

Amended Pursuant to the Order of Justice Forth made at the  
Case Planning Conference held on September 29, 2022

No. S-218672  
Vancouver Registry

SUPREME COURT  
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
VANCOUVER REGISTRY

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

OCT 28 2022  
Between



XYZ

PLAINTIFF

and

The Governing Council of the Salvation Army in Canada /  
Conseil de direction de l'Armée du Salut du Canada

DEFENDANT

Brought under the *Class Proceedings Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 50

**AMENDED NOTICE OF CIVIL CLAIM**

(Original Notice of Civil Claim filed on October 7, 2021)

(Maternity Homes)

**This action has been started by the Plaintiff for the relief set out in Part 2 below.**

If you intend to respond to this action, you or your lawyer must

- a. file a response to civil claim in Form 2 in the above-named registry of this court within the time for response to civil claim described below, and
- b. serve a copy of the filed response to civil claim on the plaintiff.

If you intend to make a counterclaim, you or your lawyer must

- a. file a response to civil claim in Form 2 and a counterclaim in Form 3 in the above-named registry of this court within the time for response to civil claim described below, and

- b. serve a copy of the filed response to civil claim and counterclaim on the plaintiff and on any new parties named in the counterclaim.

JUDGMENT MAY BE PRONOUNCED AGAINST YOU IF YOU FAIL to file the response to civil claim within the time for response to civil claim described below.

### **Time for response to civil claim**

A response to civil claim must be filed and served on the plaintiff,

- a. if you reside anywhere in Canada, within 21 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you,
- b. if you reside in the United States of America, within 35 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you,
- c. if you reside elsewhere, within 49 days after the date on which a copy of the filed notice of civil claim was served on you, or
- d. if the time for response to civil claim has been set by order of the court, within that time.

## **THE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM**

### **Overview**

1. This action concerns institutionalized discrimination based on age, marital status, pregnancy, and abuse committed against young and/or unmarried women and girls who were confined to, in or admitted to facilities run, managed, owned, or supervised by the Salvation Army.
2. Known variously as “maternity homes” and “homes for unwed mothers”, these institutions were founded and operated on the basis that unmarried mothers were not capable of or not suited to raising children than a hetero-normative nuclear family. Due to either their marital status or their age, pregnant women or girls under the age of 25 were deemed and judged as “unfit” mothers who were “unwell” and in need of rehabilitation, correction, and punishment. Therefore, it was decided and promoted that pregnant women and girls should be rehabilitated from their “unfit” and “unwell” status.

3. To “correct” and “rehabilitate” pregnant women and girls from their “shameful” and “incorrigible” behaviour, the maternity institutions meted out a careful cultivated, psychologically coercive, purposeful environment of confinement, which included dehumanization, deprivation, isolation, humiliation, and indoctrination. Residents were forced to adhere to imposed and strictly controlled “educational” programming.
4. The residents entered the maternity institutions expecting humane treatment, but instead were dehumanized, shamed, humiliated, and mistreated. Residents experienced physical, sexual, emotional, or psychological abuse. When their newborn children were born in hospital or in the institution, the mother was blindsided as her newborn was forcibly confiscated and the mother was barred from access.
5. The Plaintiff alleges that she and other Class Members were subjected to physical, sexual, emotional, and psychological abuse arising from the systemic practices, programs and structures meted out, taught, and provided to them by the Salvation Army and its agents. The Plaintiff and the Class Members seek compensation for the wrongdoing they have suffered at the Defendant’s hands.

### **Parties**

6. The Defendant, The Governing Council of the Salvation Army in Canada / Conseil de direction de l'Armée du Salut du Canada (“**Salvation Army**”), is a registered charity in Canada with an address for service at 2 Overlea Blvd, Toronto, ON M4H 1P4. The Salvation Army had and continues to have operations across Canada, including in British Columbia.
7. The Salvation Army is a Christian religious organization. The Salvation Army or its predecessor have operated in Canada since about 1882. The Salvation Army is a corporation established by private act of the Parliament of Canada in 1909: 1909, c. 132, as amended 1916, c. 63, and amalgamated per 1990, c. 49. The Salvation

Army provides oversight and direction to all Salvation Army ministries in Canada, coordinates the appointment of officers and lay personnel, and maintains control over related corporations.

8. The Plaintiff, X.Y.Z., is a resident of British Columbia.
9. The Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and on behalf of the following classes:

All persons in Canada, or their estates, who were placed or resided in a maternity home operated by the Salvation Army in Canada, on or after January 1, 1960 (the “**Class**” and “**Class Members**”)

And the following included subclass:

All Class Members, or their estates, who were under the age of majority at any time while in a maternity home operated by the Salvation Army in Canada, on or after January 1, 1960

### **Maternity Homes in Canada**

10. At material times, the Salvation Army operated “maternity homes” at the following locations in Canada (together with any other locations in Canada at which it operated maternity homes these are the “Maternity Homes”):

#### **BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**Maywood Home**  
7250 Oak St.  
Vancouver, B.C.

## ALBERTA

### **Hill Haven/Parkwood House**

1340 8th Avenue N.W.  
Calgary, Alberta

## MANITOBA

### **Grace Haven**

Box 2907  
Steinbach, Manitoba

### **Bethany Home**

205 Arlington St. 1956-1974  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
Changed to **Lindenview Place** 1974-1993  
205 Booth Drive,  
Winnipeg, Manitoba

## SASKATCHEWAN

### **Grace Haven**

2929 26th Avenue  
Regina, Saskatchewan  
alternate address also found: 2301-15th Avenue, Regina

### **Bethany Home & Hospital**

802 Queen St.  
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

## ONTARIO

### **Grace Haven**

245 James St. S.  
after 1973 moved to  
138 Herkimer St.  
Hamilton, Ontario

**Bethany Home**  
450 Pape Avenue  
Toronto, Ontario

**Bethany Home**  
1140 Wellington St.  
Ottawa, Ontario

**Bethesda Home & Hospital**  
54 Riverview Avenue  
London, Ontario

**Faith Haven**  
Windsor, Ontario

**Grace Haven/Lakehead Florence Booth Home**  
497 N. Lillie St.  
Thunder Bay, Ontario

**Florence Booth Home**  
Fort William, Ontario

### **QUEBEC**

**Grace Haven**  
6690 Monkland Ave.  
Montreal, PQ

### **NOVA SCOTIA**

**Grace Haven** called Parkdale House after 1975  
47 Byng Avenue  
Sydney, Nova Scotia

**Bethany Home**  
6080 Young St. also 980 Tower Road  
Halifax, Nova Scotia

## **NEW BRUNSWICK**

### **Evangeline Home “Rathbone House”**

260 Princess St.  
Saint John, N.B.

## **NEWFOUNDLAND**

### **The Anchorage**

26 Cook St.  
St. John’s, Newfoundland

### **Glenbrook Lodge**

18 Wood Street  
St. John’s Newfoundland

11. The Maternity Homes were staffed and operated by the Defendant’s agents, including its clergy, adherents, volunteers, and lay employees.
12. The Maternity Homes confined unwed women and girls during their pregnancies. The Salvation Army and its agents had care, control, and custody of those persons while they were confined in its Maternity Homes. The Salvation Army was responsible for their basic necessities of life including housing, food, care, clothing, and education. In many cases, the Salvation Army was the temporary or ongoing guardian at law of the persons residing in the Maternity Homes.
13. At material times, the Salvation Army’s mandate and belief was that it was in the best interest of any child of an unwed mother to be raised by a married couple. This was a policy at the national level of the organization, premised on its religious precepts. To achieve this result, the Salvation Army designed, implemented, and oversaw programming to compel, induce or otherwise achieve this result by any means necessary, including the physical, sexual, emotional, and psychological abuse of the Plaintiff and Class Members.

14. The Plaintiff and Class Members were vulnerable persons, many of them under the age of majority. The Salvation Army took advantage of that vulnerability for its own purposes. The Salvation Army did not meet its duty to care for and protect the security and safety of these Class Members.
15. In the operation of its Maternity Homes, the Salvation Army had in place mandates, policies, procedures, and practices designed or permitted to operate with the objective of breaking down the will of pregnant persons in order to take their newborn children.
16. These dehumanizing, harmful practices and policies operated by the Salvation Army in its Maternity Homes, continue to have an impact for years, as the sealing of records have made it difficult, if not impossible, for the children and their mothers to connect, resulting in isolation, abandonment, confusion, and denial of knowing one's true culture, lineage, and identity.
17. In addition, in certain specific instances where mothers and children have since connected, there have been feelings of regret, grief, guilt, humiliation, hopelessness, and anger over lost time and lost opportunity to provide love, support and a good life for each other because of the forced separation inflicted on them by the Salvation Army's actions and omissions in the Maternity Homes.
18. It is a consequence of the Defendant's actions that the Class Members who entered its facilities were dehumanized and traumatized as well as physically, sexually, emotionally, and psychologically injured, and marked for life.
19. It is a consequence of the Defendant's intentional acts that the injuries sustained by Class Members are further aggravated by humiliation, loss of dignity, and ongoing state of dehumanization.



20. It is a consequence of the Defendant's intentional acts that the injuries sustained by Class Members are further aggravated by the effects of being exploited for their reproductive capacity.

21. It is a consequence of the Defendant's actions that the Class Members were denied or limited in their opportunity to form their own identity as a mother and as a person.

22. It is a consequence of the Defendant's actions that the Class Members were denied or limited in their opportunity to form a relationship with their children.

### **The Plaintiff's Experience**

23. The Plaintiff became pregnant at age 15 as a result of a sexual assault in 1982.

24. The Plaintiff was the child of immigrants to Canada. Only her father spoke English, with difficulty, and her parents struggled emotionally and financially to support their daughter through her pregnancy and into motherhood. They were led to believe that it was in the Plaintiff's best interest to be admitted into a maternity home.

25. The Plaintiff was confined to the Maywood Home in Vancouver operated by the Salvation Army in approximately 1983. Only a few months into her pregnancy, her parents were compelled to sign guardianship of their pregnant teenage daughter over to the home. She stayed there until she was approximately eight and a half months pregnant, at which time she returned to her parents.

26. While at Maywood Home, in accordance with their practice and policy, the Salvation Army and its agents engaged in a deliberate process of physical control, confinement, and privation against the Plaintiff, and repeated against other Class Members at its Maternity Homes, including:

- a. Confining the Plaintiff to the Maywood Home;

- b. Failing to adequately feed and nourish the Plaintiff, leading to significant weight loss;
- c. Depriving the Plaintiff of her clothes and personal items upon entry;
- d. Restricting her clothing to a single outfit or a brown smock;
- e. Refusing to let her have or wear shoes;
- f. Forcing the Plaintiff to provide unpaid labour at the facility;
- g. Providing inadequate medical care and subjecting the Plaintiff to medical examination and manipulation without consent; and
- h. Physically intimidating the Plaintiff to prevent any perceived disciplinary violations, escape attempts, or independent thought or actions.
- i. Limiting freedom of movement;
- j. Withholding essential information, resources and prenatal care;  
Failing to provide a sense of safety, by intentionally withholding essential information, resources, and prenatal care necessary to enter motherhood.

27. While at Maywood Home, in accordance with their practice and policy, the Salvation Army and its agents engaged in a deliberate process of psychological and “moral” manipulation and exploitation against the Plaintiff, and repeated against other Class Members at its Maternity Homes, including:

- a. Refusing to let her or anyone else refer to her by her given name, and instead requiring her to use a pseudonym;
- b. Referring to the Plaintiff as a “bad girl”, a “fallen” or “sinful” person, and attributing or implying responsibility to or on the Plaintiff for her pregnancy;
- c. Failing to acknowledge and provide information and support for sexual assault;

- d. Engaging in a prolonged campaign of brainwashing to instill feelings of guilt and inadequacy over her pregnancy and impending motherhood in order to induce her to comply with their adoption agenda by means of:
  - i. Denying that the Plaintiff could ever love or adequately care for her baby;
  - ii. Telling the Plaintiff that the only reasonable outcome was that her child would have to be adopted by someone else;
  - iii. Showing her adoption propaganda videos;
  - iv. Forcing her to attend a pro-life rally;
  - v. Banning any discussion and socialization between Class Members who raised the possibility of keeping their babies;
  - vi. Isolating Class Members who raised the possibility of keeping their babies;
- e. Restricting the Plaintiff's communication with other Class Members;
- f. Failing to provide any supports for the trauma that had brought her to the facility in the first place;
- g. Denying the Plaintiff access to any meaningful education and instead using the limited time assigned for that purpose to further the brainwashing about sin and adoption.
- h. Restricting the Plaintiff's access to and communication with anyone outside the maternity home.

28. The Plaintiff's parents were not permitted to enter the facility. The Plaintiff's parents were not permitted to speak with her on the telephone, despite attempting to do so. The Plaintiff's parents were denied any updates on her health and circumstances while she was incarcerated in the facility.

29. When her child was born, the Plaintiff and her child were immediately separated, as her baby girl was stripped from her and placed in the nursery before then being moved to an entirely different ward. When asked to see her baby, the Plaintiff was told she could not. She never saw or held her newborn baby, and instead was immediately and permanently separated from her child.
30. In addition, immediately after the child was born, the Plaintiff was given lactose suppressant medication to stop and cease her breast milk from coming in, her body's natural adaptations to motherhood, further signaling to her that she was going to be removed entirely from the life of her child.
31. The Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer lifelong consequences from her time at the Maywood Home run by the Salvation Army.

#### **Harm to the Plaintiff and Class Members**

32. As a result of the Salvation Army's acts and omissions, the Plaintiff and Class Members have sustained serious injuries, including but not limited to:
- a. physical injuries;
  - b. psychological injuries;
  - c. emotional injuries;
  - d. forcible confinement;
  - e. sexual injuries;
  - f. diminished self-worth;
  - g. loss of identity;
  - h. substance abuse;
  - i. feelings of humiliation and dehumanization;
  - j. insomnia;

- k. sleep disruption;
- l. Impairment of relationships;
- m. Secondary infertility;
- n. Fear of pregnancy – tokophobia;
- o. loss of consortium; and
- p. loss of enjoyment of life.

33. These injuries have caused and continue to cause the Plaintiff and other Class Members pain, suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, permanent disability, loss of physical, mental, and emotional health and loss of earnings, past and prospective.

34. In addition, the Salvation Army's acts and omissions additionally caused and continue to cause injury, loss and damages that include but are not limited to:

- a. pain and suffering;
- b. special damages and expenses paid related to medical and psychological treatment;
- c. loss of income;
- d. damages "in trust" for services provided by family members, past and future; and
- e. health care expenses.

## Part 2: RELIEF SOUGHT

35. An Order certifying this action as a class proceeding under the *Class Proceedings Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 50 (the "***Class Proceedings Act***");
36. General damages plus damages equal to the administration costs for the plan of distribution;
37. Special damages in an amount to be determined, which includes but is not limited to the past and future loss of income, medical expenses and out-of-pocket expenses;
38. Past and future damages "in trust" for services provided by family members;
39. Recovery of health care costs pursuant to the *Health Care Cost Recovery Act*, S.B.C. 2008, c. 27 and related enactments;
40. Punitive damages;
41. Aggravated damages;
42. Interest under the *Court Order Interest Act*, RSBC 1996, c 79;
43. Such further and other relief as this Honourable Court may deem just.

### **Part 3: LEGAL BASIS**

44. The Plaintiff pleads and relies on *inter alia* the *Class Proceedings Act*, the *Court Jurisdiction and Proceedings Transfer Act*, the common law torts set out below, and the *Supreme Court Civil Rules*.

#### **Assault & Battery**

45. As set out in Part 1 above, in its Maternity Homes the Salvation Army's agents caused direct, intentional, and physical interference with the Plaintiff and Class Members by means of forcible confinement, physical abuse, torture, psychological abuse, dehumanization, or unconsented medical treatment. This interference was both harmful and offensive to a reasonable person. In addition, some Class Members were sexually assaulted while in the Salvation Army's Maternity Homes.

46. In addition, as set out in Part 1 above, in its Maternity Homes the Salvation Army and its agents cultivated an environment where almost every act was direct and intentional as to make the Plaintiff and Class Members apprehend that there was an immediate or intentional harm or offensive bodily contact. The environment fostered and cultivated by the Defendant was a constant state of terror, shame, and humiliation for the Class Members insofar that they lived in constant fear of an immediate or intentional harm.

47. In addition, as set out in Part 1 above, the coercive structure of the Maternity Homes operated by the Salvation Army were intended to and did prevent the Plaintiff and Class Members from accessing any reasonable or safe means of escape from the Maternity Homes. The Plaintiff and Class Members were falsely imprisoned in that they were intimidated, coerced, and controlled psychologically by the demonstration of authority by the Defendant's agents, and the resulting fear of consequences of refusal, and apprehension of immediate use of force by them.

48. The Defendant is liable for the torts of assault, battery, and false imprisonment.

## Negligence

49. The Salvation Army had a duty to the Class Members in its care in its Maternity Homes to ensure that they were safe, cared for, and protected. It failed to meet that duty.
50. The Salvation Army's beliefs and mandate regarding unwed mothers and the desirability of adoption by infertile-but-married couples conflicted with and caused it to breach its duty to Class Members. By its actions and omissions, the Salvation Army breached the standard of care it owed to Class Members in its Maternity Homes by *inter alia*:
- a. Placing its religious and mission objects above the safety and security of Class Members;
  - b. Failing to provide the basic necessities of safety, shelter, food, education, and protection to Class Members;
  - c. Failing to have in place appropriate policies to properly train or monitor staff;
  - d. Failing to have in place management and operation procedures that would reasonably prevent the physical and psychological harm experienced by Class Members;
  - e. Engaging in a campaign of indoctrination,
  - f. Failing to have regard to the interests of Class Members in the operation and management of the Maternity Homes.
51. The Salvation Army's policies expressly led to physical and psychological abuse, implicitly promoted it, or otherwise permitted it to occur.



52. As a result of the Salvation Army's negligence, the Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered and continue to suffer losses and damages as set out in Part 1 above.

53. At all material times the Defendant was in a close and proximate relationship to the Plaintiff and Class Members. The damages and losses suffered by the Plaintiff and Class Members are the reasonably foreseeable consequences of the Salvation Army's negligence.

### **Breach of Fiduciary Duty**

54. As set out in Part 1 above, as the operator of the Maternity Homes, and having physical custody and control of the Plaintiff and Class Members, as well as the responsibility to shelter, feed, educate and care for Class Members, the Salvation Army owed a fiduciary duty to Class Members.

55. It was a breach of that fiduciary duty for the Salvation Army to perpetuate and permit the harm to the Plaintiff and Class Members set out at Part 1 above. Up until the present, the Salvation Army has not apologised for its wrongdoing and has continued to deny that it ever "supported the deliberate breaking of, or any attack on the bond between a mother and a child".

### **Punitive Damages**

56. The Salvation Army's misconduct, as set out in Part 1 above, was oppressive and high-handed, and departed to a marked degree from ordinary standards of decent behaviour. The Defendant violated the trust and security of Class Members, who were at their most vulnerable. The Defendant's actions offend the moral standards of the community and warrant the condemnation of the Court such that an award of punitive damages should be made.

### **Aggravated Damages**

57. Due to the outrageous and malicious misconduct of the Salvation Army, as set out in Part 1, the Class Members' injuries were, and continue to be, further aggravated. In particular, the Members experienced, and continue to experience, feelings of humiliation, loss of dignity, and dehumanization because of the damages that arise from the Defendant's misconduct. This past and ongoing state of aggravation only adds insult to injury for the Class Members. In order to repair for the total extent of the damages experienced by the Class by the intentional actions and omissions of the Defendants, the Class Members must be compensated for all aggravation of damages caused by the Salvation Army's conduct.

### **Health Care Costs**

58. The Province of British Columbia provides coverage for health care services to British Columbia residents through the Medical Services Plan and Health Insurance BC.

59. The Plaintiff is a "beneficiary" within the meaning of the *Medicare Protection Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 286 and any amendments.

60. The Plaintiff and Class Members have a claim for the recovery of health care costs, past and future, incurred on their behalf by the British Columbia Ministry of Health and by other provincial and territorial governments. The Plaintiff pleads the following provincial and territorial statutes, as amended, in support of a claim for recovery of health care costs incurred by provincial and territorial governments:

a. *Health Care Cost Recovery Act*, SBC 2008, c 27;

b. *Medicare Protection Act*, RSBC 1996, c 286;

c. *Pharmaceutical Services Act*, SBC 2012, c 22;

- d. *Hospital Act*, RSA 2000, c H-12;
- e. *Crown's Right of Recovery Act*, SA 2009, c C-35;
- f. *The Health Administration Act*, RSS 1978, c H-0.0001 (formerly known as the *Department of Health Act*);
- g. *Health Services Insurance Act*, CSSM s H35;
- h. *Health Insurance Act*, RSO 1990, c H.6;
- i. *Home Care and Community Services Act*, 1994, SO 1994, c26;
- j. *Health Services Act*, RSNB 1973, c H-3;
- k. *Medical Services Payment Act*, RSNB 1973, c M-7;
- l. *Hospital Services Act*, RSNB 1973, c H-9;
- m. *Family Services Act*, SNB 1980, c F-2.2;
- n. *Hospital and Diagnostic Services Insurance Act*, RSPEI 1988, c H-8;
- o. *Health Services Payment Act*, RSPEI 1988, c H-2;
- p. *Health Services and Insurance Act*, RSNS 1989, c 197;
- q. *Hospital Insurance Agreement Act*, RSN 1990, c H-7;
- r. *Medical Care and Hospital Insurance Act*, SNL 2016, c M-5.01;
- s. *Hospital Insurance and Health and Social Services Administration Act*, RSNWT 1988, c T-3;

- t. *Hospital Insurance and Health and Social Services Administration Act*, RSNWT (Nu) 1988, c T-3;
- u. *Medical Care Act*, RSNWT (Nu) 1988, c M-8;
- v. *Health Insurance Act*, CQLR c A-29; and
- w. *Hospital Insurance Act*, RSQ c A-28.

### **Vicarious Liability**

61. The Salvation Army is vicariously liable for the acts or omissions of its servants, including those of local operating units.

### **Discoverability And Postponement**

62. The Plaintiff and Class Members' claims are not governed by any limitation period under the *Limitation Act*, SBC 2012, c 13, s-ss 3(i), (j) and (k). The claims made relate to assault or battery that occurred while the Plaintiff and Class Members were minors or in a relationship of dependency with the Defendant; misconduct of a sexual nature; and sexual assault.

63. In addition or in the alternative, the Plaintiff and Class Members could not have brought a claim earlier because they were not in a position to do so as a result the trauma associated with their time in the Maternity Homes and its sequelae.

64. The Plaintiff and Class Members plead and rely on postponement under the *Limitation Act*, and in particular sections 3, 8, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24 and 25. In the alternative, or in addition, the Plaintiff and Class Members rely on the *Limitation Act*, SBC 2012, c 13, s 30 and the *Limitation Act*, RSBC 1996, c 266. In addition, the Plaintiff and Class Members plead and rely on the *Emergency Program Act*, Ministerial Order No. M089 and related enactments to suspend the running of the limitation period from March 26, 2020 to March 25, 2021.

**Service on the Defendant**

65. The Plaintiff and Class Members have the right to serve this Notice of Civil Claim on the Defendant pursuant to the *Court Jurisdiction and Proceedings Transfer Act*, SBC 2003, c 28, s 10 (*CJPTA*), because there is a real and substantial connection between British Columbia and the facts on which this proceeding is based.

66. The Plaintiff and Class Members rely on the following grounds, in that this action concerns a tort committed in British Columbia (*CJPTA*, s 10(g)).

Plaintiff's address for service:

Slater Vecchio LLP  
1800 - 777 Dunsmuir Street  
Vancouver, BC V7Y 1K4

Fax number for service: 604-682-5197

Email address for service: [service@slatervecchio.com](mailto:service@slatervecchio.com)

Place of trial: Vancouver Law Courts

Address of the registry: 800 Smithe St, Vancouver BC

Date: October 6, 2021



---



Signature of lawyer for plaintiff

Anthony A Vecchio QC

James Richards

Slater Vecchio LLP

and

Mat Good

Mathew P Good Law Corporation

Rule 7-1 (1) of the Supreme Court Civil Rules states:

(1) Unless all parties of record consent or the court otherwise orders, each party of record to an action must, within 35 days after the end of the pleading period,

(a) prepare a list of documents in Form 22 that lists

(i) all documents that are or have been in the party's possession or control and that could, if available, be used by any party at trial to prove or disprove a material fact, and

(ii) all other documents to which the party intends to refer at trial, and

(b) serve the list on all parties of record.

## Appendix

[The following information is provided for data collection purposes only and is of no legal effect.]

### Part 1: CONCISE SUMMARY OF NATURE OF CLAIM:

This is a claim for institutional abuse against the Salvation Army regarding its maternity homes for unwed mothers (Magdalene Laundries).

### Part 2: THIS CLAIM ARISES FROM THE FOLLOWING:

[Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case.]

A personal injury arising out of:

- a motor vehicle accident
- medical malpractice
- another cause

A dispute concerning:

- contaminated sites
- construction defects
- real property (real estate)
- personal property
- the provision of goods or services or other general commercial matters
- investment losses
- the lending of money
- an employment relationship
- a will or other issues concerning the probate of an estate
- a matter not listed here

### Part 3: THIS CLAIM INVOLVES:

[Check all boxes below that apply to this case]

- a class action
- maritime law
- aboriginal law
- constitutional law
- conflict of laws
- none of the above
- do not know

### Part 4:

[If an enactment is being relied on, specify. Do not list more than 3 enactments.]  
*Class Proceedings Act*, RSBC 1996, c 50



**ENDORSEMENT ON ORIGINATING PLEADING OR PETITION FOR SERVICE  
OUTSIDE BRITISH COLUMBIA**

The plaintiff claims the right to serve this pleading on the Defendant outside British Columbia on the ground that the *Court Jurisdiction and Proceedings Transfer Act*, SBC 2003, c 28, s 10 (*CJPTA*) applies because there is a real and substantial connection between British Columbia and the facts on which this proceeding is based. The Plaintiff and Class Members rely on the following ground, in that this action concerns a tort committed in British Columbia (*CJPTA*, s 10(g)).