

## Comments on Frank's Document Relating to the Synod

1. Page 2; Last line; You say that 'a sacramental bond cannot be broken by the couple or the church'. However, the bond to have and to hold started when the couple made their wedding vows. If the relationship has broken down irrevocably and the promises are broken forever, in what sense is the bond retained? The couple have broken it and the secular world recognises this. Why not the Church?
2. You make the same point at the top of Page 3. I do not understand the 'absolute nature of Divine law' in this context. The Natural Law is that most humans are fully human and fully alive if their marriage is permanent and it is the permanence that is an important feature of the relationship being a sign of God's love for the Church. But, if the relationship is over, it cannot be a sign and proclaiming that the marriage can not be dissolved doesn't make it a sign. The bond is broken.
3. Page 3; last para; You refer to a non-sacramental form of marriage. This makes no sense to me. Why should not the covenant made in the second marriage be just as strong as that made in the first? In practice, because the partners are more mature, they are making a more mature choice. I see no reason why the second marriage is not sacramental and semantics in this area bring the Church into disrepute particularly with the young.
4. Page 4; Section 5; This section could be developed. Since homosexuals are the product of a natural process, their needs should be met as with every other human being and there is a call for the Church to discover what the pastoral needs of the homosexual community are.