

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

EIGHTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

House Document

No. 55

H. P. 216

House of Representatives, Feb. 2, 1927.

Referred to Committee on Claims and 500 copies ordered printed. Sent up for concurrence.

CLYDE R. CHAPMAN, Clerk.

Presented by Mr. Foster of Ellsworth.

STATE OF MAINE

IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD ONE THOUSAND NINE
HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVEN

RESOLVE, in Favor of Ward W. Wescott of Ellsworth, for
Partial Reimbursement for Expenditures in Proceedings
Brought Against Him for His Removal from His Office of
Sheriff of Hancock County:

Resolved: That there be, and hereby is, appropriated and
2 ordered to be paid to Ward W. Wescott of Ellsworth in
3 the county of Hancock, sometime sheriff of the county of
4 Hancock, for partial reimbursement to him of moneys ex-
5 pended by him in defense of certain proceedings against
6 him brought by the governor and council to remove him
7 from the office of sheriff of Hancock county, the sum of
8 eleven hundred seventy-eight dollars.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

November 16, 1923, Ward W. Wescott, the sheriff of Hancock county, was summoned to appear before the governor and council to answer the charge by them brought that he was not faithfully or efficiently performing his duties as sheriff. In the proceedings above described the governor with the advice and consent of the council sought to remove Ward W. Wescott from his office as sheriff of Hancock county. Many witnesses were summoned by state which was represented by the attorney general. Very little evidence developed at hearing against the sheriff, except that of a few witnesses, who after first being granted immunity from prosecution, confessed that they had landed intoxicating liquor on the coast of Hancock county, and had taken it by automobile through said county and other counties. The council voted six to one against his removal and Ward W. Wescott continued in his office. Resolve asks the state to reimburse the sheriff, only in part, for expenses necessary in connection with said hearing, because there is a considerable sum of money involved in same for which vouchers cannot be shown. The claim is that it was not the fault of the sheriff that he was obliged to defend himself in the above described proceedings, and that it is only a matter of right that the state reimburse him, at least in part for his expenses.

In nineteen hundred thirteen, upon an address by the legislature, proceedings for removal were brought against several of the state officials, all of them save one, who was confined by illness, were either removed or else resigned; in each case, the expenses of the respondent, including counsel fees and witnesses, were paid by the state.