

Witness Name : [REDACTED]

Statement No : First

Exhibits: [REDACTED] 1 - [REDACTED] 2

Dated :

**THE INDEPENDENT JERSEY CARE INQUIRY**

---

EXHIBIT [REDACTED] 2

---

JERSEY PROBATION SERVICE.

*[Handwritten signature]*

ADOPTION (JERSEY) LAW, 1961  
ADOPTION (JERSEY) RULES, 1962.

NAME & ADDRESS OF APPLICANTS: ... 1. [REDACTED] (34)

... 2. [REDACTED]

OTHER MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD: ... [REDACTED]  
Date of Birth [REDACTED] 1964

NAME OF ADOPTEE: - [REDACTED] now known as [REDACTED]  
Date of Birth: [REDACTED] 1961

The adoptee is the child of a married woman who, through a period of co-habitation with a single man, conceived the infant, who was subsequently born at the Jersey Maternity Hospital on the [REDACTED] 1961. The father, [REDACTED] and the mother, [REDACTED]. When the child's birth was registered a mistake was made in the entry under the name and surname of the father as no person by the name of [REDACTED] exists - a confusion arising out of the combination of the missing husband and [REDACTED].

Mother and child returned to live with [REDACTED] who maintained both mother and adoptee and also an earlier child born of [REDACTED] previous association with another person. The 'marriage' lasted seven months, when the mother and putative father separated, [REDACTED] removing to [REDACTED] whilst the father returned to his parents' home in [REDACTED].

In February, 1962, the adoptee was then fostered to a [REDACTED], remaining there and being maintained by [REDACTED] for a period of eight months. However, disturbances within this family resulted in the adoptee being removed to Westway Creche. On 21st November, 1962, the adoptee was fostered to [REDACTED] and a boarding-out allowance was made available by the States of Jersey, Children's Department. The child remained with the [REDACTED] until 10th December, 1963, when the mother returned to the Island, reclaimed the child, and returned to [REDACTED] with the little boy. The child was completely unsettled and, at the mother's request, [REDACTED] went to [REDACTED] to [REDACTED], paying his own fare, and returned with [REDACTED] on 7th March, 1964. Since that time he has constantly remained in their care.

[REDACTED] has been interviewed by a representative acting on behalf of the guardian ad litem. Although she admits having consented to the adoption on the 13th April, 1964, and also to the representative that she wished her child to be adopted, she maintained that her consent was not freely given. Indeed, it came as a shock to learn that the child had not yet been adopted. The mother is aware who the applicants are and seems to feel that they are not suitable applicants; however, she now feels that [REDACTED] has been with them for such a long time, it would be harmful for the child to be removed.

The putative father is a simple-minded man, who expressed surprise that the adoption order had not been made. He indicated that he would have liked to have kept the child himself as he was extremely proud of the boy and, even now, sees the child quite frequently. However, he has aged parents, who could not adequately cope with a child of this age. There is

/also the...

There is also the legal fact that a putative father has no legal significance in the Island's laws regarding adoption. However, he admits having signed his consent to the adoption, this having been done on the 20th June, 1964, at his place of employment - [REDACTED].

In interview with both natural parents, it has been ascertained that the adoptee has received protection from tuberculosis, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, polio and small-pox. It has also been ascertained that the mother and her immediate family have been clear of epilepsy, mental illness and tuberculosis. However, this situation does not appertain on the side of the putative father, who maintains that [REDACTED].

However, a medical report submitted by Doctor I. Maine on 22nd February, 1966, indicates complete freedom from these illnesses. The adoptee was also examined psychiatrically by Dr. J. P. F. Fogarty, who found him normal in intelligence, and, although showing slight behaviour problems - due to unsettledness caused by the removal from the applicants' home - was in all respects a normal child of just average intelligence. No stipulation has been made regarding the religious persuasion of the child; should the adoption order be made, the child will be brought up within the Church of England, the faith of [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] is a Roman Catholic.

The applicants were married at St. Saviour's Church on [REDACTED] 1959. They were without children for several years which prompted them to ask for the duties of foster parents. With the arrival and pleasure of the adoptee, a child was born to the couple on [REDACTED] 1964 ([REDACTED]). [REDACTED] is employed, as a [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] his weekly wage being in the region of £20 per week. [REDACTED] is fully occupied with household duties. Both applicants are of average intelligence, although [REDACTED] tends to be highly strung and nervous. Within this setting the adoptee has adapted himself quite well, although his unsettled background - being pushed around from home to home - has obviously made him an attention and affection demanding child. The arrival of [REDACTED] had also aggravated an already difficult situation, but, again, there appears to have been adequate adjustment as an observation whilst the two children were playing, indicated that [REDACTED] was most gentle with his younger [REDACTED].

The family now live in a two-bedroomed 'Station' Flat, which is clean, comfortable and adequately furnished. [REDACTED] named as a person to whom references could be made in the matter of this adoption, is a [REDACTED] employed by [REDACTED]. He has known both applicants over the past six years and recommends both as prospective adopters. This is corroborated by Miss Thornton of the Jersey Children's Department, whose office completely negotiated this application and placing.

This adoption enquiry has been a most difficult one to investigate. The long lapse from birth to eventual application has been marred by illness, uncertainty and a certain

/ amount of...

amount of apathy on the part of the applicants. Although the adoptee was originally placed as a foster child with no thought of adoption, the natural growth of affection and protectiveness prompted this application. In the same way, the separating from the child by the natural parents and the natural concluding by both persons that the child had been adopted, allowed the parents to accept the situation. Their uncertainty about consent at the present moment is based, therefore, on shock and deep guilt feelings, a prevalent and natural feeling of any parent placing his/her own child for adoption.

With the adoptee's welfare in mind and having investigated all relevant matters connected with this adoption, it is still difficult to make any strong recommendation to the Court. However, having ascertained through psychiatric discussion with Dr. Fogarty that the child could suffer great emotional strain through further removal or delay, it is recommended to the Court that an adoption order be granted.

23th May, 1966

V.P. Jones,  
Guardian ad Litem.