

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AFTER DIVORCE

A WORKING PARTY REPORT*

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1987 a small working party was established under the auspices of the Ecclesiastical Law Society to examine the question "Can the Church of England have a consistent discipline with regard to those seeking marriage after divorce?"

The working party has mainly consisted of four priests of very different traditions within the Church of England, three of whom are qualified solicitors either now or formerly in legal practice. Three of the priests are beneficed clergy and one is an NSM. All that follows has been hammered out in the light of dealing with ordinary people at the coal face of the law and of the parish.

The working party presented a paper to the bi-annual residential conference of the E.L.S. in April 1991. Its public reception and private affirmation were markedly different and the working party is grateful to those who highlighted both the need for a consistent policy and something of the bumpy road ahead.

Following the E.L.S. Cardiff Conference the working party felt the need for more information and decided to ask all the archdeacons on General Synod for their help. Our questionnaire (Appendix C) provided a wealth of helpful information, far beyond our expectation, and replies emphasised the need for simplicity and flexibility.

2. FACTS AND FIGURES

The questionnaire circulated to the archdeacons on General Synod provided helpful insight into a number of the issues raised in this paper. We are extremely grateful to them for their help and for their care in replying. So far, 43 out of 46 (93%) have sent helpful comments, letters and documents as well as replies to our questionnaire. This represents 95% of the dioceses in the two provinces. Five additional returns have been made by diocesan and suffragan bishops. The sample is relatively small, but the findings are statistically reliable, and the facts speak for themselves.

Present practice, as might be expected, varies enormously. One in five dioceses adhere strictly to the Convocation Regulations, 76% encourage clergy who do marry divorced people to refer, in some way, to the bishops, and 1 in 20 support the clergy in making their own decisions. The overall impression is that it is very difficult for diocesan bishops to provide a consistent policy throughout their diocese, though most provide guidance. In every diocese there are clergy who, whatever the diocesan ruling, choose to exercise their right to marry those who have been divorced and whose former spouse is still living.

The "success" of diocesan policies is therefore very difficult to assess. In those dioceses where bishops encourage referral, 62% of the archdeacons were wholly satisfied with the system, 29% moderately so. About 9% thought it was not working well. It was clear that reference to the bishop, in about 1 in 5 dioceses, is minimal or non-existent. However, several archdeacons were strongly of the

* The Working Party has mainly consisted of: The Ven Alan Clarkson, The Revd Stephen Rix, the Revd John Rees, The Revd David Sherwood.

We have been greatly helped in our work by the concern of a number of members of the Ecclesiastical Law Society and by the archdeacons who replied to our survey to all of whom we would like to express our warmest thanks. The burden of this paper, however, must rest squarely upon those whose names are listed above.

In particular, the recommendations of this paper and the doctrinal explanation in Appendix A are those of the Working Party and are not intended to express views of the Society.

opinion that the parochial clergy should make the decision themselves, referring only extremely difficult or border-line cases to the bishop.

While most archdeacons working in dioceses with a referral system felt that their present practice was working well or moderately well, 86% of all those who replied were unhappy with the present national situation. A national code of practice was favoured by 75%, and if those who enforce the Convocation Regulations are included (since they already have a form of code of practice) the figure rises to 87%.

A significant number, nearly two-thirds, thought such a code might be possible in spite of the enormous range of views held within the Church of England. Nearly half felt that our first set of proposals offered a possible way forward, the main criticism being an intense dislike or mistrust of advisory committees or any form of bureaucracy.

The crucial question seems to be whether the clergy should act alone, referring only difficult cases to the bishop, his commissary, an adviser or a committee, or whether the referral of all cases should be the norm. Dislike of bureaucracy seems to favour the single person, be it the bishop or his appointee. An instinct for consistency looks to some expression of "my care and thine". A sense of urgency and the needs of pastoral care look for simplicity and efficiency. Present financial anxieties seek the avoidance of new structures and committees.

While the survey underlined the unsatisfactory nature of the present situation, it failed to reveal a common mind as to the best way of regulating remarriage and providing an intelligible policy for the Church of England and the people of this nation as a whole.

The choice of archdeacons gave something of an over-view and many took the trouble to check their answers with their bishops. It could be argued that very different answers might have been obtained from the parochial clergy since only four of the archdeacons who replied are incumbents, however, 86% had personally been faced with requests for remarriage in recent years, some had taken weddings involving those who had been divorced (and whose previous spouse was still alive), and many had used services of prayer and dedication. It is significant that 40% were unhappy with the Service of Prayer and Dedication after Civil Marriage and one diocese insists on its own version being used.

Two further pieces of information indicate the size and growth in demand for services of marriage or dedication for those who have been previously married.

(a) Figures gleaned from the Archdeacon's Articles of Enquiry in 1991 in the Diocese of Winchester show that about 1 in every 11 couples seeking marriage in church are blessed after a civil ceremony. The diocesan bishop, like many others, encourages the use of the Service of Prayer and Dedication with those who have previously been divorced, and asks clergy who remarry to refer to the bishops before doing so.

(b) Figures from the Office of Population Statistics show that the number of weddings taking place each year in Anglican Churches in England and Wales involving at least one person who has been married before and whose previous spouse is still alive, has grown from about 1,200 in 1979 to over 6,000 in 1989 and that the number is still rising. One in 20 of all weddings conducted in Anglican Churches in England and Wales now involves at least one person who has been divorced, compared with 1 in 250 in 1976.

Our enquiries have reinforced our view that there is considerable disquiet at the present situation, a widespread desire for a simple code of practice,

or strict adherence to the Convocation Regulations, and a degree of realism about the kind of observance that any such code might be given by the Church of England as a whole. It is this high degree of dissatisfaction with the present situation together with the weighty desire for a code practice and the growing numbers that seek our help that has encouraged us to press on with our work. If any code of practice is to have any hope of being of service to the Church of England as a whole then it must be flexible in operation. We have taken this into account in the scheme that follows.

3. THE PRESENT SITUATION

Since the failure of Option G, most parochial clergy have made up their own minds as to whether or not they should marry those who have been divorced and whose first partner is still alive. The majority of diocesan bishops have provided clear regulations and encouraged clergy to refer cases to them, leaving the final decision to the clergy themselves.

To some extent the post-Option G dust has settled and almost all the archdeacons who responded to our survey recorded that the marriage of those who have been divorced is not a big issue in their dioceses. It appears that the clergy are living with a familiar Anglican "fudge" and getting on with the job. It is difficult to estimate the proportion of the clergy who regularly remarry those who have been divorced. Some who set out with the idea of remarrying a selected few have found it so difficult to administer in practice that they no longer do so. The pastoral implications of choosing some and not others are great, and it is extremely difficult not only to be fair but to be seen to be fair. Furthermore, there is some evidence of a hardening of attitudes towards remarriage as society as a whole reacts against the permissiveness of recent years.

The clergy find the situation difficult enough, but most lay people are thoroughly confused by the events of recent years, and many have little or no idea what the Church of England actually teaches or believes about marriage and divorce. Numbers of church-goers, as well as clergy, are unhappy not only about the principle of remarriage but also about the idea of their churches being used for that purpose.

Many couples seeking remarriage find the offer of a service of blessing inadequate, even distasteful, and tend to shop around, having heard that some clergy do remarry, even if theirs does not. Sadly, some Free Church ministers are not too careful about offering weddings to those claiming to be "C of E". The level of dissatisfaction with the existing Service of Prayer and Dedication is significant, but it may be that it is the principle and not the content of the service which is in question. Clergy who use this service are under increasing pressure to celebrate the second marriage in a way that makes it more and more like a wedding service.

The pressure upon clergy to conduct marriages for those who have been divorced will not go away. The number asking for marriage rises every year.

Option G failed partly because of its bureaucracy and partly because it made impossible time demands upon clergy. The present undefined situation requiring, at most, a letter to the bishop, has one great advantage in that it keeps the time spent with couples seeking remarriage within bounds.

Time is a considerable restraint upon what can and cannot be done. Clergy who do remarry find it necessary, and rewarding, to spend much more time with couples marrying for the second time than they do with those for the first. Indeed, many clergy who already spend what they feel is a disproportionate amount of their time with the occasional offices would find it necessary to reject any policy which greatly increased the time given to this part of their ministry.

Time is also a consideration for couples marrying a second time. Because of past failures they almost always live together for a time to see if the relationship will work. Once they decide to marry they choose dates that are weeks rather than months ahead. Church procedures involving delay lead to a high rejection rate among couples seeking remarriage.

4. THE QUESTION BEFORE US

The question before us is “Can the Church of England have a consistent discipline with regard to those seeking marriage after divorce?” Two-thirds of the archdeacons who took part in our survey believe that to be possible.

Some would maintain that the Church of England already has a clear policy in the form of the Convocation Regulations. However, there are many clergy who feel themselves obliged to abide by the Regulations, and yet are not convinced that it is right in the modern world. They find themselves refusing what in their hearts they believe to be right. This does nothing for their credibility.

Ever since the General Synod acknowledged the propriety of allowing some people to marry again while their former spouses are alive, the need for a new code of practice has been self-evident. The outline for such a code already exists in a document which has come to be known as “The son of Option G” (Appendix to GS 633) and in many of the excellent guidelines issued by diocesan bishops to their clergy.

If the Church of England stands by its decision that under certain circumstances it is right for people to remarry whilst their first partner is still alive, then it must define the circumstances.

However, with so many major issues on its plate at the present time, the Decade of Evangelism, the development of new patterns of ministry, the implications of the ordination of women, pastoral re-organisation, the effects of the recession, the needs of society, care for the homeless, ministry to the ageing, and so on, there are signs that the Church of England has neither the will nor the inclination to grapple with marriage discipline.

Nevertheless, it seems absurd that the Church of England should go on leaving such an important matter seemingly unregulated, when many other sections of society are increasingly worried by the ease of divorce and the break-up of family life. The Church’s silence on this matter seems deafening. Sadly, the impression given by the acceptance of the ministry of clergy who have remarried after divorce (Amending Canon No 9), is one of double standards. Its strict guidelines will not reach public ears.

It is as well to remember that as the Law now stands, Church and State are not in agreement over a number of matters to do with marriage, divorce and remarriage. Since this situation is not likely to change for the better, clarification of the Church’s discipline is all the more desirable, especially if the Church is to be credible as it takes the world seriously during the Decade of Evangelism.

Two very practical matters remain unresolved. First, the balance between episcopal oversight and local decision. The bishops in their report to General Synod, dated June 1984, were in no doubt that any new regulation should “place the responsibility for decision upon the diocesan bishop in consultation with the parish priest”, and that both the parish priest and/or couple concerned should have the benefit “in appropriate cases of reference by the bishop to a diocesan panel of advisers”.

Secondly, the right mechanism for both reference and appeal. Several archdeacons wrote strongly in favour of clergy being trusted to get on with making the decisions about remarriage. Others wanted to avoid bureaucracy at all costs

preferring reference to a single person rather than a committee. It is very clear that different dioceses call for different solutions and that flexibility in any reference system needs to include everything from a wise counsellor to a small panel at diocesan, archdeaconry or even deanery level.

Two further factors need to be taken into account before outlining a possible way forward. First, our understanding of Ministry is changing fast. Clergy and lay people are searching for a new partnership, with a renewed emphasis upon every member ministry. Bishops and clergy are exploring together the many facets of accountability. Lay people, too, who pay an increasing part of clergy stipends, are expecting a greater say not only in appointments but in subsequent accountability too. Dioceses are becoming increasingly aware of the need for "good practice" at every level. Unless account is taken of this new spirit abroad wrong decisions will be made with regard to any code of practice.

Secondly, there are theological and practical problems which have to be taken into account with regard to marriage discipline. These have been well rehearsed in *Putting Asunder* (1966), the *Root Report* (1971), the *Lichfield Report* (1978), *An Honourable Estate* (1988), numerous Synod papers and documents and many other writings. However, we have felt it necessary to make brief comment on the interpretation of the New Testament and release from vows in Appendix A.

5. CODE OF PRACTICE

In recent years dioceses and parishes have effectively chosen either to abide by the Convocation Regulations or to use a diocesan code of practice as set out in bishops' regulations. From certain points of view this is working satisfactorily but it leaves a great variety of practice from diocese to diocese, and does not meet the desire for a national policy and code of practice.

In a sense we already have one code of practice in the Convocation Regulations, but this does not meet the needs of the dioceses and parishes that recognise the possibility of some people marrying in church after divorce.

The House of Bishops reported to the Synod in January 1984 that while they had decided not to return Option G to the Synod because of a high degree of dissatisfaction with it, they also noted "strong evidence in diocesan discussions of firm support for some modification of the Church's present marriage discipline". Bishop John Taylor, speaking in General Synod in March 1984 when the Bishops' Regulations were presented, said "We have to choose between a deliberate and monitored change or a confusion of contradictions". Failure to provide that framework for monitored change probably accounts, in part, for the high degree of disquiet expressed in our survey over the lack of a national code of practice.

"The son of Option G", a report from the House of Bishops accompanying "Marriage in Church after Divorce" (GS 633), though rejected by Synod in July 1984 shortly after the failure of Option G, provides the nearest thing we have to a national code of practice, and might well now find acceptance if brought back in a revised form by the House of Bishops. There is no doubt that a sensible and realistic code would be greatly appreciated by clergy and lay people alike, and make some sense of the present situation.

6. CHOICES

If a national code of practice were to be provided, then dioceses and parishes would have a number of choices.

A diocese could choose to abide by the Convocation Regulations or deliberately opt for the national code of practice. Observance of the Convocation Regulations would not detract from the civil duty laid upon the clergy to marry those who presented themselves for marriage unless their conscience dictated otherwise.

In those dioceses opting for the national code, parishes would be free to opt for use of the national code rather than the Convocation Regulations. This "opting in" would need to be a deliberate decision made by clergy in conjunction with their P.C.C.s on the basis of a simple majority vote. This choice would then be formally notified to the bishop and be binding until such time as clergy and P.C.C. chose to revise that decision.

In the event of a dispute between clergy and their P.C.C.s there should be recourse to the bishop in exactly the same manner as disputes over the use of new services are settled.

7. SIMPLICITY AND FLEXIBILITY

Once a parish has "opted in" it would be up to the parish clergy to observe the national code of practice. However, there still remains the difficult question of bishop and clergy sharing this ministry to those requesting marriage in church after divorce.

Many bishops may wish to continue with established practice of encouraging clergy to notify them or refer cases to them. Some may wish to change their system, as there is some evidence of bishops being overwhelmed by the number applying. Forecasts indicate continuing growth in requests for marriage after divorce in Anglican churches.

The archdeacons' evidence clearly indicated various policies tailored to the needs of bishops and people in very different locations. Direct reference to the diocesan bishop which works well in the Isle of Man may not be appropriate in a large diocese like Exeter. Flexibility of structures for monitoring applications for marriage seems essential, and each diocese should be free to choose its own.

The need to keep the structure simple, and free, as far as possible, from bureaucracy, is paramount. Furthermore, dioceses are not in the mood to shoulder additional burdens in terms of manpower or finance.

A number of possibilities exist. First, the single person who acts on behalf of the bishop as his commissary. Several dioceses already have such advisers. A better model may be to have a number of such advisers, men and women, strategically placed throughout the diocese, who meet together from time to time to establish consistency of practice. It has been suggested that surrogates, carefully chosen, might be appropriate.

Secondly, a diocese may choose, as some already have done, to trust the parochial clergy, providing them with advisers for difficult cases. That adviser may, or may not, be the diocesan or suffragan bishop. This is clearly the simplest system of all and is consistent with our growing awareness of the need for a shared ministry based on mutual trust.

Thirdly, a diocese may choose to have small advisory panels at diocesan, archidiaconal, deanery or even sub-deanery level, to monitor applications and even meet some of the couples concerned. Details of a team ministry model that impressed the working party are to be found in Appendix B. The working party has not abandoned its view that this system has much to commend it, but has bowed to impressive rejection of bureaucracy by the archdeacons. The only solution we totally reject is that of "laissez-faire".

The value of having an external authority for reference in difficult cases is that it may take away some of the blame for refusal from the local parish priest and enable him to continue to exercise a pastoral ministry to the couple concerned.

Whatever diocesan structure is chosen, provision must be made for couples to appeal against any decision to refuse their request for marriage, whether it be made by parish priest, adviser, panel or bishop. It should be noted that so far no one has challenged a parish priest in the exercise of his conscience, but under the terms of the Matrimonial Causes Act 1965 it is not beyond the bounds of possibility.

Whatever guide-lines are laid down in the national Code of Practice, it would seem wise to include a provision that if one of the couple seeking marriage lives outside the parish in which they wish to be married, the clergy of the parish in which the proposed marriage is to take place should make contact with their opposite number in that parish before agreeing to the marriage. Residential or Electoral Roll qualifications would apply as at present.

8. CONCLUSION

The acceptance by the Church of England that under certain circumstances it may be right to remarry those who have been divorced and whose first partner is still alive requires a stated discipline as to those circumstances and how they shall be applied.

A universally accepted policy, though desirable, is unlikely to be achieved. Therefore a workable solution has to be found which provides consistency, at least within dioceses, proper pastoral care for couples seeking remarriage, safeguards for clergy and laity unhappy about remarriage, reasonable speed of operation, and a right of appeal.

The opting in, rather than opting out, of clergy and Church Councils, provides a clear signal for those living in that parish, and allows for the proper sensitivities of both clergy and people who find the principle of remarriage unacceptable.

We cannot pretend that this is a neat solution. But then, we are not a tidy Church. What we are faced with at present is the absence of any agreed framework within which the clergy can exercise their pastoral discretion. The proposals we make are very much an Anglican compromise and reflect the wide range of views held within our working party but we believe that they would at least provide some semblance of order, to justify the varieties of practice which are part of the genius of the Church of England.

APPENDIX A

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS.

Our understanding of Christian doctrine, which ought always to spring from our prayerful meditation on the ways in which God is active in our contemporary world, always lags behind our experience of life. Whether as ministers of the gospel or practitioners of the law, we are compelled by our encounters with those whose marriages have broken down to see that there is a place for divorce, and often also for remarriage during the life-time of a former spouse. Indeed, the General Synod has explicitly affirmed this.

There are many areas of faith where our dogmatic assertions have failed to keep pace with the compassion of our hearts. The two main issues we have encountered are the New Testament witness to the teaching of Jesus, and the vows of lifelong faithfulness which form a central part of the marriage service.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

If we believe that divorce and remarriage can be the will of God for some people today, we are faced with how to interpret the declaration of Jesus recorded in Mark's Gospel: "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery" (Mark 10,11f RSV). We obviously cannot simply transplant these words into the twentieth century, and apply them indiscriminately to our marriage discipline today.

It is our belief that, in this case, the form critics are right when they tell us that these words reflect the heightened Christian conscience of the early church in Rome, where Mark's Gospel was compiled, rather than the *ipsissima verba* of the incarnate Lord. The same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, about other Biblical rules such as the Pauline privilege and the Matthaean exception, so that what matters is what the Spirit is now saying to the churches, and in particular the Church of England, on this question.

Most of us accept in theory what form criticism teaches us, but in practice we still read the Bible in the old, pre-critical way. We know in theory that this is indefensible, but our practice has not yet caught up. In pastoral matters it is the heart that counts, and we dare not allow the rules we apply and the counsel we give to be governed by theories to which we can no longer give honest intellectual assent.

RELEASE FROM VOWS

Secondly, the vows of lifetime faithfulness. There is no doubt that the solemn promises, spoken before witnesses and in the presence of God, are unequivocal in their wording 'forsaking all other, keep thee only unto her/him, so long as ye both shall live' and "to love and to cherish, till death us do part". In practice, though, it often happens that these promises become impossible of fulfilment. One party deserts or ill-treats the other, or is so habitually unfaithful that the relationship is irrevocably destroyed. It is difficult, under such circumstances, to insist that the negative part, of abjuring any other relationship, be sustained, when the positive parts, serving, loving, honouring, keeping, and possibly obeying, have become quite impossible of fulfilment. Christianity is supposed to be a religion which promises new life, and such an insistence looks suspiciously like the very reverse.

Nevertheless, the vows remain in force until they are released. As a matter of strict law, we must accept that a decree absolute of divorce serves to release the parties from their mutual promises of lifelong fidelity. It may sometimes be thought that the civil courts grant decrees too easily, but in most cases the decree is the last link in a long chain of events which have caused great pain and suffering to the parties, any children, and often friends and other relatives too. Many legal practitioners, as well as clergy, would agree that there is no such thing as an easy divorce.

It is, though, a fact of pastoral experience that there lingers on a deep sense of guilt, of continuing obligation, and often of bitterness too. Wise counselling will bring such matters to the surface long before the ceremony, but even so some couples will find a liturgical expression of penitence in the wedding service helpful, as an open, public recognition of the need of God's grace and forgiveness.

Release from vows needs to be considered both from the point of view of the people concerned and that of the person who will conduct the wedding. From a theological point of view marriage vows may be equated with monastic

life vows. Although uncertainty abounds, it seems probable that a release by the Archbishop of Canterbury would suffice. He might wish to delegate that authority to the diocesan bishops. For some people a simple exchange of letters might suffice. For many people the decree absolute might be felt to be a sufficient release. Release during the wedding ceremony is inappropriate. It is an impediment which needs to be cleared beforehand.

APPENDIX B

SUPPORT STRUCTURES

Our enquiry into current practice with regard to the remarriage of those who have been divorced led us to a particular model carefully worked out by a team ministry in conjunction with their suffragan bishop. This seemed to offer the pastoral sense of Option G without being too cumbersome, and have within it a measure of consistency and oversight.

The team of four clergy work in a sprawling suburban area with four parish churches close to a city. The parish is growing fast and the area seems to attract a high proportion of people whose first marriages have failed. With many requests for second marriages, the team felt that they should, in one way or another, accept responsibility for couples from within the parish seeking remarriage.

Each couple is interviewed by a panel of two lay people and one of the clergy (not the one in whose church the marriage may take place). The panel looks for things to celebrate as well as for signs of penitence, care for children by previous marriages, commitment to each other for life, and evidence that the couple have worked through the pain and bitterness of previous relationships.

The panel members meet from time to time to ensure that there is consistency of policy in the parish, and for their own training. Difficult cases are shared with the suffragan bishop.

Nearly half the couples, when told of the interview procedure, decide, for varying reasons, not to seek remarriage in church. Only a few are turned down by the panel and these are always told of the panel's decision face to face. The parish policy therefore includes both selection by the local church and self-selection by the couples themselves who decide whether or not to accept the Church discipline.

Although the demands upon the panel's time are great and it may take a month to find a date to see a couple, both clergy and laity believe the system shows proper responsibility and care for those in the parish seeking remarriage.

The details of this particular model have been recorded at some length because the principles are important and contain within them the seeds for a variety of needs. The value of an external reference is clear and can be taken at a number of levels, in each case with the knowledge and approval of the diocesan bishop. What that unit is will depend upon the needs of a particular diocese and its choice of options.

APPENDIX C – QUESTIONNAIRE TO ARCHDEACONS REMARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE CURRENT PRACTICE

1. What is current diocesan practice? *Please tick appropriate box*
 - a. Strict adherence to Convocation Regulations of 1938 and 1957
 - b. Adherence to Regulations
combined with Bishops pastoral instructions about remarriage
 - c. Episcopal encouragement given to clergy to remarry?

- 2. In the case of b. and c. above, are the clergy encouraged to refer
 - d. all cases for remarriage to one of the bishops (Diocesan or Suffragan)
 - or his representatives (in individual or committee form)
 - e. some cases
 - f. none?

- 3. In the case of d. and e. above, does this work
 - g. well across the diocese
 - h. moderately well
 - i. poorly?

THE PRESENT SITUATION

- 4. In your opinion *Please cross out what does not apply*
 - j. Do you feel that the present situation, YES/NO
not just in your diocese, but nationwide is satisfactory? YES/NO
 - k. Is this a big issue in your diocese? YES/NO
 - l. Do you believe a Code of Practice, of some kind, is desirable? YES/NO
 - m. Do you believe it is possible to provide a Code of Practice YES/NO
that would satisfy the majority of clergy?
 - n. Do you think that the enclosed outline YES/NO
of our work offers any hope?
 - o. In what ways would you want to modify, or suggest alternatives, YES/NO
to a scheme that refers cases to a local Advisory Committee,
ultimately answerable to the Bishop, but able to give advice on his behalf?

YOUR OWN SITUATION

- 5. It would help us to know:
 - p. Do you look after a parish and face this issue personally? YES/NO
 - q. Do you find the authorised Service of Blessing YES/NO
after a Civil Ceremony satisfactory?
 - r. Have you been asked personally to remarry YES/NO
those who have previously been divorced?

COULD YOU HELP US?

If you could send us . . .

- 1. A copy of any Diocesan Directions
 - 2. Any local work that has been done which might be helpful and relevant to us.
- . . . we would be most grateful.

Comment, ideas and advice would be most welcome.

Diocese:

Archdeacon of:

Signature

Thank you for your time and for your help.

Archdeacon of Winchester

Chairman of the E.L.S. Working Party