

# Call For 'Clear, Objective' Reporting From Dr Tjingaete

I FOUND your editorial comment 'A call for more productivity' in which the report of the Auditor-General for the financial year ending March 31 1993 to be most illuminating.

There are a number of points which I believe deserve further comment.

Firstly, a person who should be 'independent and objective' should use such expressions which reflect his or her objectivity.

The Auditor-General has created for himself a problem of expression for future reports.

The use of expressions as 'culprits', 'fraud is rampant', 'outstanding S & T E allowances have reached alarming proportions', 'chaotic fash-

ion' as these terms are all relative to one of degree and substance.

For instance, the expression 'rampant' is used denoting that a situation has arisen where the incidence of fraud has reached uncontrollable (mass or mob) proportions and the perpetrators thereof are doing it in an aggressive and defiant manner.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is one of those singled out where fraud is rampant.

Now when one checks the AG's own comment

under 'Auditor opinion' on page 86 of the report, reference is only made to one incident of theft, in which Zambia Kwacha were stolen and on page 96 under subparagraph 3.7.7.2. 'Fraud/theft/misuse of government property and manpower' the Auditor-General himself reports: "Nothing in this regard was reported to me by the accounting officer nor were any detected during the verification of annual report information."

Come on Dr Tjingaete,

be fair, does this add up to 'rampant fraud' or are you guilty of using your independent office to attack the Minister of Foreign Affairs because he dared to criticise you?

This surely seems to be the case as you very disappointingly on page 3 question the right/privilege of certain members of the National Assembly to do what they are appointed to do and that is to question the acts, attitudes and comments of any person which they regard appropriate to raise in parlia-

ment.

Your sensitivity to this situation suggests you are not able to take criticism (which you must accept as part of the democratic process) but you feel free to criticise others in a subjective fashion, whereas your high office calls for a clear head and objective reporting.

Finally, I find the parallel of your comments and those of the DTA most amusing. (Is there a mutual 'hot line' and if so, who is paying for it - the taxpayers?)

Greetings, and we are looking forward to next year's report and the 'rampant flow of excessive expressions'.

ER LUFF (SNR)  
WINDHOEK

*Letters to the Editor*

