

12th February, 2018

Rev. Dr. Olasupo Ayokunle
The Chairman
CAN Trust Fund
National Christian Centre
Abuja

Dear Sir,

REPORT TO NEC

Please find below my report to NEC on developments in the CAN Trust Fund. I make this Report to NEC on the basis of the mandate that NEC gave me on 9th July, 2014 to establish and manage the CAN Trust Fund.

I regret to inform you that the 0.019% performance of the CAN Trust Fund in 2017, coupled with the contrary working relationship that I experienced with the Chairman necessitated this Report. The Laity Trustees tried to intervene so that a meeting of the Trustees could be convened to manage the situation but they were unceremoniously rebuffed by the Chairman.

I am sending this Report to NEC but I would like the Chairman to be aware of it so that if there are issues he disagrees with, he can easily prepare to correct or refute it.

Thank you, sir, for your kind consideration.

Bosun Emmanuel
Coordinator

CAN TRUST FUND: REPORT TO NEC FOR FEBRUARY 16, 2018 MEETING

12th February, 2018

National Executive Committee (NEC)
Christian Association of Nigeria
National Christian Center
Abuja

Distinguished Leaders of the Nigerian Church,

I wish to express great regret at having to bring this uncomplimentary Report to NEC. However, in a situation in which positive change is not readily visible, I am compelled to seek NEC intervention. I make this Report based on the mandate that NEC gave me on 9th July, 2014 to establish and manage the CAN Trust Fund.

One of the objectives of the CAN Trust Fund is to mobilize N5 billion monthly, which translates to N60 billion annually for CAN. The goal of the CAN Trust Fund is to ensure that CAN is financially independent to fulfill its obligations to the Body of Christ in Nigeria. Of particular emphasis is the need to liberate CAN from soliciting and receiving donations from Government and politicians due to the nefarious influence they seek to exert on the Christian body.

After receiving the mandate to establish and manage the CAN Trust Fund, a Board of Trustees made up of CAN leaders and reputable laity members of the Church was inaugurated to provide guidance and management. It was part of my proposal that the Trustees should be headed by the President of CAN as the Chairman. The objective was to leverage on the office of the President of CAN both for endorsement and influence. This arrangement worked beautifully under the former President of CAN, his Eminence, Pastor Ayo Oritsejafor, who worked assiduously to ensure that the CAN Trust Fund not only received NEC mandate, but it also took off before he left office.

Since a new leadership boarded the CAN Trust Fund, progress stalled. At the end of 2017, the CAN Trust Fund posted a 0.019% result. It was a very poor performance which was a reflection of uncommitted leadership. The members of the Trustees, particularly the laity members, sought to rectify the situation but they were rebuffed by the Chairman. The Heads of the Blocs were very cautious in response, probably because they did not want to precipitate a conflict amongst the Blocs.

The vision of the CAN Trust Fund is easy to achieve. This was reinforced at the Christian Leadership meeting in Lagos on 7th November, 2017 as all the Church leaders in attendance agreed that monthly token donation by individual Christians to CAN, would produce a mass volume that would make the Association financially independent. The unfortunate thing is the leadership seems at variance with the goal of the CAN Trust Fund. Even though it gives an outward impression of supporting the Trust Fund, it systematically undermines it.

I have struggled to understand why the Chairman would seem to be so hostile to a project that was meant to help him succeed as President of CAN and enable the Nigerian Church overcome its foes. I could only come up with three possibilities, and each one is disturbing.

- a. The Chairman gives the impression that he wants to undermine the legacies of his predecessor. His hostility to NCEF, CAN Trust Fund and total ignoring of CAN Strategy Document are worrisome signals. These are legacies of his predecessor.
- b. Or, does the Chairman prefer funds to be contributed into an account he alone has authority over? Could that be why despite being Chairman of Trustees of CAN Trust Fund, he started another Fund Raising Committee within CAN, with proceeds to go into an account which he has control over?
- c. Or, are we to suspect that our President of CAN is holding brief for the Islamists? They don't want CAN to be financially independent. Could that be the reason why he refused to sign the letter of protest to SSS/DSS last year after they harassed Laity Trustees that he is Chairman over? The refusal to sign that letter is very pregnant with meaning. To date, a logical explanation is yet to be offered.

Therefore, based on the mandate that NEC graciously handed over to me in Makurdi in 2014, I humbly request that NEC seek answers to the following questions from the Chairman of the CAN Trust Fund. The answers to these questions would help in resolving the poor performance of the CAN Trust Fund.

1. Why is the Chairman of the Trustees reluctant to convene meeting of Trustees? In 2017, following a reminder to him by Laity Trustees to convene a meeting after **eight consecutive months** (Sept. 2016 – May 2017), the Chairman retorted, **“Where is it written that the Trustees should meet?”** As of today, (12th Feb.) the Trustees have not met for **five months** (5th Sept. 2017 – 12th Feb. 2018). When the Laity Trustees reminded the Chairman again, the Chairman rebuffed the Elderly Laity Trustees with harsh and unkind words. That was very unfair. Till today, the Chairman has not provided a date for the next meeting of the Trustees five months after the last meeting. How would the Trust Fund produce results if the Trustees do not meet regularly?
2. The former President of CAN approved two signatories “A” for the accounts of the CAN Trust Fund. This was to ensure that if one signatory “A” was not available, the other would release funds. He also approved that Heads of Blocs would rotate as the alternate signatory “A”. When the current President of CAN took office, he insisted that he must be the only signatory “A” and relegated the Heads of Blocs to signatory “B”. Now that he is sole signatory “A”, the Chairman appears to be holding the operations of the CAN Trust Fund to ransom. Operational funding is often received in arrears and currently we

encountered resistance before he agreed to sign the cheque for the December 2017 and January 2018 which we are yet to receive on 12th February. We operated mostly with loan from NCEF. Was it premeditated?

3. Two of the Laity Trustees met with the Coordinator on 7th November, 2016 and amongst others, offered to mobilize **free monthly operational funding** for the Secretariat, through their contacts. This would ensure that whatever money the CAN Trust Fund generates would be applied for CAN projects 100%. It was a wonderful offer. The Chairman was promptly informed so that he would give approval for the two Laity Trustees to commence. The initiative failed because the Chairman took an unnecessary long time in responding even after I drafted the letter of acceptance and simply requested the Chairman to forward it to the two Laity Trustees. Eventually when he responded, he demanded that he must be the one to approve expenditure. Why would anyone make such demand? The initiative lost momentum and the idea was jettisoned, till today. After making the Secretariat of the Trust Fund lose free operational funding, what alternative arrangement did the Chairman make to fund the Secretariat regularly?
4. Based on my report to NEC on 11th October, 2017, NEC approved that new CAN Trustees should be appointed to replace the Trustees that were appointed in 1986. To date, nothing has been done even though it is clear that the non-appointment of the new Trustees for CAN negatively impact on the ability of the CAN Trust Fund to access operational funding in the banks. The Secretariat of the CAN Trust Fund operates mostly with loans from the NCEF. NEC should kindly find out what delayed the appointment of new Trustees for CAN since October 2017? GTBank, UBA, and Zenith banks are all asking for the letter from CAN Trustees.
5. Should the Chairman of the CAN Trust Fund be the sponsor of another fund raising Committee within CAN? What could be urgent about projects in National Secretariat that would warrant the Chairman of CAN Trust Fund float another Fund Raising Committee with proceeds going into an account in which he alone has the final say on disbursement? The money from the CAN Trust Fund, is it not for the same projects? Why duplicate efforts? And, this was done without discussion with Trustees of CAN Trust Fund. To worsen matters, the fund raising was aimed at politicians and Government officials, the very group that NEC wants to stop CAN Officials from soliciting funds from so that CAN shall be free from external influence.
6. The President of CAN organized a Leadership Conference on 7th Nov. 2017 to mobilize support for CAN. However, when time came to display the account number on the screen, it was the account of the Fund Raising Committee under the control of the President of CAN that was displayed. Even after the Coordinator of the CAN Trust Fund protested that it should be the Trust Fund account, it was not changed. Are we now to conclude that the objective of the Conference was actually to mobilize N1 billion into the account of the fund raising Committee of the President of CAN using the CAN Trust Fund as smoke screen?
7. A serious issue that borders on where loyalty lies is the refusal of the Chairman to sign the letter of protest to DSS after they harassed members of the Trustees. The mystery still remains unresolved. Why would the President of CAN/Chairman refuse to sign? One of the Laity Trustees was so unhappy he commented thus on 24th March, 2017: *"This is*

the greatest act of dishonesty and treachery the Church of Christ will witness in modern Nigeria. It is a betrayal of the worst order and is unacceptable to me. The CAN President should be told in no unmistakable terms that this is a clear statement of his disapproval of the NCEF and lack of regard for the dignity and protection of our persons and the Church of Christ entrusted to his care by his election as our President.

Secondly, the situation on hand has gone beyond the level of the Legal Director who wrote the first letter and accompanied us to SSS. Any letter to SSS now must be by a superior authority for it to be meaningful and in the best interest of the Church.

If the CAN President is afraid to sign it or has been intimidated into absconding from his responsibility to God and His Church, then let the Vice President sign it otherwise let the letter be dropped. We shall then take it that the President has dumped the NCEF. Simple. I will then hold the CAN President and CAN responsible for my arrest and questioning by the SSS and take any action as I deem fit in the circumstance.

I doubt if after this any sensible person will risk his life for the ideals of CAN under this dispensation and that's exactly what the enemies of Christ want.

I am deeply disappointed.”

8. On 25th July, 2017, the Chairman of the Trustees, while discussing with seven Elders of the NCEF, told terrible lies about me. Money that I never collected, things that I never did, were charged against me. Fortunately, the Christian Elders immediately called me to confirm. In December 2017, he told a Medical Doctor another set of lies against me. Again, the Doctor was kind enough to call me to confirm. Only God knows how many other people he would have deceived and they did not call me to confirm. They would assume it was the truth because they heard it from “the President of CAN”. Why would the Chairman embark on campaign of calumny and falsehood against the Coordinator of the CAN Trust Fund knowing full well that it would undermine the support and goodwill for the CAN Trust Fund?
9. Another disturbing penchant of the Chairman is the habit of inviting non-members of the Trustees to participate in the meeting of the Trustees without any prior discussion or consent of the other Trustees. This has legal implications. Any non-member of a duly constituted body that participates in the deliberations renders all decisions taken in that meeting null and void. Even though the people invited are CAN officials, they are not members of the Trustees of the CAN Trust Fund and they were not invited by the Trustees. If anyone should challenge in a law court decisions of the Trustees on this ground, every work of the Trustees shall be overturned.
10. Giving consideration to the issues above, would NEC not consider it expedient that a change in leadership of the CAN Trust Fund is imperative? Under the current leadership, the CAN Trust Fund posted 0.019% performance in 2017. It is either the current Chairman is too busy to pay attention to the CAN Trust Fund or he is not interested in the project. After all, CAN Trust Fund is not one of the Constitutional responsibilities of the President of CAN; it is simply a privileged position. Considering the various attacks on Christianity in Nigeria, Christians have no other option but to make CAN financially independent so that structures that would defend and promote Christianity would be put in place. A stitch in time saves nine.

OBSERVATIONS

The request in point No. 10 is predicated on the following considerations:

- a. The current Chairman has become too controversial due to the various allegations of financial misconduct in CAN. His presence on the CAN Trust Fund may drive support away from the project.
- b. His un-Christian attitude of peddling lies and falsehood, particularly against the Coordinator of the Trust Fund, makes it difficult to work with him. Another Chairman would be needed to re-build trust and credibility which are crucial to the success of the project.
- c. The attitude of dictator and inconsideration exhibited against the Trustees could drive the distinguished persons away from the project. Since the goal is to make CAN financially independent, care has to be taken to carry influential people along rather than antagonize them.
- d. It can be concluded from the report above that the Chairman is not interested in the success of the CAN Trust Fund. It is not good management to keep in office a leadership that posted a 0.019% performance and is not showing signs of improvement.
- e. It is very difficult to work in peace and harmony with the Chairman.

In conclusion, I should repeat that it gives me no iota of pleasure to have presented this Report. However, I have encountered serious problems on the project and I need the intervention of NEC. I remain committed to the CAN Trust Fund and I am persuaded it would work, but, current leadership is a serious challenge. I seek the kind consideration of NEC.

Thank you.

Bosun Emmanuel
Coordinator, CAN Trust Fund
12th February, 2018