into Acapolco Bay.

So, all of these things, Virginia, and to all of your family, make it a real privilege for me to be able to present this award.

(Applause.)

MRS. GREGORY: It is an honor for all of us to be invited here to accept this medal for Bill,

and for those who knew him, you know what this honor would have meant to him.

He truly loved his profession and was devoted to it, and had the highest respect for the Institute, and his fellow colleagues; as I was preparing this, I had gone over some of Bill's old speeches, and in them there was a recurrence of professionalism, and with this note, I'd like to leave you with an excerpt from a speech of 1980, at the AICPA convention in Boston.

"There is a place and a need in our lives for being professional in the traditional sense, that is, that it is important to our future to think and act like true professionals, and if we do so we then can take pride in ourselves and in our profession, and that, in itself, is very important reward."

We, the family, thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN LEE: It's hard to follow that.

Virginia said to me last night that she was -- she was pleased that this award was to be given to her during my term as Chairman, not nearly as pleased as I, but, pleased nevertheless.

Bill and I were close, and if I didn't

know about love for this profession before I met him, he certainly taught me a lot about it, enough so that I do now.

Thank you, Virginia.

At its meeting on Saturday, the governing Council of the Institute took some actions, and I'd like to report those to you; we decided, for a second time, not to authorize a membership ballot seeking to modify Rule 302, the Contingent Fee Rule.

We also declined to let instructions to the Ethics Committee not to issue a proposed interpretation of the Commission's Rule stand, we —— let me be sure I made that plain; we did not lift the instruction to ethics with respect to the Commission rule, so, it will stand as it is now in the material.

It left standing the instruction that both Rules should be enforced in the regular and ordinary way.

Council received a report of progress from the special committee on Standards for Professional Conduct; that Committee which has come to be known as the Anderson Committee, and we are in hopes that that Committee's final report will be ready for us at this time next year.

Finally, Council received from our

consultants, Cresap, McCormick and Paget, a report on its study of the staff/Institute operations. Our staff got high marks, as you would expect, for dedication and effectiveness; we also received, from them, recommendations for improvements which are being implemented. This will make for a much more effective public relations and external affairs, and communications network, and improve our planning procedures.

It is both traditional and appropriate that the out-going Chairman make some remarks, a sort of a validictory, based on the year past, and his experiences in that year.

In the annual joint message, which I've already mentioned, and which is included in your package, Phil Chenok and I, covered the Institute's activities for the year, and I don't intend to repeat any of that, or, at least, not much of it now.

I'd rather talk about another area, some of my personal impressions based on my year as Chairman of the Institute.

Let me start by telling you that it has been a wonderful and a most rewarding experience;

Alicia and I expected much and we found more.

I started the year with some very strong

convictions about our profession, convictions which I would note for you, are based on more than 30 years of practice, and 30 years of membership of the Institute. During that time I've observed both the profession and the Institute as a local firm staff member, a staff person at one of the largest firms—largest national firms, a co-founder of a two-man practice, as a partner in a national firm, and as a managing partner of that firm; a rather varied perspective, I think you would agree.

I should note, too, that during that time
I had the advantage of functioning both in my home
State of Texas, and in New York. So, those strong
convictions that I held, come from a rather broad
base, and are largely almost exclusively centered
about the people of this profession, their character,
integrity, and commitment.

I needed no affirmation of those views, and I sought none; indeed, at the start of the year, I would not have believed it possible to hold this group in a higher regard. Nevertheless, I received much to not only support my admiration and respect for my colleagues, Cohen, Frairs, and Associates, but, enough to intensify an already deeply held feeling.

I could demonstrate that in countless

ways, but, let me select only one; during this year I, as all Chairmen, called on many to serve the Institute, and the profession one way or another.

Now, one would expect some refusals; the simple pressure of time would suggest that to us. But, let me tell you that there were none, and I repeat, none.

Every member of this Institute on whom I called, and who I asked for time for special assignments, gave it, and eagerly. Every firm for which these members worked, either as a partner, or staff, were equally free in their willingness to contribute. It is to say the least, a powerful experience; powerful not in the sense that the Chairman has power, but, powerful in its impact on the Chairman as an individual. It makes the job one of the greatest honors that the profession can bestow even more pleasureful than it might otherwise be.

So, on behalf of all of us who have been privileged to serve as Chairmen, let me express my sincere admiration to all who have given so generously in our mutual interest.

Let me also express, at this point, my appreciation to a most dedicated Institute staff; they are a remarkable bunch of people committed in unbelievable fashion to this profession, and to the

Institute. They make it look relatively easy; they 2 know, I have expressed it to them more than once at 3 Council meeting that they have my ever-lasting gratitude.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would leave the Chairmanship with one admonishion to this profession and to this Institute, and particularly, and especially to its leadership; to say that we are functioning in a period of dynamic change, is obvious; it is to be sure, all about us, and the rate of that change is rapid. What I will not accept, and I do not agree with those who suggest that we are engulfed by it, powerless to do anything about it; we can, and we must do what is necessary to shape our future and the future of those who aspire to a career in this profession.

I spent a good deal of time this year, and most recently, last Thursday and Friday, with the Special Committee on Standards of Professional Conduct for CPAs; I'm convinced more than ever of the significance of their deliberations, and the impact that their work can have on this profession and its future.

I'm equally convinced that it can, and it will require courage and intellectual integrity to implement their conclusions and their recommendations; if that should be correct, if bold action is suggested, then I charge future Chairmen, and the leadership of this profession to have the character necessary to bring it to pass.

We must resolve the dilemma that I have describe all through my year as, commercialism and professionalism; and, as I said a year ago, I'm satisfied that we can, and I'm more than ever satisfied having participated with the Anderson Committee, that it will come to pass.

I've heard their aspirational expections for this profession, and that convinces me; but, the answers are not yet clear; what appears to be clear is that the resolution may, and probably will require bold action.

So, I charge the leadership to take that action. I believe it's needed and expected of them; the profession is looking to them for leadership, and I charge them to provide it.

We ran an article—or, we reran an article written by Jacques Barzun, Professor Americas of Columbia University, in the March issue of the Journal of Accountancy, and I've carried that article with me even before it was rerun in the Journal, and I have read to just about every audience I've spoken to in

•

the last year, these final words.

In his article, Barzun is speaking about ethics, and he's not speaking about ethics of this profession, but, he's speaking about ethics of all of the learned professions, and he concludes by saying, that to effect a moral regeneration which can come about only when the members of a group feel once more confident that ethical behavior is desirable, widely practiced, approved, and admired, and after a marked decline it can only be a slow growth, and only one force can start it on its way, the force of moral and intellectual leadership; and, that's the charge that I would leave to my successors.

Now, this is the point in the proceedings when we will have an open session, and if there is any other business to come before this assembly, this would be the time for it, and I understand that my dear friend Rholand Larson has a piece of business which I've been waiting for most anxiously.

Rhol and?

MR. LARSON: Thank you, B.Z.

There aren't many responsibilities left for the immediate past Chairman, but, I have to say I have been looking forward with eager anticipation to this opportunity to say a few choice words about my

successor.

I knew B.Z. before he was nominated as Vice Chairman of the Institute, but, after that, Ruth and I came to know B.Z. and Alicia, of course, much better. We had a lot of great experience in that year when we served together, a lot of good laughs; I considered sharing a few of those with you so that you would appreciate even more, some of B.Z.'s unique humor. But, I decided that would probably detract a little bit from the real message that I wanted to leave in these brief moments.

I really came to appreciate B.Z. during the year he served with me as Vice Chairman; he was just great; always supportive; he had just an unusual and incisive grasp of the issues of this profession; it was obvious, during that time, as well as in my experience with him before; you all know that he serves with a real commitment, and of course, all that adds up to a tremendously effective person.

This past year I continued to serve on the Board of Directors, and I had a chance to see him function as Chairman of that group, and my admiration for him only increased. He really demonstrated superb leadership during this last year.

There really are no words that can

express, I think, my feelings about B.Z., and about the job he has done, but, I do want to leave you, B.Z., with just two; one is, respect; a great amount of respect for the job you have done, but, maybe even more importantly, respect for B.Z. as a person, and I know all of you who know him, share that.

Q

The second one, which is probably even more important is, gratitude, and I want to express my personal gratitude for the opportunity to work with you, B.Z., it was a great experience, and I'm the richer for it, as I said to the Board the other evening.

But, I want to express the gratitude of the membership for the really fine, superb, and excellent job you have done; and, of course -- (Applause.)

-- what I'm really here to do is to present B.Z. with his Past Chairman's Pin, and I do that with real enthusiasm, and, B.Z., I know you will wear it proudly.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you very much,

Rholand. I will, indeed, wear this pin with a great
sense of pride, and with the same sort of pride that I
observed those who were honored to receive it before
me have, when they wear it.

,

__

Thank you, Rholan, for those kind words, and thank you all very much.

Now, we are in the open session, and I understand there are at least two who would address this assembly; I see one approaching the microphone.

MS. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I am Maxine
Young, a member of the AICPA from Fort Wayne, Indiana.

I thought the entire system of reporting is independence, without independence, there's no objectivity, and there's no integrity. As a member of this Institute, I received the CPA letter of April 9, 1984; the CPA letter of April 9, 1984, contained a supplement, which I hold in my hand, entitled: Report of the Nominations Committee. To my surprise, I read in the report that four members of the Nominations Committee were nominated to high office in the AICPA.

Mr. Chairman, it's inconceivable to me
that the Nominations Committee would nominate members
of its own Committee. It does not matter whether
those four individuals left the room during the
meeting—during the vote taking, if they participated
in their own nominations, or whatever, events such as
these certainly detract from the membership confidence
in official proceedings.

Undoubtedly, members of the public, and

the financial press as well, read the CPA letter; what can be their perception of our profession when they read such things as these.

For the reasons which I just cited, I hereby move the following motion:

"Whereas independence and objectivity are fundamental to the public accounting profession, and

Whereas the public perception of the accounting profession must enhance and not detract from our appearance of independence, and

Whereas the Nominations Committee of the AICPA must be independent and objective in their deliberations and recommendations, and,

Whereas it is inappropriate for members of the Nominations Committee to be nominated as an officer, director, member of Council, or national trial board,

Therefore, be it resolved that it is the sense of this annual — this meeting of the AICPA, that members of the Nominations Committee not be nominated to hold office as an officer, director, member of Council, or member of national trial board, and be it further

Resolved that the Board of Directors,

and/or the Council of the AICPA submit to the membership an amendment to the by-laws which would prohibit such practice in the future."

Mr. Chairman, I move this motion.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN LEE: We have a motion and a second. Yes?

MR. SERT: My name is John Sert from New Orleans, Louisiana, and I would just like to add my second to this resolution of Ms. Young. I believe her explanation and the contents of the resolution are clear.

I just want to make one statement to make it understood that this certainly is no reflection on the members of the Committee when they nominated him; they're all very fine gentlemen, and eminently qualified for the position, but, I think for the future, the American Institute should just not put itself in such a position that would subject it to criticism; therefore, I urge support for this resolution.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you. Is there anybody else who would speak to the resolution?

I'd like to tell this body that I, as

Chairman of the Institute, received a letter earlier

in the year addressing this very subject matter, and I have been elected by Council on Saturday of last week to Chair the Nominating Committee for the ensuing year, and it is my intention to make that Nominating Committee aware of those sentiments; I would not tell you that I do not share those sentiments; we have 215,000 members of the Institute, many, if not most of whom are eminently qualified to serve, and it had been my intention, absent such a motion, to urge the Committee to conduct itself in conformity.

Now, I advise this body of that in the hopes that it may be — they may see it appropriate to defer any action on a motion which, in my judgment, needs their time and consideration, and perhaps even needs response from those who might feel to the contrary, I, for one, not being one of them. I just thought that I would exercise the privilege of the Chair so that this body in acting, would understand where we, as a group, are.

I see John Meinert.

MR. MEINERT: John Meinert from Illinois.

This question was discussed at great

length when I was Chairman of the By-laws Committee; I

happen to be from industry so I hope that even though

I'm not independent, I do have integrity.

the sentiments, and I'm glad to hear what you said, B.Z., because what we did at that, in great length, we spent more time on the Nominating Committee than any other change in the by-laws, and we decided that we wanted more candidates and greater representation, and we felt that we should consider at least 22 candidates and only 11, then, from that 22, would be selected for election to the Nominations Committee, so, the first thing we wanted was a very broad based Nominating Committee.

I would like to say that I share some of

It has developed somewhat that way,
perhaps not as fully as we all would appreciate;
people in industry and education are still underrepresented, and sometimes some of the newer members-younger members are underrepresented; it still tends
to be some of the old-timers that get on the
Nominating Committee and I think we have to watch that
as we select new members for the Nominating Committee;
however, we did put in this, and it was narrowly
passed, as those who were at the Council meeting may
remember, there was a good deal of concern that we
were going to get inexperienced members, but, we
managed to get this through by a narrow vote, and that
was that no more than three candidates to the

Nominating Committee itself shall be members of the Council, and no more than one of such three Council members shall be a member of the Board of Directors, and then, of course, they select them new, B.Z., because we did feel that the out-going Chairman should have experience in the people, and the selection of the people.

I would like to see us — I would voice my opinion that the motion is not needed at this time, but, I also would voice my opinion that we do need broad representation on the Nominating Committee, and when the Nominating Committee selects officers and directors, that they bear in mind that we should have a broad base representation.

However, I do not feel that anyone should be deliberately not selected just because he has experience, or just because he's served before; I think we need a mix of experience, and if you may say, inexperience, or people who are learning; I think we need a fresh point of view; I think we need fresh perspectives; new blood, at it will, young members and so on, and people that have not been — have not seen prior service. But, I would like to see that happen within the framework that we've already established.

CHAIRMAN LEE: John, thank you very much

Á

for those explanatory words.

Is there anybody else who would speak to the motion? I see somebody rising in the back.

MR. CLEAVMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm Ed Cleavman, Long Island.

I don't think that the previous speaker addressed the issue; it's not a matter of having new-fresh people serve on the Nominations Committee; the issue is that those who do serve on the Nominating Committee not be nominated for office; that, I think is the issue, and I would support the motion because I think it is eminently fair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you. Is there anybody else who would speak to the motion, or against it? Yes, thank you.

MR. FALLS: I'm Tom Falls from Washington,
D. C.

You inferred that if this motion were defeated there is machinery to consider it, and I don't know what that machinery is.

CHAIRMAN LEE: I can't speak about machinery; I can tell you what my intent is. It is my intent, and I should note, I think, my limited experience, which is as an observative issues

committee, had the Chairman of the Current Year's suggest that nomination of the Committee Members themselves to high station should be resisted; I mean to express that to the Committee; I mean to urge it on them with all of the strength that I can muster; I can tell you that insofar as I am able, as the Chairman of the Current Year's Committee, that such a motion would be unnecessary, and I'd already decided to suggest similar action to future chairmen.

That does not suggest machinery, that just suggests my personal frame of mind, perhaps. I hope that helps.

Yes, sir?

MR. COX: Mr. Chairman, I'm Bill Cox from Houston, a member of the Nominating Committee of the Texas Society, and as you know we do have this rule in Texas, and it has served us very well to eliminate criticism of self-perpetuation, and I think it would serve the American Institute well, and I rise to second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you, Bill.

John?

MR. McMULLEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm John McMullen from Atlanta, Georgia.

I must speak in favor of the motion, and

22

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

wanted to be sure the members understand the basis behind this; there are 11 members of the Nominating Committee; four members were nominated. I don't think anyone is questioning the integrity of the nominating process; we'd simply like to have the process changed so that there is no question about that in the future; but, to have 36 percent of the members of the Nominating Committee nominated, does not appear to lend objectivity.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you, John. Francis Humphries.

MR. HUMPHRIES: B.Z., I'm Francis
Humphries from Charleston, South Carolina.

I agree that it is a tragedy that four members of the Nominating Committee were nominated to high office, but, I also think it was a mistake, and I think possibly the one thing worse that we could do than nominating those four members to high office, is to take precipitous action on amending the by-law; we had the study group, which I happened to be a member of, that spent long hours trying to determine just what the by-laws of this Institute should be.

I'd like to see the integrity of this body given a chance to overcome a mistake like that, rather than to make another rule that we all had to live by.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LEE: Thank you, Francis.

I hear a call for the question, and is there a second? I'll read the motion, if I may, without all the Whereas':

"Now, therefore, be it resolved that is
the sense of this annual business meeting of the
American Institute of Certified Public
Accountants, that members of the Nominations
Committee not be nominated to hold office as an
officer, director, member of council, or member
of the national trial board, and

Be it further resolved that the Board of Directors and/or the Council of the Institute, submit to the membership, an amendment to the by-laws which would permit such practice in the future."

Is the question clear? All those in favor, please say, aye.

(Audience responds.)

All those opposed?

(Audience responds.)

I would say the, ayes, have it; motion passed.

Is there any other business to come before

this assembly, or anybody -- yes?

MR. KNIGHT: B.Z., I'm Pat Knight from Florida.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's been two years since we reported at an annual meeting on the implementation of the 150 hour accounting education requirements which is sometimes referred to as, fifth year, and the Florida delegation believes that maybe a brief up-date is in order.

As you may know, effective in August, 1983, all first time Florida applicants who applied to sit for the CPA exam must have complied with the new 150 hour law.

The fifth year is working well in Florida; we received excellent feed-back from students and professors alike; the program is settling into place, and all the elements are very much on track.

And, importantly, those involved in the implementation are both enthusiastic and optimistic, they believe that the idea is sound and timely.

We applaud the AICPA, notably through the efforts of the Commission on Professional Accounting Education for stepping up their involvement and activity in support of increased education. Since the work of this Commission has now been completed, the

1 2 3

AICPA recently appointed a special committee on implementation of a post-baccalaureate education requirement.

This Committee, chaired by Bob Ellison of Florida, is available to meet with State Society representatives, and any other groups interested in discussing the implementation of a legislative requirement for the fifth year.

We understand that to date, seven States have heard a presentation from Bob, and his Committee, and that four others have been scheduled.

Once again, we encourage all of you to consider the 150 hour education requirement in your own State, and if our experience in Florida can be of any help to you, please let us know; we'll be glad to help you in anyway that we can.

Thank you.

(Motion made.)

CHAIRMAN LEE: Pat, thank you very much.

Are there any others who would address
this assemblage?

Well, seeing none, I would ask for a motion for adjournment; we will then take a coffee break and come back for the President's Panel; do I have a motion?

5

Ó

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All in favor?

(Audience responds.)

We are adjourned, and would you be good enough to come back at 11:15; thank you. (Short recess.)

> I'd like to welcome you PRESIDENT CHENOK: all to this panel session. We have with us this morning a group of AICPA Committee representatives who are involved with all the areas of the profession, and I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce them, and to thank them in advance for participating.

On my far left is Roger Cason who is Chairman of the Accounting Standards Executive Committee.

Next to him is Phil Crawford, a member of the Accounting and Review Services Committee.

On my immediate left is Al Ellentuck, who is Chairman of the Federal Tax Executive Committee.

On my immediate right is Merle Elliott, Chairman of the MAS Executive Committee.

Next to him is David Landsittel, Chairman of the Auditing Standards Board.

And, on my far right, Monday Lowe, Chairman of the Professional Ethics Executive Committee.

Our objective this morning will be to try to bring you up to date on the activities of the Senior Technical Committees; the format for this session is a panel; I will be directing a number of questions to each of the individuals here.

Also, at the end of the aisle are some question cards, and time permitting, we will try to respond to questions that you may have as a result of the presentation.

Now, let's get started, and let me begin with the tax area, Al; that's one that certainly has received an awful lot of attention this year.

Now, I know there are some technical developments, but, before we get into that, perhaps you can tell us a little bit about the newly created membership tax division; how many Institute members have joined, what activities have been developed, and what are your plans for the future, Al?

MR. ELLENTUCK: Well, Phil, I'm pleased to say that the Tax Division is coming along very nicely, possibly better than we had anticipated.

At the time Council approved the establishment of the Tax Division, which was just about a year ago, we had some 250 appointed members; by April of '84, we had our organization pretty well

set up, and we sent out invitations to the entire AICIPA membership; at present count, we have over 12,000 members, and those applications are still coming in.

We set the dues at \$70 a year with a short grace period for those joining before August 1st; benefits include a subscription to the Tax Advisor, which is, as you know, an outstanding publication, and this gives a big boost to the Tax Advisor; invitations to our semi-annual meetings; members will receive the newsletter, position papers, agendas, a whole flow of information—reports on our activities of the subcommittees' task forces, and the Executive Committee; and, to encourage participation, each member will have the ability to monitor the activities of one of our subcommittees—we have 17 subcommittees covering the gamut in taxes, a whole wide—range of subject areas.

One of the most important benefits is, as I said, our semi-annual meetings, and we have one coming up in December in Orlando; we are expecting somewhere between 500 and 1,000 people attending, which could be as much as — it could be as many as four times what we normally have in attendance.

At this point, I think we've overcome our first hurtle which is to put together a package of

dues and benefits which would be attractive to as many members of the AICPA as possible.

The next hurtle, as I see it, is to involve these new members in the activities of the Division, but, at the same time to move ahead the work that we're doing, and to move ahead effectively even with the involvement of so many more members.

Our objectives were to give a significant portion of the AICPA membership the opportunity to become involved in the activities—the professional activities that we're engaged in, in a meaningful way. We think this will result in CPAs being better informed on taxes, and, as a whole, up-grading the level of practice. We think we'll have a greater pool of tax talent to assist in the works of the Tax Division; and, perhaps the most important, we think the new Division will, and possibly already has, underscored the preeminent role of the CPA in tax practice, and strengthen the impacts of the positions that we're taking on various issues.

We noticed that already when we testified before Congress, and when we speak with the Commissioner, we seem to be getting a better reception.

So, I must say that at this point, so

early in our genesis, we seemed to have moved pretty far along that road to achieving our goals.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Thanks, Al. What about tax legislation; what can we look forward to this year; there's a lot of talk about tax simplification, a flat tax, substitutions of other kinds for the existing income tax; what is the status of these proposals, and what — what has the Tax Division done by way of response?

MR. ELLENTUCK: Well, Phil, the most likely legislation that we can expect next year is something that I regret to say, will be similar to what we had this year, and the Tax Reform Act of 1984; we're expecting a bill with many minor changes, loophole closers, revenue raisers, which is going to add more—even more complexity to our tax law, and which we — we deplore and have some recommendations to deal with.

The flat tax, of course, has attracted the most interest; there's a lot of talk about it, and a lot of talk in Congress about the flat tax. The discussions now are actually focusing on what we call, a modified flat tax, that one — one of those is the, fair tax, which will give you some rate progressivity, and some deductions, a little different than the pure

flat tax.

The Senate Finance Committee held some hearings, at which I testified on behalf of the AICFA, and it essentially said that we had serious doubts as to whether the flat tax would achieve equity and simplicity, that they were hoping for and expecting, and that the present system, which we've been working under for 71 years would really require a lot more thought and contemplation before attempting to change that system, a lot like genetic engineering, you better think carefully before you start tampering with it.

What's happening, interestingly enough, is that the interest in the flat tax seems to be wanning as more and more Congressmen start understanding what's really involved in it, and how it would really work.

So, we will continue to testify and be active as the debates on flat tax go on, but, we think that may well die out in favor of some other major reform that Congress is considering.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Al, what about particular areas, what do you see as the specific targets for change this year—or, what's the Government going to do to try to raise additional revenue

next year?

MR. ELLENTUCK: Phil, the basic areas of tax form that the Congress and Treasury are looking at, as you may now, Treasury is now involved in a major study of alternative tax systems, which they're expecting to deliver—to make public by December, conveniently, right after the election; they are looking at a consumption base tax which is essentially — it give you a deduction for savings; an example of consumption base provision that we have in our tax law now is the IRA, for example.

They're looking at VAT, which is a value added tax, or a national sales tax, and maybe looking at some base broadening, which is the flat tax without the flat rate.

Each has its own problems; possibly we will see some features of each of these major alternative tax systems cropping up and seeping into our system. We believe, however, that Congress really needs to take a different tact, and we've testified to that effect. The tax laws become much too complex if they pass this — another similar provision; in '85 it will be even more complex.

The public and practitioners are really losing confidence in the system, and we've recommended

a national — the formation of a national commission on tax simplification to really start examining the tax law, simplifying it, and attempting to make it work without a drastic change.

Incidentally, the Tax Division has already in-place, two task forces, one on simplification, and one on studying the alternative tax system, so, we're kind of somewhat ahead of Congress and Treasury in this regard.

Revenue — there's only one thing that everybody agrees on, and that is that Congress will have to raise revenue next year, there's no question about that. One thing we may see are some minor revenue raisers—minor provisions that raise revenue, similar to what we had in the Tax Reform Act of '84.

Congress also might simply face up to it and raise our rates; we'll have to see about that.

And, the third possibility is a valuated tax, or a national sales tax, possibly added on to our present system, not as a substitute. That may not happen next year, but, it could well happen within the next two or three years.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Thanks very much, Al.

Let's turn to another area where taxes are
a matter of concern, and that is in the accounting

area; the Financial Accounting Standards Board has a project on its agenda relating to income taxes, and Roger Cason, I wonder if you can tell us how that is developing, and how you see the effort moving forward.

MR. CASON: Thanks, Phil. It's kind of a dubious distinction to go from talking about paying taxes to talking about how to account for them.

The FASB held a public hearing on this topic this year; they also, in response to concerns about the timely guidance standards overload pressure, held three hearings with smaller companies and their auditors, to get an idea of how income taxes should be accounted for.

I guess they're a bit perplexed, because after being told that they should deal with taxes, make it a major agenda item, if there is a concensus it is that perhaps what we have is not too bad. A lot of the responses they're getting is similar to where we now stand.

Some of the issues—I guess the key issue is whether you're in favor of interperiod allocation, like you now have, or whether you're in favor of some kind of flow—through, or income tax method; I know a lot of the Institute's constituency favors that; the Technical Issues Committee is supportive of that; if

you go to some kind of allocation method, should you have comprehensive, pretty much like we now have, or some sort of partial as some countries have; I think if there is a concensus, probably about where we now stand would be that concensus.

And, then there's the question of if you have comprehensive you discount it; those who are

And, then there's the question of if you have comprehensive you discount it; those who are concerned about standards overload that this kind of just really brings fire in their eyes; and, even those who favor it are worried about its practicality of being able to do it.

Another issue is net operating losses, and the present rules on tax credits; the question on net operating losses is, should you ease the rules somewhat, right now, as you know, our standard is that you cannot recognize an NOL unless it's assured beyond any reasonable doubt, and there's some people who work in Washington, D. C., who define that as, never, at least, never such as they have seen, and then some would like that ease, or at least made it clear that you could recognize them earlier.

Their present agenda is to get out an exposure draft of a standard this year, and a final in 1985.

And, I guess in concluding, I have to

mention a comment that one of the major companies made when they were talking about their deferred taxes where they referred to them as, an unidentified growing objects.

Phil?

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Thanks, Roger. You mentioned a couple of things in the course of giving the answer, and that relates to the issues of standards overload and timely guidance. We have seen activity by the FASB in that area, and this year they are aggressively dealing with the matter. At the same time, as you suggested, there's a need to be responsive to pressing practice problems on a timely basis.

Now, it — it is a problem to reconcile these needs, and what I think we'd like to know is what actions is the Institute taking to deal with the matter; what's the FASB doing, and do you see any role for the conceptual frame-work in this question of giving guidance on more difficult problems?

MR. CASON: I guess, Phil, the answer — probably the easiest one first, on the conceptual frame-work, one of my partners has point out that on a recent standard, the board issue, and it had a four to three vote, those four in favor pointed to certain

paragraphs and concept statement three, and supporting the position, and the three dissenters pointed to some other paragraphs in concept statement three in support of their position.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, I would be surprised if the conceptual framework is helpful in resolving this conflict.

And, so what the Institute is doing, as you know, that there is a special committee of Standards Overload, chaired by Rholan Larson; one indication of overload is that at each meeting we had you get a packet of reading matter, like this, which takes several evenings to work your way through; that group has worked hard on trying to get the concept of differential measurement before the FASB, and to encourage them to give it due consideration. year, at Council, Don Kirk reported on their view on that which was somewhat hesitant, at best, and I'd say, during the year that they've convinced us they mean it. They were approached on Statement 34, capitalization of interest; they declined to view that as a candidate for differential measurement, so, I'm not too optimistic that that's going to be successful, although there's still the effort to generate support.

We've also tried to rewrite a standard and make it in what we would call, simple English, easy to

read, and shorter, and on a trial basis we picked up ASB 34, again, on interest capitalization.

We've got a document which we passed around to the TIC, to the Overload Committee, and to certain other interested parties, and maybe we picked them carefully, but, they believe it is simpler to read.

We've had a meeting with the FASB on that, and some of those people would agree to this—agree it is easier to read, and we're working forward, on a cooperative effort, to try and get some change on those standards.

So, I guess I'd say that we're cautiously optimistic on that.

We're also working with them to keep them sensitized better; even a complex area, perhaps you can write a less complex standard, although their most recent ED on computer software—accounting for computer software, I'm pleased to report that I've given that, for a cold read, to one of our staff, and to one of the Institute's staff, and they both have passed the test by giving the wrong answer as to what the accounting is in that document. So, we've had a selective part to that to our rewrite, much to the horror of the staff who now has to do it.

As to what the FASB is doing, they have formed their timely guidance task force; it has 15 members, most of them are practicing CPAs, although there are several representatives from industry; they're meeting monthly to identify new issues, and to hopefully reach a concensus.

Right now, their meeting agenda looks kind of like the, who's who of financial institution problems, and you almost have to have a special dictionary to understand the topics. I believe the staff and the board is encouraged by those early meetings.

I think, also, that the group itself is enthusiastic about it, and the idea being that it may result in less need for new standards.

And, finally on the technical bulletin, just maybe an alert; technical bulletins now can be issued on wider range of subjects; they can change a gap; they can change FASB standards; and, they also have an effective date; so, I believe they are more of a force to be reckoned with than they use to be.

Also, they are harder to respond to, because I believe the last two had a 30 day exposure period, and it's pretty hard to get up an running in 30 days, although when you first get it, it seems like forever.

Phil, I think that pretty well covers how we are there.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Very good. We talked about income taxes, and accounting for income taxes; early, about a year ago, I guess, we had another development that created concern in the tax area, and that was the Supreme Court decision granting IRS access to tax accural workpapers. At that time there was some concern about what impact that might have on the audit process, and I'd like to ask Dave Landsittel to tell us about how that decision was viewed by the Auditing Standards Board, and what we might be looking at in the future.

MR. LANDSITTEL: Phil, the quick bottom line to your question is that we, on the Auditing Standards Board, do not believe that the Arthur Young decision should have a significant impact on the audit process, and our information, to date, indicates that there is minimal, or no impact on practice at this point in time.

Now, let me give you a little bit of a background on the decision; as I'm sure almost all of you are aware, the Arthur Young decision was one where the Supreme Court ruled that an accountant's tax accrual working papers are, indeed, relevant to an

examiner's examination of the client's tax returns.

Not only did the decision rule that the working papers are relevant, but, also that the IRS could subpoena those papers, that there was not a privilege in the same way that, let's say, the attorneys have privilege, there's no accountant/client privilege that would prevent access to those working papers to an IRS agent.

After the Supreme Court decision, the IRS accounced a reinforcement of a policy that they have that was helpful to the profession, in that that reinforcement clearly stated that the IRS will only seek accountant's working papers on a very restrictive basis after certain limiting conditions are met, and that — that policy has resulted in very few, in fact, to my knowledge, with respect to our firm, no IRS requests for auditor working papers in this area since the Supreme Court decision.

With those developments, the Auditing Standards Board took a look at what the implications of the decision are; there were fears that the decision would have a negative impact on our audit process, notwithstanding the IRS policy statement, but, after examination, we concluded, on the Board, that there was no need for any standards setting

action on our part in response to the decision.

Now, there already is an audit interpretation that's presently outstanding that we believe that is very relevant to some areas that relate to the Supreme Court decision; that interpretation was issued in 1981, and really has three questions and answers that relate to problems that could come up in this area.

The first deals with what happens if a client attempts to limit the amount of work that the auditor perform in the tax area, or, limit the information that the auditor would have access to in conducting the audit, and the obvious response to that is, that for significant areas of the audit, the auditor is responsible for accumulating a significant evidentual matter, and that any limitations in this regard would require scope limitation in the auditor's report.

The second area in this interpretation, deals with audit workpaper documentation in response to a question of how much documentation does the auditor need to retain in the tax accrual area in support of its audit conclusions. The answer in this interpretation is not a specific one, because in the final analysis the amount of documentation depends on

7

professional judgment in the particular circumstances and cannot be specifically articulated.

But, the interpretation does caution that that working paper documentation should be sufficient to show—to support the auditor's conclusion in the significant audit areas, such as, presumably, income taxes in the normal audit.

And, finally, the interpretation deals with the matter of whether the auditor can rely solely on a legal counsel's opinion in the tax area to support his work on the adequacy of the income tax accrual account. And, the interpretation suggests that this would not be appropriate, primarily, because the auditor, in the rest of his audit process, gathers a lot of information with respect to matters that have an impact, or, potentially, have an impact on the tax accrual areas, and it's this close inner-action between income taxes and all the other areas that require the auditor's involvement that would really be separable from any procedure that would allow the auditor to solely rely upon response from legal counsel in this area.

In view of that interpretation that was issued in 1981, the Auditing Standards Board concluded, after close examination, that the inter-

pretation remains relevant, remained appropriate; we did put out a notice to practitioners that was published in the CPA letter that confirmed that interpretation, and also had a closing comment that really is in direct response to your question, it said, the Supreme Court decision should not change the auditor's approach to the audit of income tax accruals. PRESIDENT CHENOK: What about the tax area, Al, any problems there as a result of the

Supreme Court decision?

MR. ELLENTUCK: I would say that we really haven't had any problems in the tax area. What -- the most important development was the Commissioner's reaffirmation of the manual provision that David mentioned -- or, allowing access to workpapers only in very unusual circumstances; the Commissioner very properly came out with a statement that that manual provision was still in effect.

There was a brief flurry of Revenue agents requesting working papers, and as soon as they were cited to the manual provision they withdrew their requests and backed away, and we really have seen almost no reappearance of that problem of Revenue agents requesting working papers.

There was also isolated situations of

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

attorneys taking the position that the privilege protected them in working on tax accrual working papers—or, working on the tax accrual, and I think that the — the fact is that the attorney's privilege in this area is no greater than the CPA's privilege, and also the ASB's interpretation, back in '81, really put the matter to rest. So, as we see it, nothing is happening, and we don't really expect very much to happen in the near future, or in the long—term future.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: That's good.

Another hot topic that's hit us during the year has been issues that relate to banks, savings and

Another hot topic that's hit us during the year has been issues that relate to banks, savings and loan associations, finance companies, financial institutions; I wonder if I could ask Roger Cason and Dave Landsittel, if they would comment on those developments; Roger, from an accounting perspective, and Dave, from an auditing perspective.

Roger, do you want to lead off?

MR. CASON: I thought for awhile that Dave was going to let me talk about auditing, but, I see he's taken care of that.

There is a whole series of questions involving financial institutions; I think lately, about 80 percent of our agenda has been taken up with these matters.

One question that the Banking Committee is considering is whether there should be some additional footnote disclosures for banks; the point being that all the nice things you like to read about to analyze the bank are not in the footnotes, they're in supplemental information, or in the fore-part for a public company.

Another burning issue is accounting for loan fees, basically, whether you can bring the fees in up front as income, or spread them over the loan. The FASB has added one of our issues paper to its agenda, and is coming out with an ED on that, or an invitation to comment, shortly.

Another question on loan fees is for S&L's, whether you can go to, I think, two percent of the loan amount, or whether you have to cost base it on a commitment fee; in the days when a typical mortgage might be less than \$100,000, that percentage wasn't too bad, but, now when you get 10 and 15, or 20' million dollar commitments, one, and two percent is a pretty big number.

We have issued a notice to practitioners on that topic.

There's a new--or, at least, a vehicle new to us which we call, ADC loans, that's acquisition,

development, and construction; in its simple form the S&L loans, to a developer, all of the funds for the project, including the land costs, the development costs, and the fees—loan fees, and the interest over the life of the loan, and the life of the loan is the life of the construction project, some of them, since they're, in effect, loaning to themselves—they loan a lot to themselves, recognize lots of fee income, that's troublesome to us; we did issue a notice that was in the CPA letter, and in the Journal of Accountancy.

I also understand that the Home Loan Bank Board is in the process of considering regulations in this area.

We've issued another notice on ADC loans dealing with guarantees; the issue is, should you rely on the guarantee of the developer, and the general presumption is, no, or, if so, with great care because of such questions as legal enforcibility, and the practicality of going after a guarantee as opposed to property.

There's an issue of deposit float on banks, which is, essentially, whether they should record a liability to the depositor, and a receiveable from another bank, even though they have not given

withdrawal credit to the depositor; our answer to that is, they should continue present accounting which is to show the liability, and to show the asset; we understand the regulators are supportive of that answer; it's also safe to say it's not a popular answer in the banking circles, they're opposed to that.

There's an issue called, JENNEMAE dollar rolls, which is not a new donut, or raisin donut, or whatever. JENNEMAE dollar rolls are essentially where you buy JENNEMAE's and sell them on the same day, so you part with no money to speak of, and then when the buy back date occurs you roll that forward, you exercise another repo transaction, essentially — you need a new dictionary for these; a repo transaction is where you sell and promise to buy back. That was of issue with — we got it in the newspapers a lot where the thrift organization in California; it's also been the subject of several meetings with regulators in Washington.

And, to top all this off, we have an issues paper on accounting for loan loss reserves; the question is whether you have to estimate in advance, and record the expense in advance. Our tentative answer is, generally, no, that presenting accounting

for low losses is about right.

And, also, both the S&L Committee, and the Banking Committees, have pretty well concluded they need to rewrite those audit guides, even though it seems like just yesterday we passed the banking audit guide.

And, the Finance Companies Committee is working on a new audit guide for finance companies, so, this is an active area, and those of you have the privilege to audit it, it's a new world for you compared to, let's say, 10 years ago.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Sounds, Roger, like your Committee should be renamed, the Bank Accounting Committee.

Dave, what about the auditing side?

MR. LANDSITTEL: Well, the auditing side

presents a challenge to us as well. Not only does the

auditor have to have the new dictionary in order to

understand the new accounting terms of the accounting

transctions, but, the changing economic and

deregulatory environment that relates to banks and

other financial institutions, really presents, in my

mind, a significant challenge from the audit process.

Roger mentioned that presently underway are contemplated revisions of the bank audit guide,

and the development of the new finance company audit guide; the bank audit guide was issued in a revised form only a couple of years ago, but, the Banking Committee monitors, regularly, and very closely, audit implications in this very fast changing environment, and as a result of that, there's a pretty clear need, at this point in time, to redo it again.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the other hand, that process is by definition one that's slow in terms of a quick responsiveness to the practitioner for areas to -that do come up; as a result, the auditing standards board has worked closely with the banking committee, and the banking committee has done a significant job in publishing, from time to time, in the CPA Letter, notices to practitioners that call attention to particular audit problems that relate to bank audit area, for example, dealing with the adequacy of disclosure about foreign loans, dealing with the auditor's responsibilities for evaluation of loan loss reserves, dealing with the audit of loan participations purchased and sold. So, there are areas that we're trying to take steps on a timely basis through the mechanism of providing information in the CPA Letter, and on the other hand, we recognize that, on a longer term basis, there is a need to incorporate that

information on an integrated basis in the audit guides that we're developing, and resources are dedicated to that area.

I think that in summary, it's important for those of us that are involved in bank audits to recognize the changing environment that the auditors are faced with, and be aware of the impact of the changes on the audit risk that we have to evaluate in our audits of these kinds of institutions.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Dave, I understand that the Auditing Standards Board has on its agenda a project that, at least, has some concern for some of your fellow panel members, and that has to do with how a CPA's report on information other than historical financial statements, when third parties are going to receive that report; obviously, this may have an impact on all areas of practice; can you give us some background, Dave, as to what caused this project to be taken up, and — or, what some of the varying attitudes are about it.

MR. LANDSITTEL: The Auditing Standards

Board became concerned, really, now, it's been almost

two years, with the fact that over a long period of

time there's been an increasing auditor and accountant

association with the kinds of services—the attest

related kinds of services, but aren't audits of financial statements.

There's an overall framework that deals with audits of financial statements that is articulated in the 10 GAS Standards, but, at least, literally read, that framework only deals with audits of financial statements, and not with these other related attest services that the accountant is asked to provide.

Overtime in the SASES, and also in the prouncements of the Accounting Review Service Committee, there's been a proliferation of different kinds of assurances; different levels of assurance below the standard auditor's report opinion, and addressing different kinds of services upon which those assurances are provided, and the project is an attempt to develop an overall foundation for us to look to when we are asked to be associated with these different kinds of services.

So, the benefits of this are, hopefully, the development — well, let me just back up; at this point in time the project has developed into one where we have developed a draft of 11 standards that would parallel, but not replace the 10 GAS standards—we still have in place the 10 GAS standards as they

relate to audits of historical cost financial statements.

But, we have this foundation of 11 standards, which in many respects are very similar, which are general standards that we would hope would provide the foundation for us to look to when the auditor is involved in these other kinds of attest services, and other levels of assurance below the standard auditor's report.

So, the benefits of this kind of project in the eyes of the auditing standards board are, number one, that it would help the board in providing a foundation, or a framework that the board could look to, to perhaps respond on a more cohesive basis with —— with —— and, not in an ad hoc way when questions come up on pro forma reporting, reporting on condensed information, reporting on internal accounting controls, and other kinds of reporting that deals with different kinds of assurances the auditor provides.

And, it would also provide a benefit to practitioners in this regard in that it would, at least, provide general standards the practitioner could look to when there are no specific standards for a particular kind of situation that comes up outside the audit of financial statements.

In addition, I think it's important, because as presently drafted, the — the standards provide, in a general sense, boundaries for the attest function, and these are general, consistent with the notion that these are general standards, but, it — for example, articulates that the accountant, in order to provide an attest service must be competent in the subject matter upon which he's asked to provide the assurances, and that there must be some sort of an objective measurable target upon which the auditor provides his assurance on, and that would be in the case of financial information in audits, generally accepted accounting principles.

In other areas it could be authoritative principles, or, it could be other kinds of disclosures in the representations of management that the auditor is attempting to provide assurances on, that provide an objective basis for the auditor, so the request is not merely one that can be responded to with a value judgment, but rather one that properly applied procedures would lead to competent auditors to the same conclusions with respect to that kind of information.

Now, Phil asked what the impact on other areas of our profession is, and we've had a good deal of conversation with the MAS Executive Committee and

Merle, and with others, and there is, obviously, an overlap, and I think it's consistent with the fact that our accountant services these days are not so clearly divided into three areas of audit, tax, and MAS, as perhaps they use to be; notwithstanding that —— I don't want to overstate the impact, because what we're talking about here is attest, and I kind of think of that as not being audit, because the word, audit, has a particular meaning of audit of financial statements, but, certainly like an audit, and we define attest in this project to incorporate, number one, the fact that the accountant is providing assurances that would go to third parties.

Number two, that these assurances that the accountant is providing, are on assertions that are management's assertions, so, it's adding credibility to management's assertions rather than an advocacy role, or developing expert testimony, which is something different, and —

Third, the result of this would, presumably, be an accountant's independence, so, we have a fence around attest that we're dealing with that I like to characterize as being like an audit that's a little bit more narrow than sometimes is perceived, and certainly doesn't mean to encompass

traditional MAS and tax services that don't really have these three elements of attest, the third party reliance adding credibility to assertions of others, and independence that we're dealing with.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Dave, reporting on a perspective financial statement seems to fall somewhere in between audit and attest, I guess; in any event, the Auditing Standards Board has been dealing with some projects in that area; do you want to tell us a little about that?

MR. LANDSITTEL: Yeah. Well, it's an illustration, and probably the best one outside of historical financial information of attest service that really isn't an audit service, and — in 1980, an AICPA audit guide was published that dealt with the forecasting area; what that guide provides is guidance on one particular level of service, and that was defined as a review level of service, and one particular kind of presentation, which was defined as a forecast of the most likely results of the client in the future.

Since that time, and even prior to that time, there's been a lot of, I would say, increasing accountant's involvement in the perspective financial information area. The increase isn't really so much

with the Fortune 500 company publishing information of a perspective nature, and asking the accountants to be associated with it, but it does come in a number of different areas; in the financial feasibility area; in presentations that are encompassed in tax shelter offerings; and, in private company relationships between the accountant and the client where, for example, electronic worksheet type of presentations are requested by the client for the purpose of being taken down to the bank as a basis for financing, and there's been a lot of questions in this area that continually come up.

As a result of that, the Board has assisted in the development, along with input from others, in a revised audit guide, which is, presently, and exposure; that revised guide deals not only with the review level of service, but defines a compilation level of service as well, and not only with a presentation of a forecast, as defined as the most likely prediction about the future, but, other kinds of presentations that are comprehensive presentations of perspective information, a projection, which might be a, what if—what if I build a plant, notwithstanding whether or not that would be the most likely circumstance of the future.

So, we have this draft guide that's presently out for comment that does try to expand upon the guidance within the presently existing 1980 guide.

We also, at the same time, have issued a draft of an authoritative statement in this area. After a great deal of consideration, the Board concluded that it would be appropriate seek comment from practitioners on a more authoritative statement for two reasons; one, is that when problems have come up sometimes there needs to be strength of indorsibility more than that that comes from a guide; and, secondly, in almost all cases that we have today in other areas, where there are guides outstanding, those guides are predicated upon higher level accounting gap guidance, or, higher level SAS kinds of guidance, and are really extrapolations of that higher level of — in an application in a particular industry, or area.

In the forecasting area, that's not the case; there is no higher level authoritative umbrella upon which the guides can be predicated; so, the Board has chosen to release for comment from practitioners, and others, a draft of an authoritative statement that would be authoritative under Rule 201, dealing with perspective financial information.

Now, that document draws out the significant standard setting aspects that would ultimately be in sync with the more detailed, how to do it, guidance that would remain in the guide; the guide draft, I think, is 120—some odd pages, single spaced; the standard is like other standards, oh, certainly, double spaced, 30 pages or so, so considerably less in length in this area.

The present status is that the comment period ends October 26th; we're very anxious to recieve comments from interested parties in all areas; it is important that we receive your in-put, and then the Board, in its deliberations in December, January, and early spring, will consider the comments very closely, and determine whether it's appropriate, and how it's appropriate to go forward.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Dave, you used the term, authoritative, and then, enforceable, and, of course, I — when you used that term, I guess you're talking about, enforcable under the Institute's Code of Ethics; now, that process—the enforcement process, generally involves the use of a program that's known as the Joint Ethics Enforcement Program, or JEEP; I know that that is a matter that the Ethics Executive Committee has been looking at for some time, and I

wonder if Monday Lowe, if you can tell us a little bit about how you see that going, and what kind of legacy you're going to leave us as you leave the Chairmanship of the Ethics Division.

MR. LOWE: All right, Phil. The JEEP program is really live and doing well; should — for the sake of some of you, let me just give you a brief background on the Joint Ethics Enforcement Program.

It's really, as you recall, a program that's a joint effort between the American Institute, and the State Societies, and those four other jurisdications—those States and jurisdictions that chose to become part of a program. We, at the present time, have 50 of our — 54 States and jurisdictions that are a part of that program.

Through contract, or arrangement, the American Institute becomes an agency of the State—or the jurisdiction, and vice—versa, the State, or juris—diction becomes an agency of the Institute all for the purpose of enhancing the administration and enforcement of our standards.

Some of the major objectives that were to be accomplished as this program was set in place, was to promote uniformity in the application and interpre-

tation of the ethical standards.

Also, to promote enforcement in a manner that could be characterized as being done with an even hand; those members that were dealt with, say, in Louisiana as compared to those that were dealt with in Arizona and New York, would hopefully bring about the same treatment through Societies operating in the same manner.

One of the big things that the program was designed for was to eliminate duplication of effort.

Often a member goes through court, and after going through court has to deal with the State Board, and after going to the State Board, has to deal with the State Society, and after going through the State Society, has to deal with the American Institute. So, any effort that we could put forth that would eliminate that process of duplication is certainly worthwhile, and the JEEP program has been able to accomplish that.

The JEEP process has just been subjected to an extensive study, and brought about some major changes in the JEEP program, and the contract that the Institute and the State Societies and other jurisdictions operate under; the revised JEEP manual underwent exposure during the last year and a half;

comments were received from the Societies and jurisdictions, those comments were put into the process; after making changes in an original draft, that manual has now been—and, contract, which is part of the manual, has been considered by those 50 jurisdictions and the other four jurisdictions that are not a member of JEEP.

I'm happy to report that at the present time, 44 of the States have adopted that revised JEEP manual; seven State Societies, at the present time, were meeting in September and October to consider the manual, and every indication we have is that those seven States will also approve the new revised manual that we have placed in effect.

I think the adoption of that manual, as revised, and then as extensively revised, as far as the operating procedures for JEEP is concerned, speaks well for the program, that everyone has had a chance to see how JEEP is working as an effort between the Institute and the State Societies, and the effect has been that I believe that the feed-back has been through the Societies that JEEP has worked well.

I wouldn't to lead you to believe that there's no problems with JEEP, but, with something that massive has to continue to be worked with; but, I

believe the JEEP program is much improved from where it was a couple of years ago before the -- this massive study was undertaken.

It provides examples, for instance, on various correspondence; it's a, how to do it on investigations; how to do it on moving forward with cases that a State would be investigating, and so forth.

Phil asked me to tell you what kind of legacy I would leave as I left the Ethics Division; Leonard Dobkins of Buffalo, New York, will be taking over as Chairman effective as of this meeting, and having a Chairman such as Leonard Dobkins, there's no need to leave any great, great legacy, because this guy is so great that the Ethics Division is in good hands.

But, one thing that has been a problem to the JEEP program is, since it is so massive, and so many people involved—so many volunteers, all of the Ethics Committees of the various States and jurisdictions, all of that staff support that comes from the staff of those Societies that lend support to the volunteers in those areas, means that there's a tremendous problem of communication, of keeping everyone up to speed on interpretations of the Code, how

 those interpretations apply, so that we are in every area of our profession throughout the 54 jurisdictions apply that even-hand.

So, the major emphasis at the present time is on communications, of bringing about — we're exploring, at the present time, those of you that are familiar with the publication that goes out on State legislation; we're exploring that side of communication that would go out periodically to the Ethics Divisions throughout the 54 jurisdictions, and other ways to make sure that everyone understands what the left hand is doing, so that the right hand is in step; and, in that effort, with a program that has been so well received, that is so well structured, I feel, at the present moment, that the only thing that that program needs is to increase the emphasis on communication, and Leonard Dobkins has pledged that he's going to move forward with that, Phil.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: That sounds very good.

Let me ask you, if you would, to comment on something that B.Z., or a report on earlier, that is, the Council discussion relating to two of the specific rules, the one relating to Contingent Fees, and the other one relating to the Commissions; I think that those members who were here at the annual meeting who

weren't at the Council meeting, might like to know a little more about the discussion; and, also, what the impact of that will be on the Ethics Division.

MR. LOWE: Very good. To those Council members that might get a bit anxious about me starting to talk about Commission and Contingent Fee, relax, because there's not going to be an extensive discussion.

What I would like to do though, for those members that have not been part of the Council process, and maybe not exposed to some of the things that Council has been exposed to, give you just a brief update on what has happened since May, and you will recall that at the May, 1984 meeting, Council rejected a recommendation to ballot the membership on changes that were being proposed dealing with Commissions and Contingent Fees.

You will recall that that ballot was defeated by a close margin at the May Council meeting dealing with Contingent Fee; you'll recall that the present Code has a prohibition on Contingent Fee engagements, except in very narrow areas where they're fixed by courts, or where they're determined based upon results of judicial proceeding, and Council saw fit, in May, to leave that Rule just as it is.

At that same time we were proposing that some changes be made with interpretations of the Code dealing with Commissions, and I won't go into what those changes are, but, the changes were to have the Commission Rule apply in a less restrictive manner so that if a member did not have special skill and knowledge as a result of his education and experience in a product of service, well, then the Commission Rule would not apply to that particular activity.

Council rejected that by quite a large margin of any changes, and we ended up being left in the same position there with Commissions.

There was one other item, and that one other item was an interpretation that the Institute had that if you did, in fact, receive a Commission, disclose that fact to your client, and immediately pass that condition through to your client, then you were not in violation of the Commission prohibition rule.

New York, incidentally, also ended up -- before we had that rule, the New York State Society had that rule.

In accordance with the Council it made, and subsequent action by the Board of Directors, the Ethics Division moved forward in a normal course of

business with enforcing the rule and moving forward with the cases that we had before us.

After that May Council Meeting, the ——
letters were received on July the 27th, and September
the 14th, imposing a resolution that came from the
Colorado Society, and just to sum it up briefly, the
Colorado Society was saying to the Board of Directors,
we don't believe that the atmosphere and so forth,
that the debate was carried on in the May meeting was
what we would like to have seen the climate be at that
particular time, and as a result, we're asking you,
the Board of Directors, to place on the October agenda
for the Council meeting, a reconsideration of the vote
on the Contingent Fee rule.

At the same time—or, nearly at the same time, the New York State Society, on July the 11th, sent a letter, and a subsequent letter in September, the 18th, I believe it was, enclosing a resolution urging the Board of Directors to place on the Council agenda for October, a reconsideration of the pass through provision, that if, in fact, you did receive a commission, you disclose it to a client, and immediately pass that commission through to the client, that would not be a violation of the rules covering commission.

Now, although the Board did not initiate either of those requests for consideration—the Contingent Fee, and the Commission rule, that was killed in the May meeting, is the obligation of the Board of Directors to structure the agenda for the Council meetings, and as you heard this morning, in order to have any matter considered at Council meetings is just a matter of presenting a resolution to the Board of Directors to have that done.

So, under those guidelines, on Saturday, these two items were reconsidered; I could say they were reconsidered and put to rest, at least for the time being. So, we do — if you picked up your present Code, and if any reason you think it's outdated, it's not; it's right where it was two or three years ago, since 1974 almost, with some new rulings, and some new interpretation; but, the 13 rules that were put there in 1974, are the same rules that we're living under today.

And, to tell you how it affects the Ethics Division, Phil, the message is that the Ethics Division should enforce those 13 rules as they are written, with particular emphasis, I believe, on the Commission and Contingent Fee rule, being read literally, and enforced that way.

Division, after Council's May action, and after the Board lifted the matter of suspension of enforcement until Council acted, we did move forward in the Ethics Division in the normal course of business to enforce the code as it was written, and to move forward with those cases that we had under investigation at the time of the suspension, waiting for Council action.

So, our activity from this point on, is

So, our activity from this point on, is going to be the same activity that we've had for the last two, or three, and four months, we're moving forward in the normal course of business to enforce the code and to move those cases that we have before us, as we should under the rules that we have.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Monday, that's just an excellent summary of what took place at two meetings, and also of the work of the Ethics Committee in that area, and I thank you.

Let me turn to another aspect, if I may, of the work of our senior committees, and that is, trying to develop responses to the needs of the membership. The Accounting and Review Services Committee undertook a survey of membership attitudes in that regard, and I'd like to ask Phil Crawford to tell us about the responses, and tell us what those

responses indicate, and what that will mean to the work of the Accounting and Review Services Committee.

MR. CRAWFORD: Just a little bit of back—ground as to how this project got underway is the fact that you're well aware that the SAAR1, is a relatively new aspect of our profession, but yet it affects so many of the practices out there, is that we wanted to wait a certain period of time to get a feeling as to how the practice is actually operating, and we've kind of had this project in the background for the last two or three years.

Earlier this spring, we did develop it; we sent out approximately, 5,000 questionnaires; the experts tell us that if we would have gotten 400-500, it would have been a great response, we, in fact, ended up in excess of 1,800, or about 36 percent. So, we find that there's a tremendous amount of interest in the project, and certainly in accounting review, and compilation services.

One of our major concerns also, is the fact, that as we, again, toured the country at speaking engagements, whatever, that there are various interpretations, or, should I say, reliance upon what we would utilize as we review our compilation. Numerous times that people were doing exactly the same

things between practices, yet, one would issue a review report, the other would issue a compilation report.

This gave us some concern because our legal counsel advise us that if a practitioner, in fact, gets sued, he may be held to the higher standard of the professional standards as written, or what the practice standards are in the field.

We are still tabulating these responses; they're down at, in fact, Monday's territory, they're being tabulated at Louisiana State University; there are 26 questions with many sub-type questions; we hope to have these out and finally summarized sometime in the spring.

It may very well be that we're going to come down to the fact that some of the standards, as written in SSAR1, may be revised, or changed; at a minimum, I think, that we will probably be coming out with some type of practice aids to the practitioners as to try to more clearly delineate the write-up, accomplish, and a review. There's just been a wide diversion of actual practice.

One of the things which we've heard quite frequently, is the fact of, that of engagement letter; people have indicated that they are requiring them

absolutely on compilations, but not on reviews, whereas within our — in the actual — they are not required at all, and this has created quite a bit of concern.

And, our suspicisions have been somewhat substantiated based upon a preliminary evaluation that the practice is wide-spread; people are doing things—you could follow a pattern on a certain bunch of questions, and you come out with one result; the same pattern comes down, and you come out with another result; so, we feel fairly strongly that we probably will have to have some type of practice aid, or some type of clarification.

I think also that what is happening is the fact that we've had — most of us know what an audit is, and that's when you go in and you just bang it out, and we come up with an examination. People also say, well, we know what a compilation is, that's what I'm going to do that I'm going to put my name on; it may not be what we interpret as a pure vanila compilation, you just take the client's data, perform the minimal standards required for a compilation, and put it out. We find a lot of people do not feel that that is enough in their own personal situation to put a compilation on, so, they're going to do a little bit

more, and often times get very close to the review, if not a review.

Now, they're a little bit perplexed as to what is the review, and so they're tending to modify it as an audit—almost as an audit, but, not quite either, they'll back off.

It's very interesting that, like I say, on some of their preliminary things that every question seems to be inter-related with the other, and we hope to generate some very good data; certainly will be responding in the JofA, or in some type of other document, the results.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Phil, I understand that one of the things that came out of the surveys is a belief on the part of practitioners that we need to give more guidance in the analytical review area; is the Committee doing anything about that?

MR. CRAWFORD: We are progressing on that; we found some confusion among practitioners as to what is an analytical review as envisioned by SSAR1; there is some little reading of SSAR1 that perhaps no analytical review is necessary, however, in the review statement we say that a review does consist of inquiry and analytical review.

We found, also, at least conversational-

wise, that there are many practices who, in fact, take the Appendix A, to SSAR1 as far as develop a list of inquires, so they have some documentation in the inquiry; but, we also find that there may not be that much documentation on the actual analytical review, the appropriateness or whatever.

The Od Board is developing a task force and has been moving right along on an analytical review guide, or a cookbook, I don't think it's quite been defined exactly how it's going to do, Dave, but, we are going to be writing a chapter, or certainly be very deeply involved with how it's going to apply to the review report.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Ladies and gentlemen, I have to tell you that we have set some kind of a record this morning; this group has been up here talking for more than an hour, and the fellow on my right, Merle Elliott, hasn't said anything, and those of you that know Merle know that that's quite uncharacteristic, so, I think I'd better give him an opportunity to say a few words.

Merle, the MAS Committee is doing, and has done a great deal by way of developing guidance information for practitioners as well as having set a couple of standards that were put out several years

ago, and I think — I think the group here would like to know what you have on the agenda, and what your plans are for the future.

MR. ELLIOTT: Well, I'd like to just preface this by saying, I've had plenty of opportunity to have input with Dave Landsittel, and the Audting Standards Board, and discussions about the levels of assurance, and prospective financial statements, so, I didn't really have to say anything too much today, and I think when those documents finally come out, they will be documents that will pretty much satisfy the profession.

We've not addressed ourselves in the past couple of years to the development of any more standards; several years ago we developed statements on standards for management advisory services, numbers One, Two, and Three, that defined management advisory services, made the standards binding for the first time, and also incorporated what had formerly been called, informal advise, into the binding standards.

Having done that, and eliminating 50 pages of previous non-binding standards out of the professional standards literature, we decided that our role ought to be to develop helpful guidance to the profession rather than developing any more standards in that

area.

Our approach to that has been, in addition to various seminars, and annual meetings that have been largely directed to the interests of the smaller client and the smaller practitioner, we've undertaken a program of development and publishing non-binding, non-authoritative practice aids.

Thus far, we've issued, in the past three years, nine of those; we have over 20 additional titles under preparation; they have been well received in the profession; we're not a profit center, but, I think we probably make some contribution from that standpoint.

Well, we've issued a practice aid on assisting small clients in securing funds; assisting clients in maximizing profits; we have a practice aid on ratio analysis; several EDP related practice aids, and that, pretty much, is the emphasis that we've been taking, and we plan to take, and we don't plan to address any standards unless a pressing need should develop.

And, additionally, we monitor the activities of the other Divisions, and try to be helpful and make sure that our voice is heard when we don't think they're being helpful.

earlier today, in his message to the members present,
B.Z. Lee talked a little bit about the professionalism, commercialism area, expansion of scope of
services, and the like, and, of course, the management consulting area is an area that has seen growth
in recent years in view of segments of the profession,
I wonder if you can tell us, Merle, whether you see
this as a fact, and if so, what basic and fundamental
changes do you think that might make in the profession
itself.

MR. ELLIOTT: Well, first, I think it's a fact, although I believe that business advise, management advise, assistance to clients, has been offered by accountants as long as there has been accountants around. The preeminence of audit and tax service has been a relatively recent development in the profession, so, that MAS is not a new thing, but, MAS in a structured sense, that is, what we've defined as, MAS engagements, is becoming more and more an opportunity for practice expansion in the smaller practice areas, and MAS consultations, I believe, by the definition, and by the binding standards, is being more widely recognized as being a service of value to clients, one that clients appreciate, will pay for,

and properly done is of great value to them.

So, I think we're seeing—I know from talking to practitioners throughout the country at various meetings that there's a tremendous amount of increased awareness in the opportunity for advice to management; sometimes it's called, business advisory services; and this is the consultation type of MAS, and with the advent of the micro—computer, the ability of technology to be made available to the smaller clients; there's a massive growth and opportunit for all of us to provide those kinds of services to more and more clients.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Very good. One of the things I've learned this year, and it's an opportunity you have as a new Chairman comes in each year, is a message from B.Z. Lee, and B.Z. carries around with him in his wallet a little card with 10 key questions that audit committees ought to ask their auditors, and one of those questions is, "is there anything else we need to know", and I would like to put that question to our panel, and I'd -- I'd like to do something a little different in putting that question to the panel, and that is, I'd like to ask them to respond in reverse alphabetical order; so, Monday Lowe, would you take off.

MR. LOWE: Well, by golly, it's nice to head up the list to respond to something that I've been responding to B.Z. all of this year, as he's talked to — in the Ethics Division about ethics, and one thing about your leader for this past year, he's stayed informed, and he's known where every committee was, and there's a great number of things that we need to respect him for, and that's just one of them.

I guess, if I had to, Phil, at this point say, is anything that the membership of this profession needs to know, I think I'd remind you of a few things; I think I'd remind you that as you look at these leaders here, and the great work that — this Institute has some of the finest professional staff that there is that helps us to move forward with the projects we have.

And, secondly, remind you, I guess, that

— I believe, personally, that the process works; I've
been involved in this process with the Commissions,

Contingent Fees, and the Ethics area now for a number
of years, and we made recommendations, we have exposed
those recommendations to the membership and to

Council; we've had Council consider them, give us
input, go back to the drawing board, then finally,

bring it to a final debate and a vote, and a process that allows reconsideration for those members that feel like things have not come out exactly as they had wished; and, then a vote on the reconsideration.

So, I feel very good about where we are, particularly, at a time when there are imperfections in our standards of conduct, and it's that process that I'm talking about also provided the opportunity to have those imperfections surface, and to provide for a blue ribbon committee in the name of George Anderson's committee, the Special Committee on Standards of the Profession, to take those imperfections and deal with them, and as we move forward, with the combination of that process, the outstanding staff that we have with the Institute, and the dedicated volunteers, I'll remind you that I feel very comfortable, Phil.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Dave, do you want to — MR. LANDSITTEL: Phil, I don't want to comment on specific other projects of our Auditing Standards Board, we do have a number of other projects on our agenda, but, I do have a couple of general observations about our Board that I think are important.

First, I get asked questions a number of

times about standards overload, and Roger commented about accounting standards overload; we're sensitive to that problem as well. When I first assumed the Chairmanship responsibilities for the Board a couple of years ago, more than one individual cautioned me that my contributions should not be measured in terms of number of SAS' that are released during my Chairmanship, so, we do try, as a Board, to be sensitive to this issue; we've put out at a rate of about three SAS' a year, and some of those are really up-dates of prior standards to reflect just changes in our environment.

On the other hand, the Board is —— does seek a balance, and does feel a responsibility to add to the support of our practice when we do have problems that do require standards, and we're not intimidated by the standards overload issue when we believe that standards are, in fact, needed to cover the audit process.

Saying that, brings me to a point that I want to emphasize that I eluded to earlier, and that is that it really is important for us to get as much in-put as we can from our membership, and Merle, I do appreciate your in-put, but, we need in-put from others in addition to Merle, and we do get valuable

in-put from the comment letters that we receive; we take each comment letter, circulate it to all the Board, and also the staff takes all the comment letters and correlates those comments by subject, by paragraph, in the document, and we look at them closely, and it is important for you as practicing members of our profession, and those that interact with the audit process to give us in-put, because it is needed.

I'd like to close just to comment that we're in an environment today that's challenging to our Board, and I think challenging to practitioners; obviously, we're aware, and I think somewhat frustrated as a profession by business failures, and the alleged audit failures that relate to that.

The micro-computer has a significant impact—potential impact on our practice; the audit process is also impacted by the competitive environment, and I would say that increasingly competitive environment that we're involved in today, and uncomfortable that as a profession we're continuing to deal with that effectively, and I have a comfort like Monday does in this regard from an audit perspective.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Merle.

3_.

MR. ELLIGIT: Okay, Phil, thank you.

First of all, I'd like to say that

finishing nine years in the MAS Division, and working

with all of the other Divisions, and if — if there's

any suggestion that there's any animosity between Dave

Landsittel and I, and the MAS Executive Committee, and

the Auditing Standards Board, that is not true; we

have disagreed frequently, but, I don't believe we've

ever had a disagreeable meeting, so I'd have to echo

Monday's comments that with the quality of profes
sionalism of the volunteers who work in the

Institute's activities that you have little to fear,

but, if they don't hear from you—if we don't hear

from you in the MAS Division about the guidance that

would be useful, we miss an awful lot, so, I think if

and committed to doing the best they can to improving practice, and most -- most of the volunteers are involved in practice. Many of the volunteers are from

I close with anything that I think the group needs to

know, is the leadership of the Institute is dedicated

government and industry, and in connection with those

that are in industry, one of the things that the MAS
Division is, at least, contemplating is providing some

helpful guidance in the management area as opposed to

management advisory, so, this would be something that

once we feel we have gotten pretty well along on our, how to consult library, that's comprised of our practice aids, we may address that, how to manage area.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: A1?

MR. ELLENTUCK: Thanks, Phil.

You know, there's been so much attention focused on the flat rate tax that there's been another trend, very insidious, that's been developing, and I'd just like to mention it.

In the Tax Reform Act of 1984, Congress had proposed a provision that would require the preparer to not only examine the records wherever travel and entertainment was involved, or, wherever the mixed use of business and personal property, such as automobiles, or computers was involved, would it require us to go in and examine those records, and verify that they were correct; that disturbed us very much, not only because of what we thought it would do to the cost of income tax returns, but, because of what we thought it would do to the relationship between us and the taxpayer, and the client.

We fought very hard against it; we testified, and made a major effort against this provision, and ultimately we were successful; Congress

eliminated the examination and verification requirement, and we're very pleased; what we're doing now is attempting to monitor the situation when the next time Congress gets together to legislate again, to make sure that, or, at least to be aware in the event that this type of approach rears its ugly head again.

To me, this is a perfect example of what the Tax Division, and the Institute can do for members and practitioners, and for the tax system itself, and we plan to do a lot more of this.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Phil, would you like to comment?

MR. CRAWFORD: I echo the other members up here about the responses. I'd also like to indicate that one of the things that would be very helpful as you respond to exposure drafts, that even though you have no negative comments about aspects of it, that if you were in favor, that that is very helpful also.

One of the other projects which we've undertaken is getting back to the interim financial statements, you're all pretty aware of the computer prepared exposure draft we put out a number of years ago, and had in excess of 800 responses; we found that there are many people who were, in fact, in favor

of it who didn't respond because they thought things
always come out the way it's exposed; we're watching
with great interest the deliberations of the OD Board
and the perspective financial statements as to how
they come down with internal use, and as to what the
aspects of that may be on historical financial statements.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Roger, we end up with

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Roger, we end up with you.

MR. CASON: Some of those responses on those quick tear-outs are interesting. I particularly like the ones along the lines of, please give me the name and address of the person responsible for paragraph six.

Institute has ever had has said, please do something about the leasing standards, statement 13, and this latest committee is no exception; we've had several meetings with the FASB; I'd say the staff is sympathetic, but, they've just gone to the Board for the second time to add leasing to the agenda, and for the second time the Board has declined, and the one reason I believe is that if you're going to simplify the leasing standard, you have, basically, two choices, one, you capitalize no leases and disclose,

or, you capitalize virtually all leases, and there's a significant objections to both of those stands, and that's kind of the horns of the dilemma, so, I'm not optimistic that we're going to see a revised standard, although the staff of the FASB is working on a simplified written version of the existing, I don't know, 10 or 15 standards we have.

Another item that EXCEC has just cleared is our LICAL (sic) Issues Paper, which is starting to attract some flak from industry on the grounds that it does not have due process; I guess in response to that I would say that it has received rather broad distribution; we have received letters from FEI and others; we believe we've addressed those letters; we've also had staff of the SEC and FASB, attend all of our task force meetings; we think it can be a useful issues paper; the troublesome feature is that the FASB probably will not deal with it, although with the current building concern about it, they may, and if they don't, the SEC is making initial noises to the effect that, well, it's the only thing around, so, we'll follow it.

It should come out by the end of the year;
I'm told that the Institute has 1,000 back orders for it right now; it hasn't yet gone to the printing

press, so, again, we may have a profit center here, Phil; but, we do think it's helpful; we passed it by the Tax Executive Committee, and they've advised us that the conclusions—advisory conclusions in the paper, they feel would not cause a conformity problem. We were pleased to hear that.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Ladies and gentlemen, you've been very, very attentive, and very patient with the panel; I'd like to give you an opportunity now to raise any questions that you have of any of us; there are a few mikes around the room, if anybody would like to address a question to the panel, please do so.

MR. HERTZ: I'm Ron Hertz of New York; I made some comments at the Council meeting, and I'd like to refer those comments again here in regard to the question of the AICPA getting involved in controversial, political, and economic issues.

I'd like to agree with Mr. Ellentuck's position that the points being made on the question of administrative penalities and so forth, are an excellent function of the AICPA Tax Division, but, in contrast, I would like to say that the Institute position on a progressive income tax is not, that's a very, very large philosophical question.

The major early proponents of the progressive income tax were Marx and Engel in the Communist manifesto; as a matter of fact, the income tax has been and always probably will be seen as a system of redistribution of income, and certainly not a great American tradition, in fact, it violates due process among other amendments to — among other sections of the Bill of Rights, and, therefore, required a Constitutional amendment 71 years ago, the 16th Amendment, which certainly was a different kind of amendment from others which tended to advance the Bill of Rights, and not contradict it. It certainly is not a benchmark of fairness from any point of view as far as tax systems are concerned.

More, the Instituted should not be taking positions on alternative tax methods, or any other national economic, or political issue. In the particular case of the tax system, one, the Tax Division may be the least qualified to comment on such a broad economic question as alternative tax systems, because the Tax Division is not — does not consist of economists; two, we jeopardize our credibility if we take such a position when we, obviously, have such a clear vested interest in the present system.

Three, we should be actively protecting

 our clients, as I indicated before, and the profession, from totalitarian implications of enforcement methods, and other nightmarish aspects of the present system.

But, essentially, the — the point is, that the issue of alternative tax systems is highly controversial, and not one where the Institute has a proper role, except, perhaps, to present analytical data without conclude its philosophic conclusions with a pro, or anti, socialist.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Al, I think that the question is, why did the Tax Division take the position it took; the speaker argues a point of view which is that the Institute shouldn't necessarily speak out on national social, and economic issues. That is debatable; I think that other of our members might have a different view; but, I'm not prepared to address that as a concept, directly; however, Al, would you want to address the question, specifically, of the background here?

MR. ELLENTUCK: Thank you, Phil. As I said in Council, I'm certainly not going to defend Marx and Engel, someone thought they were a firm out in California.

In all seriousness, and I think the question raised is serious, I don't mean to diminish it; the issue of the flat tax is an issue that is being actively considered at the Congressional level; it's being actively talked about in the press, and I'm sure that your clients have asked you about the flat tax, it's of great interest.

I felt that we would be abandoning our duty to the profession if we didn't speak out; the comments that we made were extremely well thought out—very carefully done, and I must say that when you take a stand like this, you expect a great deal of flak, in fact, the comment that we received was almost 100 percent favorable, including in the press, and it seems to me that the Division, and the Institute should speak out on interests of importance for the profession, and to the tax system, and that's what we did.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Thank you. Yes, sir?

MR. BROWNER: My name is Paul Browner from Rockville, Maryland.

Al, I have, perhaps a, stop beating your wife, question for you as well; I consider it a hollow victory that you won before Congress in reducing the CPAs from auditing clients' travel and automobile,

etc., records for IRS, to monitoring them with a statement from the clients. As you said, I believe that this is a primary step in destroying the relationship between the client and the CPA. It seems to me that if IRS needed such information they could have easily gotten it with questions on the tax returns so that the client has to attest to it as they've done in the past.

I guess my question is, why couldn't you have done better for us in standing up to IRS?

MR. ELLENTUCK: Well, I wish we could have done better. We — the original proposal was a horrendous proposal, as I explained; it would have required us going in and actually auditing these numbers. Congress, from what I can see, has a definite interest in putting the CPA to work for them. What we ended up with, and as you know, the legislative process is a process of compromise; we, essentially, got them to back off the whole ball of wax, and what they did was, basically, a face—saving device on their part to make them feel that they were getting some form of compromise.

The — all that's required at this point, is a statement signed by the tax payer, just another form—we're use to those forms, and just a little

administrative difficulty; but, I would say that it was not a hollow victory, that it was a major victory, and I - I think the real concern is that they may try to do it again, and that we would do as well the next time they bring it up.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: I have a couple of questions that were submitted on cards, and they're both in the Ethics area, and I'd like to address them, concurrently, to Monday Lowe, because they, in raising a question, present a couple of different points of view.

The first says, "is it anticipated that the Ethics Committee, and the Special Anderson Committee will heed the voice of Council and membership, or, may we expect continued foreriders on the professionalism contained in the Ethics Code".

The second question is: "What measures are being taken to reinforce, and revise, if necessary, the Code of Ethics, as it pertains to members, and industry".

Monday, do you want to take a shot at that?

MR. LOWE: You bet, Phil.

First of all, won't you let me answer the latter part of that question first; there's been a

great deal of concern over the Code of Ethics as it relates to members and industry, government, and education, and prior to the Anderson Committee coming along, there was a great deal of work done in the Ethics Division; number one, to make certain that any recommendations that we make, would move toward — move to Council, and to the membership for action, would bring about a code that would apply to all members of this Institute; I think there are ways to do that, and now is not the time to discuss them.

But, the question is good; it's one that you should be aware is never — we never lose sight of the fact that there's a great deal of work to be done in that particular area, because we have a present code, in my opinion, that's deficient in that area, and the question is one that everyone should leave here realizing, as the Anderson Committee also deals with that issue—it deals with it with the full knowledge that we are deficient in the present code, and that much attention needs to be given to that.

As to the second part of that question;

I'm not aware of a single instance when the Ethics

Division, or, anyone working with the Ethics Division
has not been completely sensitive to maintaining the
highest levels of professionalism, and that issue has

been debated so often by so many of us, we realize
that there is a debate over eroding professionalism in
our profession in favor of what many term as, commercialism.

Personally, I can stand here and say to you that as we dealt with that issue, we held that particular item of professionalism as sacred as anything that anyone could have in the Division; there are probably some recommendations that came to you that prompted that question, and in the Ethics Division, as we move forward with recommendations, we move those recommendations, based upon all the pertinent facts and situations that exist at the present time.

But, you can be assured that as far as professionalism for this profession, I don't believe there's a single person that I've worked with, does not have one mind about making sure that through integrity, and objectivity, and competence, and all those other things, that we continue to move this profession forward so that the publics we serve, and those bodies that regulate us, will have no doubt in their minds that we have one mind as far as professionalism is concerned.

PRESIDENT CHENOK: Thank you very much,

Monday.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18 GEORGIA

COBB COUNTY

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Are there any other questions?

(Negative response.)

If not, I'd like to, on behalf of the group here today, thank the panel for a splendid discussion. I think that they will agree that the leadership of the senior committees of the Institute is in good hands, and will continue to be in good hands, and I would like, on behalf of the group here, to thank all of you who are on the panel, for our -our session today.

Thank you, very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 o'clock, p.m., the above-entitled matter was concluded.)

-000-

CERTIFICATE

I, Floyd D. Salas, being a Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing, consisting of pages 1 through 71, inclusive, is a true and complete transcription of my stenographic notes taken at the said proceedings, and was reduced to typewriting by me, personally.

I further certify that I am neither of

kin, nor counsel to any of the parties hereto; nor financially interested in the event of these causes.

WITNESS my hand and official seal at Marietta, Cobb County, Georgia, this, the 25th day of October 1984.

Hillsalen

FLOYD D. SALAS, C.C.R. B-435

-000-