

Dear Henry Cheung and the Board of Directors,

***** PLEASE NOTE THAT ALL MEMBERS WHO SIGNED THE PETITION LETTER DATED SEPTEMBER 22, 2013 (THE "LETTER") AND CONCERNED MEMBERS WILL BE CC'ED ON THIS EMAIL AND ALL FUTURE CORRESPONDENCE. *****

Thank you for your reply. In reading your reply, we find that we have more questions than answers, and we get more confusion than clarification on the issues.

Just to give you an example, when you said "a group of dissenters have employed unethical tactics to discredit the integrity of the current church leaders", who are these "dissenters" you are referring to, and what are the "unethical tactics"? Our concerned members are very puzzled by your comments.

Another inaccuracy is when you say "a petition letter was secretly circulating around the members". **THE LETTER IS NOT A SECRET.** Many, many long-time, loyal members of VCBC are deeply concerned about VCBC and its current leaders and wanted to express their views. The result is the Letter, and our conscience is clear before our Lord.

When you say "there are more healthier and constructive ways to voicing a member's views than circulating a petition", we know that you, Henry Cheung, and other 17 individuals, signed and emailed a petition dated April 29, 2013 to our Senior Pastor (we can forward you that email to refresh your memory if you like. **"Henry Cheung" is appeared on #10 of the name list of that petition**). This shows that the 18 of you agree with emailing petitions to express your opinion is considered as a "healthy" way of voicing a member's views. Besides, the Letter we sent you was personally signed by over 100 people. If you insist the Letter was "secretly circulated", I believe your petition letter to Senior Pastor, signed by only 18 people, is more qualified to be referred as "secretly circulated" one. Your comment to the Letter clearly indicates that you are attempting to apply double standard.

As Directors who are under a legal duty to act in the best interests of VCBC, we are appalled by your saying that "the decision was that if a petition letter was formally presented, we would not respond to it". Your comment implies that you arrogantly rejected the voices of many VCBC members, and therefore, you are neglecting your legal duty.

As for your response to the three points raised in the Letter, the conclusions in your reply are also incorrect.

- Philip Mah said in the June 9 meeting that he was advised by Boughton Law Corporation not to discuss the documents that Elaine Chan released. This shows that Philip agrees that the document was inappropriate to be released to congregation, and therefore inappropriate to discuss them at the June 9 meeting. It seems like you are either contradicting Philip Mah's judgment or Elaine Chan's action.
- Philip Mah should not have allowed a floor motion to remove the officially elected moderator, Kelly Chan, of VCBC. Removing a moderator is governed by the Society Act and our church By-Laws, and so requires a motion in an agenda that gives sufficient notice to members. The Society Act takes precedence over floor motions and Robert's Rules. Even worse, Philip Mah allowed this floor motion to proceed without Kelly Chan's presence nor giving him opportunity to explain himself (without prior knowledge that there will be a surprised floor motion to remove him). Philip Mah is not only violating the Society Act, but potentially abusing Kelly Chan's basic human rights.

- Regarding the four, Edward Li, Betty Yuen, James Ng and Ken Ip, representing the Joint Group went to meet Rev. Kong, our understanding to the mandate of the Joint Group is to evaluate the suitability of Rev. Kong as the senior pastor ONLY. Please clarify:
 - Who gave the Joint Group the authorization to approach, harass and push our Senior Pastor to resign before members' approval?
 - What timeline did they give the Senior Pastor to respond to their request?
 - what other message or decision did they convey?

Since you said the four "were carrying out work that was commissioned by the Joint Group", we would like to know who are the people in the Joint Group that **supported** the above actions.

Without going into more details, the actions of the six people named in the Letter (**Philip Mah, Elaine Chan, Ken Ip, Edward Li, Betty Yuen, and James Ng**, the "Group of Six") were highly unethical. No matter how you quote PIPA, floor motions, member's motions, majority vote, etc., the fact is that the unethical actions of these church leaders have caused serious disruptions, conflicts, disharmony, dissensions, rumors, and discord to VCBC. Again, as Directors, you are under a legal duty to act in the best interests of VCBC.

We realize that trying to discuss and clear up all these issues over email is inefficient and ineffective; so we formally request a face to face meeting with you and the other directors. This would give us a better understanding of each other and also help us to decide what to do next. The over 100 members who signed the Letter and many concerned members would like to meet with you. Below is our formal invitation to you and the BOD (**with the exception of the Group of Six**):

Date: Nov 17, 2013 (Sunday)
Time: 2:00PM to 5:00PM
Place: VCBC Sanctuary
Language: Cantonese
(translator will be provided)

The concerned members would love to have a "healthy" dialogue with you. Please kindly confirm your availability so that I can confirm with all concerned members.

Respectfully submitted,

Dominic Li, Winston Wong, Rita Hoi, Phyllis Tse

Cc: Philip Mah, Elaine Chan, Edward Li, James Ng, Betty Yuen, Ken Ip