

## Protect The Hersheys' Children, Inc.

P.O. Box 1305, Severna Park, MD 21146 • [info@protecthersheychildren.org](mailto:info@protecthersheychildren.org)

October 27, 2020



### *“Towards a Farther Shore”*

#### *PHC Position on the September 30, 2020 MHS cy pres Petition and why the Orphans' Court should reconsider its ruling*

##### **A. MHS Was Created to Carry the “Neediest and Most Alone” Children to a Farther Shore: the Proposed Cy Pres Abandons Them and Should be Reconsidered**

PHC is startled that the [September 30, 2020 MHS cy pres Petition](#) — seeking to establish early learning centers and entailing diversion of over \$350 million in MHS assets — was [granted by the Dauphin County Orphans' Court](#) a mere 21 days after filing. We believe that the ruling should be reconsidered and key factual claims tested in a robust adversary proceeding on a fully developed record. PHC explains our reasoning here. PHC also intends to follow this with a respectful request of the Court seeking reconsideration.

##### **1. False Premise Slams the Door Closed to Foster Care Kids and Countless Other of the “Neediest and Most Alone” Children**

The failure of charitable purpose required to grant MHS's *cy pres* Petition cannot in any way be reconciled with the facts. MHS's assertions to the contrary overlook some 13,000 children in Pennsylvania's foster care system — and 400,000 nationally — along with over 2 million American homeless children, 2.7 million children with incarcerated parents, and countless other desperately needy children who could and should be served by MHS's tremendous resources, to the full extent available. That MHS asserts Pennsylvania or America have run out of children who require out-of-home care only underscores the need for *bona fide* child welfare professionals to lead MHS and manage its resources as the Hersheys intended. The claim is unsupportable under any interpretation of the facts that should have been presented to the Orphans' Court.

MHS, at its core, is *obligated* to serve children requiring out-of-home-care to the “maximum extent its income allows.” This is not a vague aspiration: it is a solemn and legally-binding mandate. Such children are legion, as the Orphans' Court [already held in 1999](#), even citing (at fn. 11) Mark 14:7 for emphasis.

With so many Deed-mandated children to serve, the MHS Petition appears *actually* to mean that MHS cannot find enough “*high-performing*” needy children and will not reach “down” the applicant pool. This is because MHS seeks to generate “academic success” as measured by statistics curated to support this image and populate what MHS wants to be an

“elite” “boarding school,” as further described below. This includes rejecting children with greater learning needs (as are prevalent in the foster care, homeless, and other at-risk population), a goal that subordinates the core mission set forth by the Hersheys and reaffirmed in prior Court rulings.

The proposed *cy pres* will accelerate this process and definitively abandon the Hersheys’ children’s home mission, rather than adapting it to modern times.

MHS’s false “failure-of-trust-purpose” claim also contravenes the Dauphin County Orphans’ Court’s own sound findings, as stated when MHS sought diversion of charitable assets in 1999 and used nearly identical (baseless) arguments that similarly misstated plain facts.

MHS has merely recycled failed arguments from 1999 that should again be rejected. The October 23, 2020 ruling came without adequate public notice or any *bona fide* adversary process to provide the Court with a developed factual record as needed to determine whether the facts have changed since 1999 (they have not). It is notable that the [September 30, 2020 cy pres petition](#) was “verified” by MHS President Peter Gurt, whose [testimony in 1999](#) was rejected by the Orphans’ Court on this same issue.

The timing of the announcement, its immediate endorsement by oversight officials without proper public notice and comment, and the haste to get it approved are also troubling. Coming just before an election, the Petition raises concerns about subordinating the interests of MHS’s beneficiary class (a population without political or economic power) to political influences. (PHC is nonpartisan.)

## **2. Other Problems with the Proposal**

Besides the *cy pres* petition’s fatally flawed core premise and questionable timing, the proposal otherwise intrinsically makes no sense.

MHS has never served children from “birth to five years of age.” So what qualifies MHS now suddenly to do so, despite persistent problems serving other children, some in this age range? MHS even clings to discredited practices among children as young as four or five while declining to empower child welfare professionals to provide competent leadership and advise on better practices.

For instance, dubious slogans have been invoked to persuade loving mothers to surrender children as young as four to MHS group homes, on the preposterous notion that doing so purportedly provides [“the advantages of an Ivy League kindergarten environment.”](#) This harmful nonsense has been dispensed to poor mothers, damaging children emotionally and needlessly breaking up families. Credible child welfare advocates would not endorse this.

We are thus left to ask why and how will MHS supplant the many organizations with *bona fide* skill sets and proven records in this area?

## **3. Approved Proposal is Not “As Near as May Be”**

As the Orphans’ Court stated in 1999 about the MHS Board’s then requested *cy pres*:

“They seem to have ignored the obvious fact that a very wise man, Milton S. Hershey, must also have known that he could not take in every orphan in the United States but decided that the use he would make of his wealth was to reach directly as many as he could.”

The Court continued by stating *unambiguously* that the 1999 *cy pres* petition goal, however worthy, “*would do violence*” to the Hersheys’ lawful residential-care mandate. The same is true of the 2020 *cy pres* Petition, one spearheaded by none other than the primary witness testifying in support of the roundly rejected 1999 petition.

The latest proposal does not meet the legally required test of “as near as may be” to the Hersheys’ orphanage mission. The argument that “early learning centers” are “near” that mission disregards the law of the case and sound reasoning of the Court in 1999.

The MHS charity’s stewards cannot simply substitute their own goals for those of Milton & Catherine Hershey. It is beyond dispute that the law of charities empowers settlors like Milton & Catherine Hershey to designate the way that their bequests will be used. Once they do so, high standards are imposed for Court approval of departures from honoring such express wishes. These standards are not met here.

The Hersheys’ chose to rescue “orphan” children; i.e., children who require residential care. AG Shapiro should resist using his official oversight power to white-out the Hersheys’ goals from the Deed of Trust and allow MHS senior management to instead write in their own.

A comparison of the [2020 Pete Gurt-verified petition](#) with [Pete Gurt’s testimony in support of the failed 1999 petition](#) even reveals similar verbal sleight-of-hand — already rejected by the Court in 1999 — and claiming how “difficult” it supposedly is to fulfill the charity’s mission. MHS cannot openly declare that it “cannot serve more children” because that statement is baldly untrue (and everyone involved then and now knows it).

For these reasons, in each instance, MHS relied heavily on the word “challenge” to try to bridge the divide between fact and fiction, knowing it is a bridge too far.

Specifically, “challenge” is used seven times in the current (45-page) petition and appears six times in the (13-page) transcript of Mr. Gurt’s 1999 testimony; e.g., at p. 157 in 1999: “Tell us, sir, what are some of the resulting *challenges* that you face, particularly with respect to recruiting young children.” And in the 2020 Petition: “*challenges* exist to additionally increased enrollment...” (Emphasis added.) Importantly, this “testimony” was in support of the fiction that MHS “could not serve more children,” an assertion belied by all facts then and thereafter.

**How it started:** “[E]xpanding to 1500 would be a challenge for us.” (Pete Gurt, [1999 cy pres testimony](#), claiming failure of charitable intent, with MHS enrollment at 1,077.)

**How it’s going:** “[C]hallenges exist to additionally increased enrollment in the School’s Core Model...” (Pete Gurt-verified [2020 cy pres petition](#), again claiming failure of charitable intent, with MHS enrollment at 2,189.)

This deceptive “it’s-a-challenge” justification should have been retired in 1999 rather than reprised to make similarly inaccurate claims today. Did the Office of Attorney General remind the Court of this earlier dubious testimony and how the Court rejected it?

It appears that there was no *bona fide* adversarial proceeding that would enable the Court to evaluate the *actual* facts on a developed record — an essential element to the due process required in adjudicating a proposal to divert hundreds of millions of dollars in charitable assets.

By way of contrast, the MHS 1999 *cy pres* petition involved a request to divert \$50 million. It was adjudicated during a robust adversarial proceeding that commenced on January 19, 1999 and concluded on December 7, 1999, nearly twelve months later.

The current Petition involves a request to divert \$350 million yet was concluded in a mere 21 days. It lacked any similarly robust adversarial process and did not apprise the Court of how the grant would contravene the rights of children with critical needs but who were unrepresented in the proceeding. PHC does not believe this meets due process requirements with so much at stake.

Put differently, we know of 400,000 foster care children in America, over 2 million children who are homeless, and many other children in extreme need who would be happy to come tell the Orphans' Court that finding ways to serve them *in the manner mandated by the Hersheys* would not be "challenging" at all. Were any called by the Office of Attorney General as witnesses for the Court's consideration? Why not?

The media reports about the Petition stated that the Court was led to believe that MHS had the "problem" of "too many assets." Was the Court apprised of the legions of children requiring residential care who could be served directly by those assets — consistent with the Hersheys' mandate — but instead were turned away so that MHS could accumulate the present "surplus" and claim it has "too much money?" The answer is surely "no."

#### **4. Why Hershey and Not Reading, Pittsburgh, or Other Locales?**

The petition is flawed on other levels, too. For instance, the proposal contemplates spending a whopping \$200 million (of the projected \$350 million) *on design and construction*. This calls to mind the "Springboard Academy" experiment with its costly infrastructure (later abandoned by MHS). One must ask why not just fund existing and tested programs at a fraction of the cost instead of launching another MHS construction spending spree?

Here as well, this is a charity with an operating model that consistently elevates construction boondoggles that enrich local contractors and shore up the area economy above the interests of children desperate for basic services. A child welfare-anchored (and reformed) MHS board would say: "Spend the \$350 million prudently on direct services to kids in the many cost-effective and tested programs that will leverage each child-saving dollar to maximum good." But the current (and still unreformed) MHS board asks the Court: "Let us spend another \$200 million on bricks-and-mortar, again boosting local construction companies, even though it makes the least sense!"

These are all the kinds of questions that should have been presented to the Court and adjudicated on a developed record after adequate public notice and meaningful discussion.

More troubling, if the proposed facilities are intended to serve "at-risk youth," *why would MHS start in the town of Hershey?* Hershey is hardly a poor community or childhood adversity hotspot — and this, in a state where childhood need and suffering are tragically widespread.

Children in Allentown, Scranton, Reading, Pittsburgh, and elsewhere have vastly greater needs. If MHS will spend *any* more funds in Hershey, let it be to enroll the hundreds of additional children that MHS *can serve right now* and who can come *directly from the foster care system* to be educated and cared for *in MHS's existing facilities*.

The rest of the \$350 million “surplus” should go to establishing satellite campuses in other locations, just as the Orphans’ Court itself *already* directed. This directive was issued the most recent time the MHS board came to the Court with protests about the “challenges” of spending Mr. & Mrs. Hershey’s money in the manner that the beneficent couple instructed.

In the Court’s own words:

Although the location of the School in Derry Township was important to the Hersheys if, in the opinion of the Managers, the site should not or cannot be expanded to meet increased enrollment, the Trust would not fail. Courts have been liberal in allowing change of locations and the doctrine of deviation is the available remedy; location is merely a detail of trust administration. See Esther L. Fisch, *The Cy Pres Doctrine in the U.S.*

[\(1999 Adjudication at fn.12.\)](#)

How many times must the Orphans’ Court tell the MHS leadership to move beyond Derry Township? 21 years have passed since the 1999 adjudication. During that time, MHS has added some 13 billion dollars to its corpus, demolished and rebuilt state-of-the-art facilities, and otherwise [spent money licentiously](#) — yet, MHS has failed to create *even one new campus* or otherwise deploy its resources to rescue children in dire straits across Pennsylvania and America. Why?

Did the Office of Attorney General press this issue before the Orphans’ Court or pursue discussion, for example, of MHS using the \$350 million “surplus” to retool the infrastructure of the [recently closed Glenn Mills School](#) in order to cost-effectively launch a new MHS campus there? What about requests from [Girard College to extend a financial lifeline](#) and help with its residential care mission?

There are countless ways for MHS to deploy its resources consistent with the Hersheys’ wishes to serve children who require out-of-home care beyond Derry Township. These avenues should be exhausted before claims of “failure of charitable purpose” are credited. MHS has not even scratched the surface in fully utilizing its resources within its existing legal mandate nor does the Petition even hint at this failure. Pennsylvania has many *bona fide* experts as concerns child welfare program budgeting who could provide the Court with the kind of authoritative and granular analysis needed to adjudicate the Petition properly. This is what the Court should hear rather than proclamations about “reimagining education” from individuals with no records of success in education innovation and with histories of failed experimentation.

## **5. An Opportunity to Stop Closing MHS to the Most Desperate Children?**

While the MHS Petition is fatally flawed, it nonetheless presented — and still presents (if the Petition ruling is reconsidered) — an opportunity that should not be overlooked. This is in an area that may even bring consensus and concerns the vital issue of enrollment.

Sadly, MHS has been permitted to drift from its core mission of serving children who genuinely need residential care. For decades, MHS leaders have increasingly sought to serve children who are merely seeking a “free boarding school education,” as the school now boasts.

Or, as Pete Gurt testified in 1999: “[We] are looking for academic ability.” The rest of Mr. Gurt’s 1999 testimony and his related MHS activities reflected that policy shift as well — and all pursuant to a long-term (and quietly-pursued) plan that is near completion today.

As a result, the children whom the Hersheys' surely wanted most to serve when they founded MHS — wards of the Court, full “orphans,” homeless children, foster care children, and others in the most desperate categories — have been supplanted steadily over time. In their stead, children who increasingly view MHS as a mere “boarding school” for the non-affluent have come to predominate.

Thus, generation after generation, MHS has slowly changed its student population until the doors have practically closed to kids who were in foster care or came to MHS from other orphanages or similarly harrowing circumstances. MHS alumni certainly know of — or perhaps were among — those students who had learning disabilities or were given up on elsewhere, but at MHS had special teaching programs created just for them. These programs allowed them eventually to graduate with a good job waiting, even if it did not entail going on to an Ivy League college or otherwise fulfilling the present MHS leadership's desire to project an “elite boarding school” image.

Indeed, while the school omitted the fact from its flawed Petition, MHS today has *many thousands* of “applicants” per year who “compete” for each available slot, with MHS boasting of its “competitive admissions.” This is something that the Orphans' Court should have been told, for many reasons, including to test MHS's core “we-can't-serve-more-children” falsehood.

Did the Office of Attorney General challenge MHS on this subject and question MHS witnesses on the record, for the Court's benefit? Were witnesses called to present contrary facts on the record for the Court' evaluation? Was the Court even told about the thousands of children who apply each year? We are doubtful (though we have yet to obtain the hearing transcript and are seeking to do so).

Soaring applicant numbers, of course, also cause further disadvantage to the most desperate children; i.e., ones who can hardly “compete” for “admission” with children who often are from perfectly loving and adequate (if not affluent) backgrounds.

For instance, in the past, MHS students entered the school on average two years behind academically and then generally caught up, something that is out of the question today: MHS apparently even breaks up siblings now to cherry-pick “candidates” with more “promise” and reject those with supposedly less “promise,” even from the same household. Where the MHS leadership wants to tout “competitive enrollment,” we agree, with the proviso that the only area of competition should be *degree of need*.

An example of the children that MHS should consider but won't any longer was Ethan Okula: [his tragic case shocked Pennsylvania](#) for the brief time it made headlines. Another such child was [Grace Packer](#), whose death also shocked the public. Other scandals involve foster families with histories of reported mistreatment of numerous kids in their care and inferior group homes across the state. The list of tragedies is endless.

But these headlines don't tell the full story: one in four Pennsylvania youth who age out of foster care experience homelessness, struggle with mental health issues, depression, substance abuse, and anxiety disorders; nearly one in four face arrest after leaving care; young women in foster care are two-and-a-half times more likely to be pregnant by 19 than their non-foster peers; nearly half of those leaving care haven't found a job four years later. Only 4% of foster youth graduate college by 26 in contrast with 36% of the general population. Pennsylvania minority

youth face an especially difficult burden and the Petition grant will have disparate impact on them: they make up 13% of the general population but constitute 43% of those in foster care.

PHC has read the MHS statistics about what good the early learning centers might do for children ages 0-5 and who reside with their families (and thus are *outside* the parameters of the Hersheys' Deed of Trust beneficiary class): did the Office of Attorney General present the Orphans' Court with somber statistics on foster youth already solidly *within* the Deed's lawful mandate? These children could be served *right now* and immeasurably helped with the purportedly "surplus" \$350 million that MHS is seeking to divert. How many Pennsylvania group home children could receive the tutoring, quality clothing, counseling, mental health care, and have other unmet needs fulfilled with the funds that MHS is seeking to divert? How many children in Dauphin County and nearby Lebanon, Lancaster, Schuylkill, Perry, and York Counties would be ecstatic to be brought within the MHS umbrella of care? The sobering needs of children in this population are in the fierce-urgency-of-now category and not in the we-have-too-much-money fictional world of the Petition.

All these questions should have been raised in the hastily-concluded and apparently pre-determined *cy pres* hearing. We do not see how that proceeding can be said to meet the requirements of due process for an absent, entirely unrepresented, powerless, and voiceless beneficiary class — a class that was supposed to be able to rely on the Office of Attorney General to protect its interests and not merely embrace uncritically a proposal that facially fails to pass legal muster.

There are 13,000 children like Ethan Okula and Grace Packer in Pennsylvania. Yet, MHS has represented to the Orphans' Court that it cannot serve them.

PHC disagrees — and we would point out that not once in MHS's 45-page petition do the words "foster care" even appear.

How is this even possible? It is no exaggeration to say that if MHS deployed its \$17 billion in assets effectively, it could serve so many Pennsylvania foster care children that *the system as it is now operating would become unrecognizable*. This issue does not appear to have been raised with the Court in the rushed approval process.

On the contrary, MHS has virtually barred the door to such children. Put simply, the *cy pres* Petition requires MHS to persuade the Orphans' Court that its wishes to launch a new early learning center initiative — outside MHS's legal mandate or expertise — should be prioritized over providing life-altering help to 13,000 Pennsylvania foster youth with a lawful claim to such services at MHS *as MHS was actually conceived*. PHC does not see how this is legally permissible.

Here as well, Pete Gurt himself spearheaded the transformation of MHS enrollment under Dr. William Lepley, implementing the infamous "[ISM Marketing Plan](#)."

As many know, this "marketing plan" was the blueprint that MHS quietly used to accelerate the "prepschoolification" process, in disregard of the Deed of Trust's stated mission.

As the "ISM Marketing Plan" made clear, the new MHS goal has been:

- "To attract able students and shed the 'orphanage' image..."
- MHS "is to be represented as a year-round boarding school which offers full scholarships to qualified students."

- “Acceptance to [MHS] is an honor” as MHS seeks to “change the MHS image as a dumping ground for...problem children” and “recruit more able students...”

- “The middle class parents who are making up more and more of MHS’s parent body are particular about everything that touches their children’s lives.”

None of this is subtle: the goals are obvious and we are seeing them accomplished as Director of Enrollment Gurt was elevated to MHS President Gurt.

While MHS certainly is serving many needy children, we have undeniable reports of many who have no real reason to apply and could not conceivably be said to require out-of-home care. These children are not at fault, of course, and are enticed into enrollment with promises of “college scholarships” or “horseback riding;” i.e., the “recruitment” mentioned in the marketing plan.

However, the 400,000 foster care children in America don’t need college scholarships or horseback riding dangled in front of them: *they just want a safe and secure home, as the Hersheys envisioned.*



Ethan Okula was 10 years old when he died from a treatable illness in 2016, after his foster family ignored his symptoms. Promises by state officials to do better were quickly forgotten. MHS will not even consider serving children like Ethan today and the *cy pres* Petition makes no mention of them. It appears that AG Shapiro has not pressed MHS to consider enrolling such children again.

The *cy pres* Petition is thus but the final step in a long, insidious, and — in PHC’s view — unlawful march away from the Hersheys’ orphanage mission. If it is successful, and if the Orphans’ Court does not reconsider its order, MHS will openly and permanently abandon children who truly are the “neediest and most alone.”

Indeed, commenting on the Court’s grant of the Petition, MHS President Gurt boasted that the proposed early learning centers can “serve as pipelines to channel future students to the school’s main campus in Derry Township.” The related [MHS website](#) endorses this.

So unless Mr. Gurt is saying that MHS’s new initiative is *intended* to disrupt poor families and create more children who require the kind of out-of-home care that MHS is supposed to provide, he is openly declaring that MHS has in fact abandoned the Hersheys’ mission and will no longer serve such children. This is not something that Mr. Gurt should be authorized to do.

**How it started:** “Well, I have no heirs—that is, no children. So I decided to make the orphan [children] of the United states my heirs.” (Milton S. Hershey, New York Times, November 18, 1923)

**How it’s going:** “[We] are looking for academic ability.” (Pete Gurt, 1999 *cy pres* testimony.)

All this notwithstanding, the proposed *cy pres* intrinsically allows the Court to look carefully at MHS’s quietly-pursued enrollment shift. On that basis, the Orphans’ Court could have — and still can — order MHS to use its hundreds of millions of “surplus” funds to rescue children from the foster care system — instead of hoarding money in Hershey (or spending perhaps a hundred million dollars or more to renovate one building, Founders Hall, as MHS has done over the last five years *with funds that could easily have launched Hershey Deed of Trust-compliant programs elsewhere*).

In this regard, PHC renews our invitation to the MHS board to engage with us in dialogue on how these enrollment goals might be achieved. Surely, there are at least some in power who recognize the opportunity for launching an initiative in line with the Hersheys’ wishes and that will serve children who truly are the “neediest and most alone.”

We extend the same offer of constructive dialogue to Attorney General Josh Shapiro, who still has not accepted our past invitations to confer on these vital issues.

Further, the manner in which the Office of Attorney General apparently lined up behind MHS on the Petition — and failed to meaningfully scrutinize the proposal as was required for the Orphans’ Court to adjudicate it properly — renews questions about the need for charitable trust “third-party standing” in Pennsylvania, for all the reasons described above.

The general public should certainly cast a critical eye at a hastily-convened Orphans’ Court proceeding completed within hours a mere 21 days after the Petition was filed — and this, despite no prior public notice or comment period, the COVID-19 pandemic, the enormous (\$350 million!) sums involved, and the vital interests of powerless and voiceless children at stake. With no party speaking at the hearing for needy kids who require residential care — as has happened in past such court actions — PHC can only conclude that their interests were again trampled.

## **B. Conclusion: A Long View of History**

### **1. PHC Will Seek to Reverse the 2020 *Cy Pres* Petition Grant; Restoring Hope of Needy Kids “Reaching a Farther Shore”**

PHC takes a long view of history — our longest-serving board member, Ken Brady (Class of 1940), is 99 years old and met Mr. Hershey himself. This took place when the MHS founder showed up one day as Ken was doing barn chores and asked if Ken was being treated well. Our fidelity to our founders’ child-saving mission is deeply personal and philosophical.

Another of our board members — legendary CIA operative George Cave (Class of 1947 and 2001 Alumnus of the Year) — graduated shortly after Ken. George has also watched events unfold over time as the Hersheys’ orphanage mission was slowly diminished, including via the 1963 *cy pres* and all that followed. George’s birds-eye view also guides us.

Our youngest board members have seen up close the events of the last 21 years and the harmful effect of oversight official decisions on the MHS operating model.

All of this informs our present actions as we strive to do what we believe our founders would ask of us now. We do so while recognizing that others may take a different view — and we welcome civil disagreement (that in any case should be subjected to careful scrutiny and decided ultimately by the Court after all sides are properly heard).

To our supporters, we thank you for your continued faith in us.

To the general public, we call on you to consider the least among you and to follow this matter closely, because the lives of the most disadvantaged children are in the balance.

To those who were raised in care, we ask you to imagine if MHS doors were open again to others like you and what pain and trauma would be avoided for these underserved children.

To our fellow alumni, we suggest you consider renewing your commitment to an MHS reform effort that no one other than we alumni have been willing to pursue: it is not too late to prevent abandonment of our founders’ child-saving mission, if only we act effectively — but we are going to have to fight for it.

As the poet Seamus Haney put it:

Believe that a farther shore  
Is reachable from here.  
Believe in miracles  
And cures and healing wells.

If you consider yourself to have been rescued by the Hersheys — or if you care about the Ethan Okulas and 13,000 other Pennsylvania foster care kids — or if you merely believe that charitable trustees and oversight officials should not substitute their own wishes for the lawful goals of charitable benefactors — then please give us the support we need. This is not merely to defeat the 2020 *cy pres* Petition and reverse the recent (and we believe hasty) ruling, but also to have the Orphans’ Court similarly reverse MHS’ steady and deliberate closing of its doors to society’s neediest children. The latter would have broken our founders’ hearts but is also what the Petition seeks: the MHS leadership’s own words and website leave no doubt.

There is still hope that the Hersheys’ children — the desperate and abandoned like Ethan Okula and countless others whom the Petition says do not exist — can “reach a farther shore.” You can help carry them there, as some of you once were carried, too.

Faithfully,

**Protect The Hersheys’ Children, Inc.**

Kenneth O. Brady <i>MHS Alumnus</i>	Kenneth D. Beasley, PhD, PE <i>MHS Alumnus</i>	Ric Fouad <i>MHS Alumnus</i>	Charles E. Hill <i>MHS Alumnus</i>
Harry Chalmers <i>MHS Alumnus</i>	George W. Cave <i>MHS Alumnus of the Year 2001</i>	Robert A. Chalmers <i>MHS Alumnus</i>	