

. 1

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE MORTHWEST TERRITORIES

2

3

6

.7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

4 5

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

HENRY LEISHMAN.

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgment Delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories Wednesday, November 16th, A.D., 1983.

APPEARANCES:

MS. N. BOILLAT:

Counsel for the Crown

MR. D. COOPER:

Counsel for the Defence

N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)



THE COURT:

Henry Leishman, also known as Harry Leishman, is today convicted of an offence under Section 326(1)(b) of the Criminal Code of Canada.

Mr. Leishman altered a twenty-one dollar cheque to read twenty-one thousand dollars, and presented it at his After depositing the cheque into his own account, he succeeded in obtaining, at a different counter, certified cheques and cash withdrawals for approximately the same amount:

The scheme, and I use that phrase lightly, germinated over a period of approximately ten days. The accused wrestled with the decision as to whether he should commit the crime or not, and finally on the ninth day, I believe, went through with his plan.

There have been certain documents filed on sentencing: a copy of the accused's criminal record, which is admitted, as well as a pre-sentence report with a number of attachments to it.

With respect to the pre-sentence report, I believe it is of limited use. For the most part it consists by and large of a letter by the accused to the Court in effect, and copies of correspondance between the accused and his family. I believe that is going far afield from the basic concept behind a pre-sentence report, which is an assessment by an independant party with respect to an accused person's background. This is not a format that is to be encouraged. However, I accept the submissions of Defence counsel,

N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)

2

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

. 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27



, 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

that the accused is undergoing some emotional and psychological problems, and this is evident in the P.S.R. After hearing the Crown's position and the facts as admitted by the Defence, my first inclination in dealing with an offence of this nature is to consider a penitentiary term: The accused is convicted of a serious offence, one carrying with it a maximum penalty of fourteen years in jail. was dealing with a sum of twenty-one thousand dollars, which is no small amount. Although we are dealing with money, and not lives, the potential for harm is substantial. The bank upon which this scheme was perpetrated stood to lose twenty-one thousand dollars. If by chance the drawer of the cheque had had 21,000 dollars in its account (and there is no evidence it id), the bank would be out of it, and it would be a situation where an innocent third party is harmed to a significant degree.

Notwithstanding the accused's problems, I don't believe the Court can ignore its obligation to protect society, and that means protect society from the master criminals as well as protecting society from people such as Mr. Leishman, who, for his own reasons, real or imagined, commits crimes.

I have to concur with Defence counsel to a degree that there was no hope of avoiding detection. That is obvious on the facts. Further more, it would appear that the accused abandoned his scheme shortly after receiving the certified cheques, and he did not use the airline reservation he had for that day. He went home, and it is given to me



/2

that within a very short period of time after obtaining these monies, he presented himself back at the bank and surrendered the documents, the certified cheques and the travellers cheques. As a result of that, there has been no loss suffered.

While I believe I can take the potential for loss as an aggravating factor, I can and do take into account that there was in fact no loss.

estimation, is the fact that the accused was convicted only one year ago for a very similar offence involving five charges for theft, forgery and uttering for which he received a total of sixteen months imprisonment. I am certain rehabilitation played a substantial role in the Court's determination as to a fit sentence at that time. I am certain Mr. Leishman used every facility that was available and every program that was available to him in the Yellowknife Correctional Centre for his ultimate rehabilitation, that is to say, temporary absent passes, statutory remission, earned remission and parole, and in fact, I understand from the submissions today that as a result of the use of these programs, he was successful in being able to carry on his business as a publisher while he was in jail.

Notwithstanding that experience and notwithstanding the convictions today, it is distressing that the accused, in his own writings to the Court can say that he does not consider himself to be a criminal. Let me state clearly that Harry



Leishman is in law a criminal as well as in fact.

The Court can sympathize with those that feel overwhelmed by troublesome circumstances, and rate their selfworth as low. However, there are a lot of people in this
world that have psychological problems, emotional problems,
financial problems and family problems. That is what life
is all about - problems, yet they do not resort to crimes.
This is the second time Mr. Leishman has resorted to crime
during a "troubled" period, and I am very concerned that
it be clearly understood that emotional problems notwithstanding, nobody has the right to do this kind of thing.
It is criminal. It is against the law, and there will be
punishment for it.

Defence counsel urges the Court to consider rehabilitation. I believe I have to consider that in the context of the offence and the context of the accused's situation, not only his previous convictions and the efforts that I am sure were made in the past as well as what was given here today. I believe that the impact of rehabilitation on this count must begin to face in terms of weight to be attributed to it by the Court when the accused is back before the Court again in circumstances such as this accused.

I believe under these circumstances we are fast approaching the situation described in <u>R. vs. Levesque</u>, 19 CR, p. 43, where, because of the existance of administrative facilities and tribunals, the question of rehabilitation is properly left to those agencies rather than being a significant

N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)



consideration by the Court.

The Court can take and does take personal circumstances into consideration, but it must be remembered that this is a crime where people and institutions stood to lose significant amounts of money, where a lot of harm and trouble would have been caused had Mr. Leishman continued in his plan.

What I do take in substantial mitigation is the fact that the plan was abandoned. I believe that had Mr. Leishman boarded the aircraft to leave Yellowknife, then the situation would be very different and the term I was initially contemplating would be appropriate.

In assessing or attempting to reach what the Court believes is an appropriate sentence, the Court can consider a number of factors, and it is never a problem identifying those factors. The problem usually arises in trying to . balance them and weigh them appropriately.

I take into account the degree of premeditation which I have already indicated I feel is substantial, but I think that that, as an aggravating factor, has to be tempered by the fact that the plan was abandoned.

I am considering the circumstances of the offence in that the accused had no hope of avoiding detection, but I am not prepared to find that the accused had no hope of avoiding apprehension had he carried through with whatever plan he had to escape.

I have already indicated that I feel the crime is grave.

It is a serious one. The maximum penalty of fourteen years

1 2

· 7

N.W.T. 5349 (3177)



imprisonment reflects that.

With respect to the attitude of the offender, much is said in the pre-sentence report about remorse, and yet I have difficulty reconciling that with his statement that he doesn't consider himself to be a criminal. It is obvious that the accused does not view the situation perhaps as seriously as the Court or society does.

psychological problems, and is now seeking treatment. I can accept that in mitigation to a degree if it means that the accused was acting totally out of character. From the previous conviction it would appear to me to mean that the accused is not so much acting out of character and that whatever problems he believes he has are an ongoing nature. If it is an ongoing situation, then I have to be concerned about what is going to happen years from now, whether the accused will be back before the courts again, and other innocent members of society suffer as a result of his "problems" and resort to quick and easy money.

I take into account the accused's previous record, not to punish him more severely, but only as a reflection of his past and for the purposes that I have already mentioned.

With respect to his age and mode of life and his character, I can only comment that Mr. Leishman should sit in court here a little more often perhaps as a non-participant, and he would quickly realize that his problems are minor compared to what other people have. That is what life is all about, and it is of not much assistance to the



court for someone to come and say, my life is full of problems and this is why I committed the crime. We all have problems, yet most people don't resort to crime.

Mr. Leishman is fortunate that he has the support of his wife and family. Hopefully with their support in the future he won't be back before the courts again, but I have to say that that is only a hope and I express that hope with a degree of caution given the history of this man.

With respect to the penalty normally imposed for this kind of offence, I think it is fair to say for a first or second offender the penalties range anywhere from a suspended sentence to imprisonment in a penitentiary. As I indicated at the outset, because of the accused's past experience, I think it is important that it be brought home to him that this kind of conduct will never be tolerated notwithstanding the reasons behind it, and as I indicated, from the facts given to me by the Crown, I was seriously and I am seriously considering a term of imprisonment to be served in a penitentiary.

Mr. Leishman and others who are similarly inclined must clearly understand that there is no room in this society for crime, and that this kind of crime will not be tolerated any more than any other kind of crime.

I am cognizant and acutely aware of the words of Mr. Justice Tallis and certainly Mr. Justice de Weerdt who have repeatedly said that a sentence must not crush an accused. However, I have to balance the personal situation

N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)



of the accused against the need of the public for protection.

Taking into account what your lawyer has said on your behalf, Mr. Leishman, would you stand, please. On this charge I am going to impose a term of imprisonment of one year. I don't think it is appropriate to put any term of probation in there. You are a grown man, Mr. Leishman. If you do have problems and you find some relief by the treatment that Mr. Cooper has described, and I am sure with the help of your family that you will continue on whatever program is appropriate and it will assist you in the future.

(AT WHICH TIME THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript,

Laurie Ann Young
Court Reporter

7.

- -