

To: Sandra Faria, Analyst
Investigation Dept.
375 University Avenue,
Suite 404, Toronto, ON M5G 2G1
Fax: 416-979-5474

Feb. 9, 2004
Ri

From: Robert Stewart c/o Collins Bay Penitentiary
P.O. Box 190 Kingston, Ontario K7L 4V9
kangaroojustice.com

Re: Legal Aid Certificate #04-528698
Court File No. C34059

Dear: Sandra Faria

I thank you for your January 22, 2004 letter.

I'm sorry for this long letter, and parcel but most of this letter
will be defending "My State of Mine":

To address James Lockyer's concerns about "My State of Mine."

From James Lockyer January 22, 2004:
"Mr. Stewart's complaints are without merit. Among other things, he
accused me before three Justices of the Court of Appeal of arranging
the stabbing of his son on the streets of Ottawa (he may have been
accusing me of actually stabbing his son). This should help put his
present complaints into context."

Mr. Stewart has decided that there is no counsel in Ontario whom
he can trust to present his appeal and has, therefore, elected to
represent himself hence Mr. Strosos' appointment by the Court of Appeal.

My response to James Lockyer's January 22, 2004 letter.

From my letter to Nathalie Remillard Champagne Area Director Legal Aid.
Legal Aid Certificate #04-528698 written July 15, 2003 delivered Aug. 19,
2003.

This letter (and tape) I'm enclosing was cc. to: Linda Beland, Annette
Martin, James Lockyer, Marlys Edwardths, Ruth Lawson, Attorney General of
Ontario, Solicitor General of Canada-Wayne Easter (Honorable) Glenn
McAllister, kangaroojustice.com

This was my response to the June 24, 2003 letter from Nathalie Champagne.
(The letter I still want James Lockyer to answer)

From my July 15, 2003 letter to Nathalie Champagne:
My main appeal issue's are:

1. The main witness, Denis Gaudreault got all his information from the Jan.
23, 26 and Feb. 02, 1990 Ottawa Citizen newspapers. The same 3 papers the
lead detective Heather Lamarche withheld, in the second disclosure
package July 27, 1991.

2. The second part is my ex-wife Linda Beland the "get away get away driver."
Linda has a lot of new fresh evidence. Listen to the tape.

*

A side note: 12 hrs. after I phoned up and fired James Lockyer my only blood son, Douglas Stewart had a sword put through his back and out his front missing his heart by 1 in. Doug had just come from his first private trailer with me. I had showed Doug the clippings and told him what Heather Lamarche had done. The area Doug had the sword put through him, was ex-wife's Colin Burrill area. No money was taken off Doug. The police officer in charge said it was a "kill shot." Colin was the auxiliary OPP from Rockland who lived with Linda Beland for 8 years. Colin never informed Linda what the officers at the station were saying about her.

I told the 3 Justices of the Court of Appeal "that my son was stabbed almost to death 12 hrs after firing James Lockyer." That is a fact.

I still feel that my firing of James Lockyer may of had that result.

I have never "felt" or "said". "James Lockyer "arranged" or "did" this".

Colin Burrill "arranging this" is still a maybe."

My son Douglas Stewart is also the son of Linda Beland (My ex-wife). Lock up Linda Beland supposed involvement in the quash convictions of my two co-accused January 31, 2004:
See:<http://www.ontariocourts.on.ca/decisions/2004/january/sauve025967.htm>

page 2 of 32 [6]

"The Crown's case against the appellants largely depended upon the evidence of Denis Gaudreault."

Page 2 of 32 [10]

"He then had his wife drive Gaudreault to his home. Stewart's wife testified that she did not recall ever driven Gaudreault home."

I'm also including the notes of Justices Weiler, Gillese and Armstrong for the day James and I were in front of them September 22, 2003.

Note: Nothing mention about me accusing James Lockyer of:
(he may have been accusing me of actually stabbing his son).

I think one of the 3 Justices would have recorded that.

I'm sorry if James Lockyer thought I was accusing "him." We were even alone in a bath room at the jail cell's at the court house. If James thought that he should have came back to the jail cells at the Court of Appeal to find out what I was talking about.

As you know the government has spent close to 30 million dollars on this case. Rick Mallory and I spent 9 years in jail waiting for a trial. Denis Gaudreault was paid 400,000 dollars and in 1997 Denis was kicked of witness protection for threatening to kill a neighbour for "ratting" on him. The Witness Protection program moved the neighbour and put him in Witness Protection. Denis stayed where he was but was kicked off Witness Protection. Denis then went on CTV 11:00 National News for the first 2 minutes and said he would testify against me and Rick Mallory unless he was paid cash. Denis then became the first witness in the history of Canada to be paid cash to testify. My two co-accused Rick Trudel and Jim Sauve have just had their conviction "quash." This is after 13 years in jail. I can't see the crown re-trying them. The only information that Denis knows is all found (including the mistake)

in the 3 newspaper clippings the lead detective Heather Lamarche withheld, in the second disclosure package.

I'm saying that Lockyer & Campbell have withheld evidence from the Court of Appeal that would have cleared their clients. While protecting OPP officer Heather Lamarche. I'm sending you the March 12, 2003 Catherine Glaister tape. Catherine was my go between at the time not my lawyer. She had been my co-accused Rick Trudel's lawyer at his appeal from February 3 to 7, 2003.

My problems with the lawyers of Ontario is that none of the 27 lawyers involved in the case discover this. Once I had, my lawyers on my trail Susan Mulligan (James Lockyer partner at the time) refused to tell my jury this. That is why I'm forced to defend myself. No lawyer in Ontario wants to step on anyone else toe's. My best evidence (Linda Beland and the newspapers clippings, put police, crown and lawyers of Ontario in a lot of trouble.

When I fired James Lockyer March 16, 2003 all of the trail and ruling were taken out of James Lockyer control. I feel that the OPP were expecting that Mr. Lockyer would not go after them. James Lockyer has a history of not going after the police. DNA is pretty easy. This I believe put the OPP and the lawyers of Ontario in a panic. My son 12 hours later. (a warning?)

Glenn McAllister of Prentice Crow McLean McAllister April 23, 2003 letter: Then Fax to lawyers listed on front page of letter, and to all the address on the bottom of the July 16, 2003 Nathalie Remillard Champagne letter.

"Mr. Stewart pointed out to the writer as early as 1996 that it was virtual certainty that Denis Gaudreault had garnered his original information from the newspaper. Mr. Stewart also informed other people including his counsel, the OPP, CJCJ, television, and the producers at W-5. Nothing seemed to come of this information at that time other than an offer from the Crown to Mr. Stewart that if he were to plead guilty Mr. Mallory would get "time served" and Mr. Stewart would get "life 10." on a joint submission on sentence. This would mean that Mr. Stewart would be placed in a half way house within two weeks of sentence and Mr. Mallory would be out. In addition the written deal would contain a guarantee that neither Mr. Stewart nor Mallory would be compelled to testify against Mr. Sauve or Trudel should a new trial be ordered. Neither Mr. Stewart no Mr. Mallory agreed to the proposed offer. One can only assume that innocent men would be loath to plead guilty to a crime that they did not commit."

"At trial on January 13, 1999 on redirect by the Crown of the witness, detective H. Lamarche, January 13, 1999, it came to light that Det. Lamarche had given newspaper articles from the Ottawa Citizen dated January 20, 21, and 22, 1990 as part of the disclosure package provided to both the crown and defence counsel, but had held back copies of the Ottawa Citizen articles dated January 23, 16, and February 2, 1990, as well as articles published in the Ottawa Sun at about the same time and that dealt with the reporting of the case at bar. Det. H Lamarche has never been cross-examined as to why these very relevant materials were not disclosed. Mr. Stewart believes that it had to be an intentional decision by Det. Lamarche, either alone or in consultation with other members of the investigating team, to avoid producing information that would cast serious doubt on the information provided by the main police witness."

"Despite Mr. Stewart deep concerns over the conduct of all the police officer involved in the investigation, and especially the conduct of H. Lamarche, Mr. Stewart's counsel did not attack the techniques of credibility of H. Lamarche at trial. In fact, Mr. Stewart disagreed so vehemently with the content of Ms. Mulligan's closing address to the jury that he wished to dismiss her as counsel but was convinced by his co-accused and other that it would be folly to dismiss counsel after the trial proper had been completed. Ms. Mulligan would not use Mr. Stewart's chart showing the similarities between Denis Gaudreault's story of what had happened and the Ottawa Citizen newspaper article of January 13, 1990 or bring up the fact that Det. H. Lamarche had withheld the newspaper clippings despite knowing of their existence. Apparently Mr. Stewart's counsel, Susan Mulligan, felt that the jury "liked" H. Lamarche, and would not follow Mr. Stewart's wishes that H. Lamarche's credibility be attacked on the basis of the newspaper clipping and, the writer would guess, other matters."

Mr. Stewart has requested that the writer, as an old friend, prepare the above summary to the best of his ability and distribute a copy of this summary to persons of organizations which might be interested in Mr. Stewart's predicament and be willing to offer assistance or advice. To the best of Mr. Stewart's recall he has had 27 lawyers involved in his matter over the last 12 years and has lost some of the faith he has in our justice system. In Mr. Stewart opinion no lawyer who has represented him has wanted to bring up the facts surrounding the conduct of Det. H. Lamarche.

In January 2003 I then gave this Denis Gaudreault and the newspaper information and talked to James Lockyer new partner Phil Campbell and Jr. Catherine Glaister. They were doing my co-accused Rick Trudel's appeal. They never told the 3 Justices of the Court of Appeal this. Glenn McAllister wrote his April 23, 2003 letter after reading the transcript of the tape conversation I had with Catherine Glaister March 12, 2003.

Transcript from March 11, 2003 tape I'm sending you:

Catherine: Glaister<Oh, hi how are you?>

Robert<Not too bad, not too bad, um "kay", did you tell James about this newspaper clipping yet?>

Catherine: I'm sorry, about, about, the whole newspaper analysis? >

Robert<Ya, ya,>

Catherine<you know, I don't know if I told him specifically or not, but he's aware about this issue.>

Robert<when did he become aware of it?>

Catherine Sorry, can you hold on for a sec?>

Robert<ya>

Catherine<What, is it you want to know, Rob>

Robert<Well, I'm sitting there and I talked to him yesterday, he wasn't aware of the newspaper, and how it's the main witness, and how anything of this works. I've been waiting 7 1/2 years for him to take care of this and I find out he's, he's not even, he thought, that had to do with some jailhouse informant!>

Catherine<Well, he probably also told you, he just hadn't really gotten it yet, right, he's waiting for the facts to be done.>

Robert<Well, this is like my main issue of all this, this is you know this isn't haaa, you know I've been screaming about this for 7 1\2 years.>

Catherine<Yup.>

Robert<And OK, no, I, at the court of appeal OK, when uh.., OK, when you showed this to them at, them at the court of appeal right?>

Catherine<Yup.>

Robert<Did you tell them it was Heather Lamarche that withheld?>

Catherine<We, what the courts appeal heard was that Gaudreault got everything from the newspaper.>

Robert<Ya, did you, did you say Heather Lamarche forgot to give it to the crown?>

Catherine<Well, that wasn't part of our record, even, right.>

Robert<Oh, OK, but you pointed out that they didn't get it through.>

Catherine<We pointed out that the jury never heard that kind of analysis, that's what that's what the court of appeal learnt.>

Robert<Ok and he...>

Catherine<And, they didn't in our case right?>

Robert<Ya, OK and they ahhh, didn't hear that the crown didn't get it or, is, is that it was missing for some reason? That was never pointed out.>

Catherine<I'm not sure what you're asking, right, I mean, what's important..>

Robert<What is important...that Mrs Lamarche, ahhh, it's the essence of the whole case because when she does this that shows everything else to do with the case is suspect now that's what the problem with this is from her not giving it, that means whatever she's done with this case is all suspect.... It's hugely important!>

Catherine<Alright, that, that that didn't come up in our record right in our transcripts.>

Robert<Ok, ok, cut ok, cause, I'm just saying my case that's, what the whole thing is about?>

Catherine<Right, and that was played out in front of the jury, to some degree about the article and what not.>

Robert<Ya, but then the judge lied in his book about every aspect of it.>

Catherine<Right, but my point is that was played out at your trial and it wasn't played out at the other trial.>

Robert<Ok, ok me I'm just flabbergasted that he doesn't know about this and I talked to him about it...I thought Sue would have communicated this to him over the years you know.>

Catherine<Well I, I mean I wasn't there right?>

Robert<Ya, No I know, I wasn't there either.>

Catherine<I know about it right?>

Robert<Pardon?>

Catherine<I said, I said I know about it.>

Robert<Ya, it's hugely, this is the whole smoking gun damn thing. You know, if he had, you know if has, you know this is what Mr.Gaudreault did and from here Heather Lamarche's acted you know, I don't know, I don't know I'm just....And for Lockyer not to have known this is the biggest frame-up in the history of police work in Canada.... It's absolutely bazaar land you know...ok so ok um...>

James Lockyer and his partners pass and present are protecting this Police officer Heather Lamarche over the lives of 4 innocent men. Plus billing Legal Aid a lot of money. 54 years combined time for us.

That is why I started my "silly" website.

The second part of all this is Linda Beland's fresh evidence. Susan Mulligan has gone missing with the first tape I made of Linda in 1999. I'm enclosing Susan's May 21, 2003 letter delivered to me May 23, 2003 this was

in response to my May 17, 2003 call asking Susan to return that tape to my father. Also on the tape I'm sending you is the new tape of Linda I made May 22, 2003 the day before I recieved Sue's letter. The transcript of this tape I'm sending you is found on my (silly) website: www.kangaroojustice.com. See trial testimony of Linda Beland April 28, 1999

My taped call to Susan Mulligan May 17, 2003 and left a message that:
 "Ok this is Robert Stewart I'm recording you right now. I'm this is May 17, about 9:15 in the evening. I would like to have all my disclosure all my trial transcripts delivered to me at Collins's Bay Inst., and I very much like to have my wife call that I made after she got off the stand where I first informed her that ah...ah about Denis Gaudreault and the foggy night and all that. It's a very, very important tape. And I would like to have that deliver back to my father as soon as possible. Ah.. Thank you very much Sue. Ok"

Susan Mulligan response letter May 21, 2003: Delivered May 23, 2003:
 "Having said all of that, though, I will request access to that office and your file the next time I am in Ottawa, and will make an effort to locate any recordings of Linda Beland that may exist and may have been retained in your file in Ottawa, I do not have an independent recollection of which tapes were supplied to me directly, which tapes came with the file from Mr. Edelson/Ms Hawthornes' offices, and which tapes were retained by your father. I do not now recall the contents of any particular tapes off hand, but I will review any tapes I am able to locate and attempt to identify those that could be the tape you are seeking. I will not, however, be in Ottawa again for some time, but when I am there (and I have a day out of court to go through your file) I will undertake this work on your behalf and hand deliver anything I locate to your father. That is the best I can do in relation to that "request."

From the tape I'm sending you transcript of website:
 Linda Beland May 22, 2003 tape phone call.

Robert: "They eliminate the guy, okay, they shot him once in the body, once in the head. After that they heard the T.V. in the room. I'll tell you the room was at the other end of the living room. They heard a T.V. They thought there wasn't anyone else, because they were going to take the furniture and things like that, you know, check for money. Then the cunt was sleeping in bed, and they shot her in the head while she slept."

Linda: Ah...Who is saying all that?

Robert: Mr. Gaudreault.

Linda: Ah.

Robert: And he claimed, that he got that information in front of you.

Linda: Ah.. my god no. Are you well. I would have fucken freaked. No way.

Robert: And the police have never told you this?

Linda: No.

Robert: No.

Linda: No and first of all if that guy had ever done something like that you know me better I would have went right to the police right away. No, no, no.. ah no. Are you well.

Robert: That is..

Linda: Are you for real.

Robert: I'm for real.

Linda: You got evidence of of that.

Robert: Yes I do.

Linda: That is serious shit.

Robert: Yes and this is in Heather Lamarche in all there interviews and Vicki Bair have never mention this to you.

Linda: No.

Robert: No, Okay um..

Linda: A no because I would have freaked. Ha..no ..Mon Dieux. I can't believe that.

Robert: Okay..well a..it's sort of a..thing a.. Heather Lamarche. Denis Gaudreault used these 3 clippings okay Jan. 23, Jan. 26 and Feb. 02. He used that information to make up his story.

Linda: I know, but why would those people would those people want to do that to you thought.

Robert: Because they don't unarrested people in Ontario you know if they charge you for murder. They want you to go down for murder..ah the...

Linda: That not right.

Robert: I know. I can't find a..a.. Why didn't any of the 27 lawyer go interview you.

Linda: I don't know na ha..

Robert: Even...

Linda: I can't answer you that cause I don't know ha...

Robert: Well even you see... remember I.. I in 99 after you got off the stand I got you on tape with Judy Armstrong okay.. and I told you for the first time about did 5 people come running into your house And you freaked on the tape. Okay.

Linda: Oh, yea, cause nobody.. ah you know ha..

Robert: Right and I gave the tape to Sue Mulligan. Okay

Linda: Yea.

Robert: Sue Mulligan didn't give the tape to my 2 co-accused at there court of appeal. Phil Campbell.

Linda: Well, why didn't she.

Robert: James Lockyer.. I don't know. It's because, because they spent 30 million dollars they can't let us out.

Linda: Sea we that don't make sense.

Robert: I know it don't. and I got them on tape though, Okay I taped her Okay, Remember that's the tape I wanted you to to listen to at Judy's has.

Linda: Yea.

Robert: Yea.

Linda: So you got the tape. Yea.

Robert: Oh yea I got that tape, but I don't have the tape I have of you hearing about it for the first time. Sue has gone missing with that tape. She wouldn't give it to me.

Linda: uh..

Robert: This is Sue, Sue Mulligan.

Linda: That's weird. Why would see want to give you that. You know I mean like...

Robert: ah..

Linda: Holly cow. It's scarry out their.

Robert: I know. This is why I want you on recording. Is so we have it down on record.

Linda: What are they going to do to me. ha..

Robert: I don't know.

Linda: Whow..

Linda: No, I'm so far right there I mean I don't know what the heck is going on hear but this pretty blows my head away.

Robert:Ya, It blows my head away to. But you see I never told you this because I never wanted to wreck you as a witness you know I wanted you on the stand. But in my trail judge Mc Williams wouldn't allow you to be told this. Sue tried to tell you. The judge said nice try Miss Mulligan, and wouldn't allow it.

Linda:I know but what I don't understand if you didn't know these people at all. Why did they connect you with these people if you don't know them.

Robert:Mr. Gaudreault. That's it.

Linda:Oh. He's the one because he's saying that.

Robert:Ya.

Linda:Okay I don't know it doesn't make sense. So weird that.

Robert:Hu, ya but they spent 30 million dollars.

Linda:Hu wild.

Robert:That's a lot of money eh.

Linda:Uh... especially for someone you don't even know. Ha..

Robert:I know.

Linda:Uh... I know.

Robert:I discovered he used the newspaper I gave it to them in 96 I, I said here. I gave it to WS CJOH news I gave it to quite a few people I said it's over. And they continued.

Linda:They ignored it.

Robert:Yup.

Linda:That is pretty serious evidence to me.

Robert:No kidding.

Linda:I mean you know.

Robert:Yup.

I'm also including a letter from Crown Scott C. Hutchison to Mr. John Krompkamp Court of Appeal for Ontario June 25, 2003:

1. They are not, at this time, aware of any fresh evidence.

Susan Mulligan was working out of lawyer Mike Neville Office. Gloria Neville is Mike Neville's wife and recieved 257,535.00 windfall after my wrongfully conviction. Glorial Nevelle was in no rush to get me out of jail. Arrested December 19, 1990 Convicted February 1, 2000.

Now waiting for trail transcript's	8 Months	GST
October 24, 2000 Gloria Neville	\$ 7,473.75	\$ 523.16
October 24, 2000 Gloria Neville	\$ 8,835.00	\$ 618.45
3 Months		
January 12, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 6,941.25	\$ 485.89
January 23, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 6,292.50	\$ 440.48
February 3, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 3,922.50	\$ 274.58
February 14, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 4,481.25	\$ 761.81
March 5, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 3,757.50	\$ 263.03
April 24, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 3,731.25	\$ 261.19
April 24, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 5,853.75	\$ 409.77
May 3, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 4,818.75	\$ 337.31
June 21, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 8,928.75	\$ 625.01
June 21, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 2,610.00	\$ 182.70
4 Months		
October 16, 2001 Gloria Neville	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 315.00
4 Months		
February 20, 2002 Gloria Neville	\$ 9,453.75	\$ 661.76
10 Months		
December 10, 2002 Gloria Neville	\$ 4,245.00	\$ 297.15
Total 65,845.00 X 3 =		257,535.00

The reason why I have to defend myself is because I can not find a lawyer (27) that has worked in their clients best interest. Who do I report this to the Police, Crown or Lawyers? They are all in on it.

One simple mistake by Heather Lamarche that just keeps going.

What the police, crowns and lawyers did with Linda Beland is very, very strange. My ex-lawyer (Susan Mulligan) is now missing with some very valuable evidence for my defence. My 1999 tape of Linda Beland.

Now for James Lockyer's "State of Mine".

James has a bad habit of viciously attacking his former client's.

From the March 12, 2003 Catherine Glaister tape:

Catherine<I mean there's a lot of work that needs to be done it's just this was you know about a huge trial.>

Robert<Ya, I know there's a lot of work to be done but we only need a few things to go at it it's not like let's not get the whole truck load and then get confused uh... why don't you have...>

Catherine<Well, Rob I'm not getting confused I mean, I know how, I mean I know the process and it's been a long process because it's a long trial, right?>

Robert<Right.>

Catherine<All the evidence at your trial needs to be summarized first.>

Robert<Ah...and that's, that other person doing it eh?>

Catherine<Yup.>

Robert<What's her name?>

Catherine<What is her name...um like Joanne McLean?>

Robert<Who?>

Catherine<Joanne McLean.>

Robert<Ok, Joanne McLean... Mclean ...M..C..L.A.I.N.E.

Catherine<I'm not sure of the spelling I just know it's...>

Robert<And where is she from?>

Catherine<She is a lawyer in Toronto.>

Robert<Ok but you don't know where?>

Catherine<Do I know where?>

Robert<Ya, whose office?>

Catherine<No.>

Robert<You don't know her office but I guess if I look up Joanne Mclean here there's only one or ten or what?>

Catherine<You got me ha ha...?>

Robert<Ya, Ok, I don't know this is, this is just wild, I just... I always thought he knew about this for the last 7 1/2 years...doesn't know a damn thing about this.>

Catherine<Well Rob why, why don't you write some of some of this out again and when it comes here...?>

Robert<No, No it's already written it's already at your place eh, I'd like to go over it with him...it will take half an hour maybe... you know...I'm having real concerns because there's some parts now that I'm really have to get another lawyer, I figure you know? Cause there is some parts, you know, should have been brought up and you know, I, I he may be in a compromising position eh you

know.>

Catherine<What do you mean like in a compromising position?>

Robert<Well because of Sue and him eh they were talking back and forth on my trial there some stuff that didn't come out at my trial eh, Sue may have done some ah.. My trial you know.. Some.. You know, it's like would you have Gary Barns do your appeal?>

Catherine<Ok..I mean the bottom line here Rob is that you know... you had a really long trial there's a lot of preparation.>

Robert<Because of Lamarche.>

Catherine<Well ah, oh Ok but the fact of the matter is we're left with a huge number of transcripts and they have to be summarized for the court of appeals.>

Robert<You can't pick and choose?>

Catherine<No you can't just pick and choose.>

Robert<You can't.>

Catherine<No, not at an appeal I mean the appeals is completely different.>

Robert<I know, I know, I, I, don't, I've bin through 850 days of trial I understand that law, but I know appeal laws completely something else and Glenn fills me in once and a while and he says it's way different, I understand that... Ok then.>

Catherine<You know what I am saying though like it just takes a really long time you saw how long it took the other guys to get there appeal to court.>

Robert<Right.>

Five weeks later in the:

The Globe and Mail Friday April 25, 2003 Page Canada A-11

"Court sets limits on Bernardo' ex-lawyer" "Serial killer wins partial victory as Lockyer muzzled in Baltovich appeal"

A bizarre alliance between serial killer Paul Bernardo and the Ontario Crown achieved mixed success yesterday in attempting to have a prominent defence lawyer thrown off a coming murder appeal.

An Ontario Court of Appeal judge said that defence counsel James Lockyer cannot participate in a portion of the Robert Baltovich appeal in which Mr. Bernardo will be portrayed as the real killer of University of Toronto student Elizabeth Bain.

However, Mr. Bernardo -- supported by the Crown -- strongly objected to Mr. Lockyer involving himself in the Baltovich appeal in light of his having represented Mr. Bernardo in 1996-97.

"Mr Lockyer cannot defend Mr. Berardo in one matter and then attack him on another." Crown counsel Howard Leibovich argued in a brief to Mr. Justice Marc Rosenberg. There is no doubt that Mr. Lockyer and Mr. Berardo had a solicitor-and -client relationship.

"It undermines the integrity of our justice system to permit a lawyer to, in effect, defend a current client by pointing a finger at a prior client."

In a 1999 letter to Mr. Lockyer, Mr. Bernardo expressed much the

same sentiment. He noted that while representing him in 1996-97, Mr. Lockyer could potentially have examined confidential material in his file.

"It has come to my attention that you are representing Mr. Robert Baltovich through the Organization for the Wrongfully Convicted, and have as such an aim in pointing the finger for his convicted crimes toward myself," Mr. Bernardo said in his letter.

Mr. Lockyer, who has devoted thousands of hours to preparing the Baltovich appeal, said he never received the letter and only recently became aware of Mr. Bernardo's complain.

The dispute forced Judge Rosenberg to balance Mr. Bernardo's right to solicitor-and-client privilege against Mr. Baltovich's intense desire to have Mr Lockyer and co-defence-counsel Joanne McLean handle his appeal.

"The mischief that the conflict-of-interest and duty-of-loyalty rules seek to prevent is the spectre of counsel for a client acting against the interests of another client, whether present or former," the judge said.

"For members of the public to have confidence in the legal profession and the administration of justice generally, they must know that their confidences will be respected and not used against them in the future for the benefit of another client."

Judge Rosenberg said he took Mr. Lockyer at his word about not having known of Mr. Bernardo's objections until recently. The judge also said he was loath to hamper the long-delayed Baltovich appeal, and that a compromise allowing an independent lawyer to pursue the Bernardo aspect would solve the dilemma.

Judge Rosenberg said that upon Mr. Lockyer and Ms McLean turning over the Bernardo portion of the file to Mr. Greenspan is not affiliated in any way with Mr. Lockyer and Ms McLean. Crown counsel agrees that this is an appropriate solution."

At the time I was looking for the person doing my factum. Catherine Glaister tells me it Joanne McLean. I spell the name wrong. Catherine can't spell the name or tell me Mrs. McLean's office or phone number. 5 week later in the "Globe and Mail" I find out Joanne McLean is James Lockyer Co-council. I'm phoning: Lockyer & Campbell: "Association in Defence of the Wrongfully Convicted".

From James Lockyer's September 25, 2003 Legal Aid bill:

Mar-04-03	Review file, speak to J Mclean	.80	60.30	CG
	re: facts, 5:00-5:50			
Mar-12-03	Telephone call client [on tape]	.10	7.54	CG

Catherine Glaister knew how to spell "McLean" to bill March 4, 2003.

April 25, 2003 Globe & Mail:

Judge Rosenberg said "he took Mr. Lockyer at his word about not having known of Mr. Bernardo's objections until recently."

I find it hard to believe that James Lockyer would not look at a letter from Paul Bernardo. It seem James Lockyer has a hard time with reading, and ethics, but has no trouble billing Legal Aid thousands of hours. James never read my letter's either. Something about high profile cases.

But Judge Rosenberg did not have to pay that Legal Aid bill.

In another few years will James Lockyer be accusing me of a murder and in the process bill Legal Aid 200,000.00 dollars?

James Lockyer has also written to Glenn McAllister August 19, 2003:
VIA FAX 780-968-2224 Glenn G. McAllister of Pentice Chow McLean
McAllister 4812-50 Avenue P.O. Box 3102 Stony Plain. Alberta

Dear Mr. Mc Allister:

Thank you for your letter of August 13, 2003.

It has come to my attention that my name is being bandied about on a website called kangaroojustice.com in connection with Mr. Stewart's appeal. Included on the website is an "open letter" from you which questions my relationship with Mr. Stewart, yet you and I have never spoken. Do you not think it might have been appropriate to speak to me first?

I know that Mr. Stewart has always asserted his innocence of the two murders but I should make it clear to you that I agreed to represent him on his appeal as his counsel and never in my capacity as a Director of the Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted.

I am concerned by your involvement in the case. It seems to me it can not help Mr. Stewart: I would appreciate some explanation from you.

yours faithfully,

LOCKYER CAMPBELL James Lockyer

Glenn McAllister's same day reply August 19, 2003:
Attn. James Lockyer Dear Sir:

RE: Robert A. Stewart

The writer is in receipt of your correspondence dated Aug. 19, 03. If you have not yet viewed the "open letter" you refer to in that correspondence the writer has copied the only paragraph of that letter which refers to yourself and the same is duplicated as follows:

Mr. Stewart's convictions are currently under appeal. Mr. Stewart understood that James Lockyer, of the Association in Defence of the Wrongfully Convicted, was in charge of his appeal. Upon speaking to Mr. Lockyer directly Mr. Stewart has become concerned that the previous relationship between Mt. Lockyer and Mr. Stewart's counsel at trial, Sue Mulligan, might inhibit Mr. Lockyer's ability to present the appeal.

If any of the information concerning yourself in the above paragraph is incorrect please advise the writer and it will be amended forthwith.

Yours truly, PER: GLENN G. McALLISTER /ggm

James Lockyer never got back to Glenn McAllister. Is it's safe to assume the rest of Glenn's April 23, 2003 letter found on (and sent to you) www.kangaroojustice.com is accurate. Glenn wrote it. Sent it to me to correct. I sent it back to Glenn. Glenn toned it down and sent it out.

At the end of the Letter to Nathalie Remillard Champagne Legal Aid July 15, 2003 arrived August 19, 2003:

"After March 11 and 12, 2003. I believe present appellant counsel is in a position of huge conflict and would appreciate the opportunity to discuss my concerns with legal aid representatives and James Lockyer, but everything has to be on record."

When I went to the Court of Appeal in September 22, 2003 I asked for that to be recorded. The Judges tried but could not get tape recorder working. Now because of that James Lockyer is now accusing me of using the "Attempted Murder" of my only blood son to ruin James Lockyer's reputation.

"Trust me I do need and would not use my son to do that. I have plenty more "stuff" to do that. Members of my family have been attacked by the OPP all through this investigation. All are prominent members of their community's. My wife at the time Linda Beland will have books written on what was done to her.

I'm sending you this "stuff" and will give you 2 weeks to digest it. Then I will be phoning you up to discuss this "stuff." For come see me; that call will be recorded and you will receive a copy. As I ended the July 15, 2003 letter to Nathalie Champagne:
"everything has to be on record".

With all that said. Now back to the two questions I wanted answered.

1. Why did James Lockyer bill me after I fired him ?
2. Why did Nathalie Champagne tell me June 24, 2003:

"Mr. Lockyer is a reputed competent appeal counsel, he has spent considerable time reviewing your file and I am not prepared to allow a change of solicitor. The new lawyer would have to start over at considerable expense to legal Aid and may well lead to further delay in your case."

I would please like an answer why I was miss-informed by Nathiel Champaign July 15, 2003 on how much work Lockyer had done on my case. All after I fired James Lockyer. At that time it was 12 1/2 years after I was arrested. 13hr. bill just before the letter was written.



Thank you
Robert Stewart

Ps. If you were in my shoes would you hire an Ontario lawyer? If you know a lawyer that will work in my best interest send them my way. I would love to talk to one. I'm looking for one lawyer to bring in Linda Beland and do a 'Bail Pending Appeal'. Do you know a lawyer brave enough. Rick Mallory January 12, 2004 'Instructed' Ms Edwardh to bring in Linda Beland and go for "Bail Pending Appeal". I had given Ms Edwardh Linda Beland's fresh evidence August 13, 2003. The only reply so far was do not talk to the

press. How much is Ms Edwardh billing Legal Aide on this case?

Enclosed in your package:

- 1 Tape: -This was sent to all the address on the bottom of the Nathiel Champaign July 15, 2003 Letter:
 - Catherine Glaister & Robert Stewart March 12, 2003.
 - Robert Stewart leaving message Susan Mulligan May 17, 2003.
 - Linda Beland & Robert Stewart May 22, 2003
 - (Transcript's on www.kangaroojustice.com)
 - 1 "The Package" Denis Gaudreault and the newspaper clippings.
 - (The one talked about on the March 12, 2003 Ms. Glaister tape.
 - (Sue Mulligan would not show my jury this chart)
 - 1 Letter Glenn McAllister April 23, 2003.
 - 1 Letter Glenn McAllister April 29, 2003.
 - 1 Letter Susan Mulligan to Robert Stewart May 21, 2003.
 - 1 Letter Scott C Hutchison to John Krompkamp Court of Appeals Ontario June 23, 2003.
 - 1 Letter Robert Stewart to Nathiel Champaign July 15, 2003.
 - 1 Letter Glenn McAllister August 13, 2003.
 - 1 Letter Lockyer to McAllister August 19, 2003.
 - 1 Letter McAllister To Lockyer August 19, 2003.
 - 1 Fax Robert Stewart to James Lockyer August 3, 2003.
 - 1 Fax Robert Stewart to James Lockyer August 23, 2003.
 - My website was shut down the next day, I still do not know why?
 - 1 Letter sent wondering why kangaroojustice.com has been shut down Sept. 2, 2003.
 - 1 Affidavit of Kathy Doyle September 8, 2003. [Nothing about Heather Lamarche]
 - 1 Justice notes Court of Appeal Septber 22, 2003.
 - 1 E-mail kangaroojustice.com September 29, 2003
 - 1 Letter from Rick Mallory to Marlys Edwardh Janusry 12, 2004
 - (CC. Catherine Stanel W-5 and Robert Rowbothan CBC Radio
 - (Instructing Ms. Edwardh to bring in Linda Beland - Bail;
 - 1 Letter from Marlys Edwardh to Rick Mallory January 14, 2004
 - (Telling Rick Mallory not to talk to the press)
 - 1 Letter Crown Scott Hutchison to Joanne McLean of Lockyer Campbell Janusry 26, 2004 (I found Joanne McLean)
 - 1 Judge McWilliams Charge to Jury on Linda Beland January 2000.
 - 3 Trial testimonys of Heather Lamarche January 5, 13, 20 1999.
 - 1 Trial testimony of Linda Beland April 15, 1996.
 - 1 Trial testimony of Linda Beland April 26, 1999.
 - 4 Trial testimony of Denis Gaudreault October 4, 1991, September 8, 1995 October 12, 1995, October 19, 1999.
 - 1 Trial testimony of Ian Davidson August 11, 1999 (Chief of police Sudbury)
- Newspaper Clippings:
- "Woman couldn't pick out caveman in police lineup"
 - November 24, 1999 Ottawa Citizen
 - "Accused to appeal costliest murder trail"
 - Febuary 8, 2000 Gloucester Star
 - "Serial killer wins partial victory as Lockyer muzzed in Baltovich appeal"
 - April 25, 2003 The Globe & Mail.

cc. kangaroojustice.com

Glenn McAllister -Prentice Chow McLean McAllister Fax-780-963-4871

Catherine Stanel -W-Five C.T.V. W-5 Toronto ON Fax 416-313-2525

Robert Rowbothan -CBC Radio 253 College St. Suite 444 Toronto

Scott Hutchison -Crown Law Office Fax:416-326-4656

Louis Strozos -Amicus Fax 416-868-0273

Seth Weinstein - opinion letter Fax 416-368-1990

**TEEN SON OF
CONVICTED
KILLER
FOUND
BRUTALLY
BEATEN
IN BED**

PAGE 7

THE OTTAWA

SUN

50¢ Vol. 10
No. 76
EST. 1945 60 pages

Friday
February 20, 2005

**WRESTLING!
NAKED!
CARMEN
ELECTRA!**

PAGE 7B



**FOR PETE'S
SAKE!**

OT loss sparks
Bonnie's
Sens debut

**3
2
1**



MURDERED