

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Easter Group <eastergroup@gmail.com>

To: Recipient list suppressed:

Date: Sat, 21 Jul 2007 21:40:46 +0800

Subject: Truth Series 4.7 - Rejoinder to latest Council statement

In Truth Series 4, as we receive them from brethren locally and abroad, we reproduce letters to the International Council withdrawing support from the International Council in view of the strong statements coming from Bishop Gabby Reyes' letter admonishing the same body in view of its defiance of the Bishops' strong recommendations (i.e. Bishops Angel Lagdameo, President of the CBCP, Soc Villegas in representation of Cardinal Rosales and Gabriel Reyes, head of the Episcopal Commission of the Laity of the CBCP). In the days to come, there will be more and we encourage you to write your sentiments to the International Council, but please furnish us a copy.

(Nonong Contreras was a former member of the International Council and Board of Elders.)

In these rejoinders to the latest council statement and its subsequent clarification, the Truth Series focuses on the salient points sadly missed by both circulars. We also pose some questions to the erstwhile 4 members of the council to account for Bro. Lito Tayag's timely call last MC Teaching Night for more fiscal transparency.

1. MUCH ADO ABOUT "PLAYBOYS" AND "BUNNIES"

1.1. The Easter group has no pretensions whatsoever about the use of the words "bunnies" or "playboy" for a body that chose to even trivialize and add a touch of humor to its existence via a moniker. Instead, the Council has chosen to focus on a superfluity and completely misses the point that the Easter group is intent on upholding a noble cause: the defense of the Church magistrate and obedience to the 3 Bishops' strong recommendations

2. CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 6 OF THE EASTER GROUP

2.1 The minutes will clearly show the noble intent thru the content and the seriousness with which the group tried to fend off what it anticipated as a serious transgression of the Bishops' call--all because of alleged "legalisms" (when in truth corporation laws allow some flexibility in manner and date of corporations' elections, plus the fact that CFC statutes clearly state that CFC is subject to the authority of the Bishops).

2.2 We request you, dear readers, to copiously go thru the minutes and note the following points

2.21 The possible postponement of the elections came from the Bishops, NOT from Frank's group as alleged by the council in its July 2 letter.

2.22. The meeting focused on how to protect the strong recommendations of the Bishops themselves.

2.23.p. 2. B. of the minutes says "If elections are suspended... Bishops assign the Interim Council ...the original 7 are reinstated"

Some quarters have claimed that this is incontrovertible proof of an inordinate desire to return to power. If so, why was Tony Meloto included? Clearly because in the Bishops' letter, the 7 were key to resolving the problems and bring about unity through a retreat and repair of relationship. The reinstatement of the 7 was needed to have a dialogue

among "equals". (Past experience have shown the 4 men council exhibiting a condescending attitude towards the resigned members --- impressing on Frank and Lachie that they ARE the council, and that any dialogue with them is just an accommodation.)

2.24. Frank Padilla desirous of a power grab? Let us look at the past and most recent events. He did not run for the council in 1993 after the split with Ligaya ng Panginoon. He has repeatedly told the 7 to refuse nominations but was not heeded. Likewise, when he batted for reopening of the nominations before Bishop. Gabby and Bros. Joe Tale and Ernie Maipid, he again stated he was not up for nomination nor would he run.

2.25. Let the minutes (which, by the way, was strictly confidential) speak for itself .Focus on how the Easter group viewed the threat to the life and mission of CFC with real and serious concern, if the council defied the Bishops' strong recommendations. Nothing was said out of spite but always of genuine concern for CFC. Note in the minutes:

- a) in p.1. III.c. The group was worried about CFC's relationship with the Church
- b) in p.1.III.e. The group was concerned about the possible effects of the defiance on CFC's global evangelization
- c) in p. 2 . Principles agreed on:

The group felt that taking part in the elections would show disrespect for the Bishops
The group feared that non-compliance to the directive might lead to the withdrawal of recognition of CFC by the Church

The group was concerned that its national and global evangelization work will be affected instead, the Council chose to focus on the use of words so innocuous and extraneous ("Easter bunnies") to the real and hard issues. Who showed real concern about CFC evangelization work then? The Easter group or the Council?

3. THE MC TEACHING NIGHT AND THE CALL FOR FISCAL TRANSPARENCY

3.1. Our only question regarding this rather sudden surge of interest on financial transparency is the incontrovertible fact that no less than 4 members of the erstwhile Council then, and who have been elected for a new 2 year term, seem to be all involved in incurring the deficit and the lapses explained that night. Does that leave them blameless simply because they chose not to resign? Does that leave Bros. Frank, Tony, and Lachie the sole culprits because they chose to answer for the collective guilt/responsibility of a fraternal body which governed us? What do Bros. Joe T., Joe Y., Rouquel and Ernie have to say as to how this sad financial situation was brought upon us? Isn't the International Council a fraternal and collegial body and all should share the responsibility and the accountability?

3.2 We recall then that in 2005 was the first time the matter of fiscal responsibility was brought to the fore by the Tekton Guild study team headed by no less than Bro. Alex Escucha. As a task force, they engaged the Council in general, and Bro. Rouquel Ponte in particular, about the items of expense which are now brought to light again by Bro. Lito Tayag, also a member of the Tekton study team then. Was Bro. Rouquel in his capacity as Head Office Director able to follow thru with the recommendations? Was he earnest in his efforts to follow the suggestions?

3.3 It is easy to rush into conclusions but even the Lord says for us not to notice the splinter in another one's eye if you have a log in your own. Do Bros.. Joe T. Joe Y., Rouquel and Ernie escape the responsibility for all these?

3.4 If the current Council still proclaims that GK is still part of the total work, isn't GK the biggest ticket item where funds flow in from various partners all over the world and brethren who gave their "padugos"? Can GK readily account for a complete reconciliation of inflows vs. outflows? Can there be a match between houses paid for and specific houses built? Why was this very important item forgotten and focus given to smaller

ticket items like cash advances, etc.? What happened to the unaccounted 2.5 M of former Ancop funds in Bagong Silang, the Talisay hangar, the GK expo losses, the faux pax of the Bukidnon slope that incurred the displeasure of the LGU, the abandoned Bicol project of Lafayette Mining because the Bishops chose to defend the environment instead, the much delayed GK Manolo project in Valenzuela where the promised 50 houses have not materialized, the one year delay for GK houses based on complaints filed by Mr. Ric Ramos and his boss, Mr. Tang, the disappointment expressed by Gov. Lerias over the delivery of GK houses in Leyte? These and many more cases now face GK, and since it is a pillar of CFC, the CFC members and the GK partners as stakeholders deserve clear explanations.

Some points to ponder all done in the interest of fairness and equity. We wait for answers particularly from the 4 council members who have stayed on. God bless all CFC brethren.

Nonong Contreras