

STATEMENTS of NINE Artists AND  
WRITERS from PROVINCETOWN -  
EASTHAM - HEARINGS - Dec. 16 & 17 - 1960  
AND S. OSBORN BALL, LAWYER

**CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK**

*Return, Mrs. Josephine Del. Deo  
Provincetown, Mass.*  
**HEARINGS**

BEFORE THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON**

**INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS**

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS**

**SECOND SESSION**

CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE  
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CAPE COD NATIONAL  
SEASHORE PARK IN THE COMMONWEALTH  
OF MASSACHUSETTS

DECEMBER 16 AND 17, 1960  
EASTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

Serial No. 28

Printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs



Cautions

Testimony in favor of Seashore  
Park and in favor of including  
State-owned Province Lands in  
the park.

S. O. Olsen, Hall - 113  
Mary Heaton - 116

Articles & notes from Provincetown

- Mary Cecil Allen - artist p. 100
- Fritz Buttman " " 118
- Josephine Del Des " " 144
- Miriam Hapgood DeWitt, artist, p. 147
- Ross Moffett, artist, p. 150
- Jack Trickett " " 151
- Mary Heaton Vorse, writer, " 116
- Heaton Vorse, " " 99
- Mrs. M. R. Homer " " 153

Against the park.

Mrs. Walter Chrysler Jr. p. 176

See also argument against  
including Province Lands by  
John C. Saxon, Chairman of  
Province Lands Selection, In  
appreciation see also attempt by  
Saxon to discredit evidence by artists.

CONTENTS

Statement of—

Nestor A. Aalto, Massachusetts Council of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.....	173
Victor F. Adams, chairman, Board of Selectmen, Barnstable, Mass...	137
Mary Cecil Allen, Provincetown, Mass.....	100
Walcott Ames, president, Barnstable County National Bank, Hyannis, Mass.....	139
A. Osborn Ball, secretary, Provincetown Civic Association, Provincetown, Mass.....	113
Van Ness Bates, Massachusetts Improvement Association, Boston, Mass.....	71
The Honorable Edward P. Boland, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.....	10
Fritz Bultman, Provincetown Property Owner's Protective Association, Provincetown, Mass.....	118
The Honorable James A. Burke, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.....	111
Serge Chermayeff, professor of architecture, Harvard University.....	101
Mrs. Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., North Truro, Mass.....	176
Norman Cook, executive secretary, Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce.....	66
The Honorable Silvio O. Conte, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.....	8
Bertram Courier.....	181
Chester A. Crocker, Barnstable, Mass.....	127
George L. Cross, selectman, Barnstable, Mass.....	123
Prescott B. Cummings, chairman, Planning Board, Eastham, Mass.....	141
Josephine Del Deo, Provincetown, Mass.....	144
Mrs. Miriam Hapgood DeWitt, Provincetown, Mass.....	147
Charles H. W. Foster, commissioner of natural resources, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.....	15
Charles E. Frazier, chairman of selectmen, Wellfleet, Mass.....	41
Alice Hiscock, member, Chatham Planning Board, Chatham, Mass.....	178
Irving A. Horton, chairman of selectmen, Truro, Mass.....	32
Prince H. Hurd, Jr., selectman, Eastham, Mass.....	36
The Honorable Hastings Keith, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.....	4
The Honorable John F. Kennedy, a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, as presented by Fred Holborn, assistant to the Senator.....	14
The Honorable Thos. J. Lane, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.....	9
Werner Lieb, Truro, Mass.....	159
Rev. E. B. Luscombe, Wellfleet, Mass.....	135
Henry Lyman, publisher, Boston, Mass.....	154
Robert A. McNeece, selectman, town of Chatham.....	25
Ross Moffett, Provincetown, Mass.....	150
Allen Morgan, executive vice president, Audubon Society, Wayland, Mass.....	74
Franklin S. Murray, selectman, Orleans, Mass.....	33
Donald W. Nicholson, former Congressman from the State of Massachusetts.....	11
Maude H. and Edward R. Noyes.....	111
Joshua A. Nickerson, Orleans, Mass.....	60
The Honorable Leverett Saltonstall, a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, as delivered by Jonathan Moore, assistant to the Senator.....	14

## Statement of—Continued

Dr. George Shattuck, Massachusetts representative, Nature Conservancy, Brookline, Mass.....	Page 70
John C. Snow, chairman, selectmen, Provincetown, Mass.....	47
Harry Taylor, North Eastham, Mass.....	161
Orin Tovrov, Orleans, Mass.....	157
Kenneth Turner, Cotuit, Mass.....	133
Jack Tworikov, Provincetown, Mass.....	151
John A. Volpe, Governor-elect, State of Massachusetts.....	10
Heaton Vorse, Provincetown, Mass.....	99
Mary Heaton Vorse, Provincetown, Mass.....	116
Mrs. M. R. Werner, Provincetown, Mass.....	153
Mrs. LeRoy Wiles, Wellfleet, Mass.....	174
Dr. Madeline Winslow, Truro, Mass.....	130
Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, as presented by Ben H. Thompson, Chief, Recreational Resources Planning Division, National Park Service, accompanied by Frank Harrison, special assistant to the Director, NPS, and Ronald F. Lee, Region V, NPS, Philadelphia, Pa.....	83
Material submitted for the record—	
Massachusetts Division, American Automobile Association, letter from Richard W. Hoover, secretary-treasurer.....	185
Charles L. Ayling, Barnstable, statement of.....	185
Walcott Ames, president, the Barnstable County National Bank of Hyannis, Mass.....	188
Emmet B. Baker, president, Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.....	110, 185
William W. Ball, Rear Adm., USNR (ret.), New Bedford, Mass., letter and proposals from.....	186
Barnstable Town Hall, Hyannis, Mass., resolution of.....	189
Barnstable County Commissioners, Hyannis, Mass., telegram from.....	190
Francis A. T. Beane, Chatham, Mass., letter from.....	190
George J. Bisacca, president, Eastover, Inc., Lenox, Mass., letter from.....	192
W. S. Brewster, vice president, United Shoe Machinery Corp., Boston, Mass., letter from.....	193
Selectmen of Brewster, Brewster, Mass., letter from.....	193
Robert R. R. Brooks, dean, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., letter from.....	193
John Burbank, Pittsfield, Mass., letter from.....	194
Stanley E. Charm, Sc. D., Newton, Mass., letter from.....	194
Clarence M. Chase, Hyannis, Mass., telegram from.....	110
Edward F. Chellel, O.D., Warren, R.I., letter from.....	194
Chatham Planning Board, Chatham, Mass., letter from.....	195
Selectmen, Town of Chatham, Massachusetts, letter from.....	195
Chatham Park Department, Chatham, Mass., letter from.....	198
Dorothy and John Conkey, Ware, Mass., letter from.....	199
Chester A. Crosby, Osterville, Mass., telegram from.....	110
John M. Deely, chairman of the board, Lee Lime Corp., Lee, Mass., letter from.....	199
Robert A. Dinerstein, village president, Park Forest, Ill., letter from.....	200
Howard A. Dodge, letter from, presented by J. Benjamin Simmons, attorney, Washington, D.C.....	200
J. Edward Downes, Jr., treasurer, Downes Lumber Co., letter from.....	202
Henry A. Dymsha, Ph. D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., statement of.....	202
Charles W. Eliot, Cambridge, Mass., letter from.....	203
Warren A. Ellsworth, comptroller, the Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass., letter from.....	206
Emmanuel College, Department of Biology, Boston, Mass., statement.....	206
Ralph W. Goodrich, superintendent of schools, Amherst, Mass., letter from.....	206
Cecil I. Goodspeed, Osterville, Mass., telegram from.....	111
Peter Hallock, Touisset, Mass., letters from.....	198, 207
Richard P. Harding, Waltham, Mass., letter from.....	208
Irving C. Henderson, Chatham, Mass., letter from.....	209
Katherine A. Heberton, Chatham, Mass., letter from.....	208
Truman Henson, New York, N.Y., letter from.....	209

Without objection, these statements will be placed in the record in full. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. PFOST. Are Mr. Vorse and Miss Allen here? You people may proceed.

*write*

**STATEMENT OF HEATON VORSE, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.**

Mr. VORSE. My name is Heaton Vorse. I am the son of Mary Heaton Vorse, who is also making a presentation before this committee. Like my mother, I am a writer and a journalist. At present, I do a column for the Provincetown New Beacon. I grew up in Provincetown and went to grade and high school there. Much of my adult life has been spent in Provincetown. I know it well.

I oppose any change of the proposed boundaries of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park within the township of Provincetown for two reasons.

Most of the territory which is to form the cape tip section of the park is province lands. I have been over much of this area on foot. It is composed of marshland, both salt and fresh, and steep hills of soft, shifting sand, sometimes covered by a layer of humus never more than 2 inches thick on which scrub vegetation grows. There are few places on the province lands where it is feasible to build a house of any sort. When the land is level enough to build on, it is wet. When the land is dry, it is practically vertical. All of it is made up basically of unstable sand, quite unsuitable to build on, but very good park land. It is park land now, and should remain so.

My second reason is that Provincetown has no need for new land to expand in as it has already just about reached the economic limit of its water supply. There is plenty of water in Provincetown, but it contains so many salts in solution and carries so much organic material that it must be heavily treated and strongly filtered before it can be made fit for human consumption.

A second difficulty is that the water table is so close to that of sea level that a sharp drain on any one well within the boundaries of the township soon strike salt.

For this reason, Provincetown went to Truro for its water supply as early as 1907. But, even in Truro it is possible to strike salt and by 1924, the original wells had done so, and new ones had to be dug.

By 1950, the town needed more water. Surveys by Whitman and Howard to find potable water in sufficient quantities within Provincetown failed. Truro had to be tapped again and  $7\frac{1}{2}$  more miles of water main had to be laid to bring the water in. The new plant went into operation in 1954.

Should Provincetown expand and need still more water, it will have to go expensively farther and farther up the cape to get it. I doubt if this is economically feasible. It would be better for the town to be content to remain within its present boundaries and let the province lands be taken over from the State of Massachusetts by the Cape Cod Seashore National Park.

Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Mary Cecil Allen, please.

*witness*

STATEMENT OF MARY CECIL ALLEN, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

MISS ALLEN. Madam Chairman and members, my name is Mary Cecil Allen. I am an Australian artist who came to Provincetown 12 years ago. I have been a property owner there for the last 8 years. My remarks will apply primarily to the park as it concerns Provincetown. I want to express myself as wholeheartedly in favor of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park, without boundary re-trenchments, and as outlined in the bills introduced in Congress in September 1959.

I was in Australia last winter, and I was amazed to find how closely Australia was following the progress of conservation in the United States. In Melbourne, my hometown, the most desirable land for real estate and commercial development along the banks of the Yarra River, on which Melbourne is built, has been set aside by the State of Victoria to remain in its original state with eucalyptus, wattle, and other native trees. Similar restrictions have been made all over Victoria, as well as in the five other States in the Commonwealth.

I feel that if, in the name of town expansion and commercial development, the proposed park is bisected and retrenched by cutting our portions of the province lands, the whole aspect and meaning of a national park will be thwarted and destroyed.

I also feel that the interests of Provincetown as regards prosperity will be amply served by the park itself, through the added attraction for tourists which the park will provide. And here I would like to say that expensive hotels, motels, and restaurants built in the province lands, should they be acquired by the town, would be of no use to most of the tourists who would use the park. For Provincetown's summer accommodation has become so expensive in the last few years that more of the same kind of accommodations would benefit only the rich, and not the people for whom the park aims at providing a more or less inexpensive vacation, so that they, too, can enjoy the air, the ocean, the beauty of the wild scenery.

Again, if the province lands should be used for commercial purposes, and if outside promotional interests are solicited and brought in with the idea that they will expand and develop the town and thereby be of benefit to it, I submit that the actual result will be that these interests will largely take their summer earnings out of town. This is already the case with many of the businesses attracted to Provincetown by its great influx of summer visitors. These businesses go to Florida and elsewhere for the winter and only come to Provincetown for the short lucrative summer season.

I would like to make the point that the true prosperity of at least Provincetown lies in the power to attract a larger residential and property owning population, who would deal at the local stores, pay taxes, and outstay the summer visitors, often by as much as 3 months and in some cases by the whole winter.

The local stores would be encouraged to stay open more and more in the winter, if there were a larger resident population. There are already signs of this. Within the last 4 years, artists have been buying or building houses in Provincetown at a greater rate than ever before. These artists are staying later in the year and returning at

holiday times. The principal houses on the waterfront and many in the interior of the town are now owned by artists. Now of late, these artists are becoming more and more concerned and alarmed about the possible disappearance, through shortsighted commercialism, of the very features which have led them to settle and acquire property on the cape.

I know today the point has been made by some of the speakers that one does not have perhaps a right to speak on these things unless one has lived for 300 years on the cape. But since Provincetown does not appear to be able to provide indigenous artists, Provincetown, summer capital of art in the United States, has to rely on artists coming in from elsewhere.

The real assets of Provincetown and the rest of the cape are bound up with their unique natural surroundings and unspoiled coastal scenery. These, and to a great extent, these alone, are the attractions which now bring so many summer tourists and visitors; not hotels, restaurants, parking lots, and gift shops, but the opportunity to come into contact with a life so removed from that of large towns and cities, that it is, day by day, becoming rarer and harder for the ordinary man and woman to experience.

It is this natural beauty and this wild coastal scenery that a national park, without crippling boundary modifications, as outlined in the bills placed before the Congress in September 1959, would preserve, not only to Provincetown, but to the people of the United States forever.

I wish to thank this congressional committee for permitting me to give my views. [Applause.]

Mrs. FROST. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions of either Miss Allen or Mr. Vorse?

Thank you very much.

Our next witness will be Mr. Serge Chermayeff, professor of architecture, Harvard University.

STATEMENT OF SERGE CHERMAYEFF, PROFESSOR OF  
ARCHITECTURE, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

MR. CHERMAYEFF. Madam Chairman, I am thankful for your indulgence, because I know I was not scheduled to appear at this time. I am starting to run a fever and I started it, I assure you, at 7 o'clock this morning, and not about midday. I want to keep as much as I can to the purpose of this inquiry. But it is necessary, because some points were raised earlier, for me to comment on part of these hearings.

I am appearing before you so to speak in a treble capacity: one, as a Truro resident; two, as a professional planner, and, thirdly, as a do-gooder. I want to make quite sure that my position in this matter is understood by your committee.

As a resident, I am absolutely sure that the large proportion of taxpaying residents in Wellfleet and Truro are not represented in the recommendations which have been placed before you. It is a curious situation in which I have to be flattered, by undue attention, given half the time of an important selectman witness to what was obviously an attempt to discredit a witness in advance of his appearance.

Without objection, the statements by the Congressmen that were placed in the record while the witnesses were coming forward this afternoon will be placed immediately following the congressional testimony. Is there objection to those being included in that place in the record?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

The committee will reconvene in the morning at 9:30 and we hope to be able to start promptly. The subcommittee stands in adjournment.

(Whereupon, at 5:50 p.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 9:45 a.m., Saturday, December 17, 1960.)

## CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1960

EASTHAM TOWN HALL,  
Eastham, Mass.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 9:45 a.m., in the Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass., Hon. Gracie Pfof (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mrs. PFOF. The Subcommittee on Public Lands will now come to order for further consideration of the Cape Cod National Seashore legislation.

Our first group of witnesses this morning will be Mr. S. Osborn Ball, Mr. Fritz Bultman, and Mary Heaton Vorse. Mr. Ball, are you going to testify this morning?

Mr. BALL. Maybe that is what you call it, I will speak, if I am permitted.

Mrs. PFOF. Will you please come to the rostrum?

Mr. BALL. Up there?

Mrs. PFOF. Yes.

While the witnesses are assembling, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have placed in the record immediately following the congressional testimony yesterday morning a telegram which was received yesterday from Gov. John A. Volpe, Governor-elect of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered. The telegram to the committee is in favor of the legislation.

Will you proceed, Mr. Ball?

Mr. BALL. Madam Chairman, what is the time limit?

Mrs. PFOF. Approximately a maximum of 15 minutes for each individual.

### STATEMENT OF S. OSBORN BALL, SECRETARY, PROVINCETOWN CIVIC ASSOCIATION RE PROVINCE LANDS, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. BALL. My name is S. Osborn Ball. Please don't be misled by my initials. I am the trustee and therefore have title to 2 miles of ocean front in Truro and it is considerable acreage. I am also secretary of the Provincetown Civic Association, which is dedicated to what we think are the better interests of Provincetown.

I would like to speak briefly on both situations.

Now, the evidence you see around us tells us that Cape Cod will succumb in its entirety to the needs of the ocean approximately 4,000 years from now. So our only problem is what to do with it during the 4,000 years. I think the time has passed when we oldtimers can hope that Cape Cod will stay the way it is.

Since this park was proposed the rape of this beloved country has begun in earnest. Therefore, we have absolute proof it is going to change and then the issue is, Should it be done by bulldozers? by money-mad people? by banks wanting to lend? by builders wanting quick jobs? by loan sharks? Or is it to be done by the U.S. Government in another manner?

As a trustee of a valuable piece of land, I cannot advocate one or the other. My father and mother have their own cemetery on that land. I have a big dog cemetery. I am inclined to think if I weren't a trustee that, since we have a choice of evils, that the Government can do it less terribly, less awfully than the present method by bulldozer and rape of all of these beautiful hills and country.

I wish, however, may it please this honorable body, and Madam Chairman, that you would be more honest than you have been. I do not say that you have been intellectually dishonest, but I have listened to these hearings for 2 years now. Citizens are always asking, "Can I keep my home? Can I leave it to my beloved people? my own family?" and similar questions.

And our legal representatives and legislative representatives, without any embarrassment, have said, "Why, that is what the bill says. Of course you can." Now, this is a fraud because no matter what a bill says, it can be amended in the twinkling of an eye. Mr. Udall will have vast powers, as all Cabinet members have. He will only have to write out a directive, it can all be changed. And therefore, I implore you to let the citizens realize that the question isn't that; the question is, Shall the cape be completely changed from Provincetown by private interests, or shall it be changed by the operation of the National Park Service?

But as far as assuring the people that they can stay, why, there isn't enough steel barbed wire fence in the world to allow me to stay on my estate because how can I keep the people out? You can't, because you would have to have around-the-clock guards stationed every 200 or 300 feet. So it is silly for us to decide yes or no, should there be a park on any such minor consideration as that; it is simply ineffective.

Now, we come to Provincetown. If I would not be considered more ridiculous than I am, I would get down on my knees to your honorable committee, and plead with you not to let the town of Provincetown take any portion of the province lands. This beautiful country, there is nothing like it in the whole United States, was taken for two purposes a century ago: to prevent those gigantic dunes from engulfing Provincetown in the northerly gales, and to preserve for posterity one of the most incredibly beautiful places in the country. Provincetown doesn't need this bill they have filed. Don't let them have it. They talk about the economy. I am going to die not knowing anything about economy. There isn't any such thing. That is a fancy word for builders who want to make money, for real estate men to develop it, for banks, for lawyers, people crazy to make more money.

If you take the entire original amount of Cape Cod that you planned, you wouldn't hurt the economy any more than if you take half of it. All you are going to do is instead of having a hundred banks as we now have, you will have 500 banks; instead of 100 big contractors, you will have 500. That is what they mean by economy. Let's face it.

Now, Provincetown is surrounded by bay, ocean, moving sand dunes. You wouldn't build a store on a dead end street. This is a dead end street, 50 miles away from nowhere. If you add any more residences or businesses to that area, you will choke it to death. And I say that our selectmen and our town manager and the rest of the people who are pushing for this thing are doing it to destroy it, they are doing it because they envision a town manager getting \$5,000. If you take this dune, he will be able to get \$15,000.

That is the most beautiful part of the whole park taking. If you are going to take a part, take all of the province lands. I feel very strongly about this because it will most certainly ruin our town. In the summertime we have 15,000 cars coming into Provincetown a day. What is going to happen if they increase that? Our town manager told us at the last civic meeting that Schine Hotel Corp. had already said that they would be glad to come in and develop that beautiful country, those beautiful ponds, and dunes, with modern hotels, golf courses, and heaven knows what, and maybe even a bust in the center of the town of McCarthy, for all we know. I say we don't need that, we don't want it.

You heard Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon in the past television debate. Did any one of these people representing various States ever mention God Almighty? No, not once. Let us think a little bit of the spiritual values today, the good things, the clean things. There is going to be plenty of money under the Kennedy program. They are even going to let me get taken care of for free, medically, whether I need it or not. They are going to keep giving, giving. That will take care of anybody's private economy. We don't have to work any more.

I sincerely urge you to do all you can to save our little town, terribly maligned as it is, and unjustly maligned. Save us from a fate much worse than anything the atomic bomb can do to us because it will do it by degrees, it will choke us, it will finish us.

I thank you.

(Statement of Mr. Ball follows:)

STATEMENT OF S. OSBORN BALL, SECRETARY, THE PROVINCETOWN CIVIC ASSOCIATION

THE NATIONAL PARK ISSUE

As to the 2 miles of ocean front land in Truro of which I am trustee, my fiduciary capacity prevents me from assuming any active part in this issue. I have had fabulous offers for portions of this trust. The legal duty to beneficiaries is clear. I can, however, state what appears to be the true issue. The true issue is not squarely met even yet. The true issue is not whether the citizens wish to keep the cape as it is for of course everyone wants that. The true issue is that since it, the cape, cannot possibly be kept as it is, by which of the two available methods shall it be changed.

Shall it be changed by the present speeding up of the present process of raping our beloved country by sale and barter? Or shall it be changed by the preservation of huge areas protected from this rape by those greedy for gold even though that preservation means turning it over to millions of tourists for inspection and mounting visitation? Certainly zoning can only slow up but not stop sale and barter, for men and women are found at their worst when the rainbow indicates the presence of gold. Right at this very moment speculators devoid of spiritual content wreak havoc on our beloved country. One heard nothing of God in the recent campaign debates. But those who love this country—and many they are—inherited much more than campaign planks. They inherited, and they hope to keep the spiritual calm that this great, boundless beauty breathes



upon us as surely as the surrounding oceans give of its ozone. They like not this mounting greed for gold which reminds them of men rushing for the lifeboats on a sinking ship. They would like to die the way their beloved country now is at the very least. Better had they died, then, 10 years ago.

#### THE STATE PROVINCE LANDS

If the town of Provincetown is allowed to take any portion at all of the province lands—and their officials brazenly propose to take its most incredibly beautiful and restful part—it will be a bloody execution removing the fountain head—indeed the very pièce de résistance—of the purpose of any national park. But thinking Provincetowners are less concerned with that than they are with the disastrous effect it will on a little town, hemmed in by dune and sea, a very dead end town wherein there can be neither rhyme nor reason for expansion. In no sense is it a "hub." Not a single bona fide reason can be given to expand a town so located. Hundreds of acres of land suitable for dwellings remains unoccupied. Yet the perpetrators of this hoax say they have already interested the Schine Hotel people in its development. Do we have such spiritual beauty and peaceful ponds and moors and quiet expanse for such a purpose, or do the town officials see in this overloading of a dead end street a chance for more and bigger salaries and political advancements?

Render unto these Caesars the things that are for Caesars but leave us alone to our beautiful little town with its beauty as God bestowed upon it. Let the Federal Government preserve and reserve it. Leave it, not for Schine Hotels, but for the eyes of the millions of touring Americans who will come from all of the States in our Union to see for themselves how lovely it is. If Rachael Carson be right when, in "The Sea Around Us," she says that Cape Cod will sink beneath the waves 4,000 years from now, let it sink with this loveliness intact.

#### CONCLUSION

Obviously, citizens more concerned with spiritual values, and with a profound love for this paradise will always be outnumbered by the mortgagees, the speculators, the builders, and the dollarwise ambitious. The changes in the beloved country cannot be stopped. Shall this be done by the long successions of rape already in process? Shall this be done by reservation and preservation although it means inviting millions yet unborn into the county of Barnstable? Doubtless the bones of my father and mother and of my dogs lying in the cemeteries within the Ball trust will be confiscated by a national park. But will my tears that day be any less than those shed when, instead, the giant bulldozers of giant speculators destroy not only these remains but also the beautiful land itself? Let others argue the point.

Mrs. FROST. Our next witness will be Mrs. Vorse, please.

#### STATEMENT OF MARY HEATON VORSE, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mrs. VORSE. Madam Chairman, Congressman Keith, members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, my name is Mary Heaton Vorse. I have been a voter and taxpayer of Provincetown for over 53 years. My children and grandchildren have all attended Provincetown schools, so my circle of friends extends over all Provincetown, among young and old.

My occupation is that of a professional writer. I have written 17 books and hundreds of articles. One book, "Time and the Town," is a Provincetown chronicle. I have had considerable Government service. I was on the Committee of Public Information, Foreign Division, under George Creel of Colorado; headed Public Information in the Indian Bureau for nearly 2 years; was an overseas member of the Red Cross (Italian and Balkan Commission); briefly a member of the American Relief Administration led by President Hoover; I worked for UNRRA in Greece and was attached to the Italian Mission from Christmas 1945 to 1947.

Provincetown has been my home, its welfare my chief concern.

I have come here today, as I am sure we almost all have, whether for the park or against it, because we love the cape and wish to preserve its essential quality which speculators are destroying.

I myself am wholeheartedly for the national seashore park and against any essential changes in the park's boundaries as they were first planned.

I wish especially to protest against taking any part of the province lands destined for the national park as hurtful to the park, the cape, and Provincetown. I can assure you that this reflects the opinion of large numbers of my townspeople.

I cannot understand how the selectmen and others can support the park as they do, and at the same time work with tireless concentration to mutilate and destroy the park by taking its most unique feature, the province lands. They prepare for their expected visitors by destroying the very thing they have come to see.

The province lands are the natural termination to the 60-mile sweep of the great beach. They are an indivisible and necessary part of the national seashore park.

Nearly 75 years ago the province lands were made a State park by act of legislature because of the unique character of the country.

They are unique. Long ago, I wrote:

I do not know of any country which is so wild and so diverse within so small a compass. This little piece of land, small when you measure it in square miles, is unlike any other place; nor have I found any one who has seen anything like it.

Thoreau, looking at them in autumn, says:

I never saw an autumnal landscape so beautifully painted as this was \* \* \*. This was perhaps the most novel and remarkable sight I saw on the cape.

There is no other spot in the seashore park that combines all the noteworthy features, historical, geological and biological. It is a bird watcher's paradise. There are few places in these United States where side by side are found the forest birds and the waders—the herons and loons and also the sea birds, from the least tern to the great arctic gulls.

And finally, the province lands are an eloquent and conclusive argument of the urgent need for a national seashore park, if we are to preserve our cape. What would have happened to it and our beaches if left in private hands we may see lamentably in Wellfleet and Truro, where land speculators have descended like gannets on a dead fish, hoping to glut themselves before the park could stop them.

Consider Provincetown itself in relation to the province lands. Provincetown lies along the long curve of the bay. Behind it, enclosing it and guarding it from exploitation are the province lands, a crescent of woods, marsh, ponds and moors. Behind them is the vast solitude of the dunes, and then the Atlantic Ocean.

It is proposed to amputate the whole of the wooded crescent for development, leaving only for the park, like the paring of a fingernail, the dunes, and the shore. Provincetown has been a great fishing port. It is still the fourth port on the North Atlantic seaboard; fish will be caught here while there are fish in the sea.

The town, through the last 50 years, has become the acknowledged art center of the East. No one planned it that way. No one said,

"Come, let's be an art center." It developed spontaneously, drawing its creative force from the spirit of the town, which bred great captains and explorers, as it has inspired artists and writers.

Provincetown is more than an art center. The Provincetown Players were born here and had their first playhouse on my wharf. They changed the history of the theater in America. There has been a summer theater here in the Players' tradition ever since, and they didn't think they were going to change anything. They didn't plan to change the theater, they planned to give a few plays, but it turned into a great movement, so strong was its creative force.

The Symphony Society of the cape was founded here and developed by Jo Hawthorne, internationally famous conductor, son of the great painter, Charles Hawthorne.

The number of fine craftsmen, workers in ceramics, leather, silver, wood, and other media, is increasing yearly. If this natural trend continues unchecked, Provincetown will become not only the art center of the East, but the cultural center. If you tamper with the province lands, we may well have instead an imitation Narragansett Pier, or a fake Tuxedo Park.

What has made Provincetown is its unique position. The town and the back country, as we call the province lands, are indivisible as a human body. They cannot be cut apart and live.

Through the centuries the province lands developed their austere, wild beauty. Man trifles with the balance of nature at his peril. To cut off the province lands, by which the town has been protected and nourished, is to destroy the very thing that made it a unique town, quick with creation.

I plead for its preservation. Our country began here. The Compact was written in this harbor. Leave this historic town to fulfill its destiny.

Mrs. FROST. Thank you very much, Mrs. Vorse. [Applause.]

Will you remain there, just a moment, please, you and Mr. Ball, until we find out if there are questions by the committee?

I have just been advised that Mr. Bultman has arrived. Would you please come forward and give us your statement, please?

*Bultman*  
STATEMENT OF FRITZ BULTMAN, PROVINCETOWN PROPERTY OWNERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. BULTMAN. I would just like to introduce into the record of these hearings a letter from the Provincetown Property Owners' Protective Association. It is composed of 100 taxpayers representing 64 pieces of property in Provincetown, but most of these taxpayers live in the New York area.

Mrs. FROST. Do they favor or oppose the park?

Mr. BULTMAN. They favor the park and the present boundaries and that is the body of this letter. Shall I read the letter?

Mrs. FROST. Yes; you may.

Mr. BULTMAN. It is addressed to Congressman Aspinall, but I think it is addressed to you directly now. [Mr. Bultman then read the letter reproduced below.]

Mrs. FROST. Thank you very much. Because of the names attached, the letter will be placed in the record.

(Letter referred to follows:)

PROVINCETOWN PROPERTY OWNERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,  
Provincetown, Mass., December 14, 1960.

CONGRESSMAN WAYNE W. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives  
of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you on behalf of the members of the Provincetown Property Owners' Protective Association whose names and addresses are listed at the foot of this letter.

At a meeting of the association the members hereinafter listed unanimously voted in favor of sending you the following communication:

We urge you to oppose Massachusetts House bill 3290 which would convey to the town of Provincetown a tract of land within the limits of the province lands at Provincetown, which lands are now included in the national park as projected in the measure now before the U.S. Congress, for the following reasons:

(1) Included in the proposed conveyance is an area consisting of woods, marshes, ponds, and dunes, which area is included within the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Act and within the boundaries as defined in the Saltonstall-Kennedy-Keith bill, as revised. This area would constitute one of the most beautiful portions of the proposed park and should be included as a part of the national park, in order that its natural beauty may be preserved and conserved. In the hands of private individuals it would be highly commercialized and would, undoubtedly, produce a honky-tonk development bordering on the park.

(2) The area in question is needed as a protective barrier between the dunes and the town of Provincetown and should not be destroyed by a conversion of same into a commercial development.

(3) The area in question is a haven for natural wildlife and should for that reason be conserved and preserved.

(4) The area in question is not necessary for the expansion of the town of Provincetown, as there are ample lands now available for such expansion which have not been used to date.

Respectfully yours,

MAURICE C. BRIGADIER,  
President, Provincetown Property Owners' Protective Association.  
JEAN BULTMAN, Secretary.  
VICTORIA BRAUN, Treasurer.

PARTIAL LIST ONLY OF MEMBERS OF ASSOCIATION

Mr. and Mrs. Maurice C. Brigadier, 479 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Halper, 481 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Fritz Bultman, Miller Hill Road, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Harry Pinkerson, 49A Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Rose, Bradford Street Extension, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Kaplan, Commercial and Allerton Streets, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Mervin Jules, 613 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Mark Rothko, 250 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Dr. and Mrs. Arlie Sinaiko, 597 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Boris Margo, Atkins Mayo Road, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Byron Browne, 600 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Chaim Gross, Franklin Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Rothman, Commercial and Allerton Streets, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Nassos Daphnis, Bang Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Abe Burrows, 551 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Dr. Alice Fabian, 665 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Dr. and Mrs. Edmund Braun, 472 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Frederic Varady, 204 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Richmond, 40 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Irving Marantz, 200 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Victor Candell, 22 Bangs Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Dr. Diana Kemeny, Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Kardos, Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
Mr. Warren Hassmer, 236 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.

Dr. Yela Brichta, 326A Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. Joseph Acker, 605 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. John F. Bosworth, 605 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Umberto Romano, 422 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Robert Motherwell, Commercial and Allerton Streets, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Manacher, 23 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. Julian deMirsky, Webster Avenue, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Weiner, 345A Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Newman, 600 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Wallace Bassford, Snow Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Donald Thompson, 186 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Leo Manzo, 592 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Seong Moy, 18 Brewster Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Albert Rubenstein, 565 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mrs. Vivian DePinna, 50 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Philip Katzen, Allerton and Bradford Streets, Provincetown, Mass.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Herman Maril, 252 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.

Mrs. PFOST. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon. Do you have any questions, Mr. Ullman?

Mr. ULLMAN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

You say the town of Provincetown does have, in your opinion, room for expansion, without the province lands?

Mr. BULTMAN. I think there has been a survey recently of that and it shows that there is almost as much land available for expansion as is presently built on.

Mr. ULLMAN. I do not believe that information has been made available to the committee. I would urge that if such a study has been made, that it should be made as a supplemental statement.

Mr. BULTMAN. I think it can be verified by the maps. I believe Mrs. DeWitt has the areas. She knows the actual area.

Mr. ULLMAN. It is possible this is incorporated in the Park Service testimony.

Mr. BULTMAN. It is not only there, but private people have made a map of the town, they made certain measurements, and there is so much and so much land that has been built on, and so much and so much land, almost double; that has not been built on at all, which is in the hands of private individuals.

Mr. ULLMAN. What percentage of the taxpayers and property owners signed this letter?

Mr. BULTMAN. This covered 64 pieces. We got the actual signatures for this letter of 40-odd signatures, 40-odd pieces of property covered.

Mr. ULLMAN. Out of the 64?

Mr. BULTMAN. Out of 64.

Mr. ULLMAN. I see.

Mr. BULTMAN. This is only in the New York area that we were able to get this number of people together in this short time. This became apparent when the boundary changes started to come to public notice. We did not know about it until this October.

Mr. ULLMAN. Thank you.

I just wanted to commend the other witnesses for very able statements, and, of course, particularly Mrs. Vorse for a very fine statement. Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am not sure I get just what you have in mind here. You refer to the province lands?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is a State park now?

Mr. BULTMAN. That is a State park now.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You want to leave it as a State park?

Mr. BULTMAN. No; that this be included in the national park in its present state, without changing the boundaries. There is a plan to change these boundaries and take from the province lands certain area and put them in the boundaries of Provincetown. This is not needed, we feel, for the growth of the town.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Before there was talk of the national park, were you satisfied with the State park as it is now?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You would be willing to leave it as it is; you are satisfied with it?

Mr. BULTMAN. If it remains the way it is.

Mrs. PFOST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes.

Mrs. PFOST. It is actually a State park, or merely State-owned land?

Mr. BULTMAN. I am informed it is a State park.

Mrs. VORSE. It is a State park since 1893.

Mr. BULTMAN. It is a State park and has been so since 1893. But it has been this way from the beginning, and it is just now—

Mrs. PFOST. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes.

Mrs. PFOST. Are we to understand that it is not actually operated as a normal State park would be, but that it is really in a state of preservation?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes; it is in the state of preservation. It is technically a State park, but I do not think it is run as a State park.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you.

Mr. BULTMAN. But it is preserved. This is what we would like to see continued.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You referred to a Massachusetts House bill 3290—

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH (continuing). Which would convey to the town of Provincetown the tract of land within the limits of province lands. Is that the park you are talking about now?

Mr. BULTMAN. That is right.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Which land is now included?

Mr. BULTMAN. That is right.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Who is promoting that legislation?

Mr. BULTMAN. That is being promoted by town officials.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They want to destroy the State park?

Mr. BULTMAN. They want to introduce that land, to take over that land as part of Provincetown to develop commercially. There is no actual need for that as far as—

Mr. CHENOWETH. You say they want to develop it commercially?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes. At a recent meeting, I think Mr. Ball will bear me out, there was talk of building hotels and motels back there to take care of the proposed visitors.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think Mr. Snow testified here yesterday that was to be for residential purposes only.

Mr. BULTMAN. We have been told by the town manager that he had letters from a hotel chain and that it would be used for hotels and motels to take care of the expected visitors to the park area.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You feel that the town of Provincetown now has expanded about as far as it should?

Mr. BULTMAN. Well, it has more land, there is more land within the present boundaries of the town to expand. I think there are 400 acres of nonmarshland to be built on still within the boundaries of Provincetown. I believe there are 500 acres that are built on at present. And it seems that 400 acres would prove ample for building, for future expansion. The town could expand almost double its present size.

Mr. CHENOWETH. How many acres are in the State park?

Mr. BULTMAN. In the State park?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes.

Mr. BULTMAN. I do not have those figures.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Just roughly, just approximately?

Mr. BULTMAN. I am told about 3,000. I do not have the exact figures. But the part the town has tried to acquire through this House bill is the woodland area of the State park.

Mr. CHENOWETH. When was that effort first started to get this land?

Mr. BULTMAN. It was started last spring and the bill went through the House of Representatives here in Massachusetts during the summer months. It was not generally known until this fall that the bill had passed the House of Representatives and at that point, various groups formed and this was one group that formed in the New York area, taxpayers in Massachusetts who felt that the bill would harm the development of the town rather than help it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Do I understand that effort then was precipitated by the fact that they would rather have it in Provincetown rather than go into the national park?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Otherwise, they would leave it as it is?

Mr. BULTMAN. One or the other, but not for commercial development.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think that is all, thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Alaska?

Mr. RIVERS. Madam Chairman and Mr. Bultman, the Park Service witness yesterday testified that they would expect the towns to provide overnight accommodations for visitors and related services. Now, I hear everyone almost disclaiming any intent to do anything that is of a commercial nature. Do you not think there is going to have to be some provision made for some additional accommodations for the visitors in Provincetown?

Mr. BULTMAN. I think that there will have to be and I think there is area within the present boundaries of Provincetown to build considerable amounts of commercial development.

Mr. RIVERS. I see.

Mr. BULTMAN. Within the present boundaries.

Mr. RIVERS. This unused land within the present boundaries is privately owned, is it not?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes, it is privately owned.

Mr. RIVERS. You refer to it as available. Will these people that own it jar loose at all to let it be used?

Mr. BULTMAN. There is at the moment, I believe, up for sale a tract of 20-odd acres, and this land has no roads in it yet. The available land is not developed, there are no roads or lights or water there yet. It is possible just by increasing or extending the road in Provincetown, the present roads, to operate this land. It would not be another community. The thing is that we feel building back in this area, that is State land and is designated as part of the park that it would become another community whereas there is a possibility of extending the present facilities and opening large tracts, yes. There is quite a lot of land there. I think it could be made available. There is no reason—the reason people haven't sold it is that until now there are no roads, no facilities, water or lights or anything else back there.

Mr. RIVERS. That is all, Madam Chairman, thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Are there further questions?

The Chair wishes to thank the three of you very much for very fine statements.

Our next group of witnesses will be George L. Cross, selectman, town of Barnstable, Chester Crocker, Eastham Planning Board, Dr. Madeline Winslow, Truro, Kenneth Turner, Cotuit, and Rev. Earl B. Luscomb. Will Victor F. Adams come up, too, please?

The first witness will be Mr. Cross.

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE L. CROSS, SELECTMAN, BARNSTABLE, MASS.

Mr. Cross. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, Congressman Keith and ladies and gentlemen, my name is George L. Cross and I am a resident of Hyannis, Mass. I am a selectman in the town of Barnstable, Mass. Barnstable is the largest town in the county of the proposed site of a national seashore park. Townships pay a proportionate share of the operation of the county government and the town of Barnstable pays 46 percent of this cost.

Cape Cod (Barnstable County) is a small island connected to the mainland by two bridges. Because of this very unique feature, and other characteristics, the whole county is very much unified in its actions and thoughts. The effects of traffic, taxes, zoning, employment, and other economic trends we have in one town are bound to be of concern to all the others. I have heard and read much on this subject.

I am opposed to the national seashore park being established on Cape Cod. All of the towns in this country have public beaches plus many ways of access to the water. There are no restrictions on these beaches. In some of the areas small charges are made for parking privileges and nowhere is there a charge for the use of the beach or bathhouse.

been and we appreciate the restraint with which you have testified here.

Mrs. FOST. Are there further observations or questions of the witnesses?

If not, thank you very much, each and every one of you. We do appreciate your statements and we are very happy that you had an opportunity to appear this morning though we realize that you had hoped to appear yesterday.

Will the next group of witnesses come forward? They all come from Provincetown: Josephine Del Deo, Miriam DeWitt, Ross Mof-fett, Jack Tworkov, Mrs. M. R. Werner.

Will you proceed, Josephine Del Deo?

*artist*  
STATEMENT OF JOSEPHINE DEL DEO, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mrs. FOST. State your full name for the record?

Mrs. DEL DEO. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, Representative Keith and members of the audience, my name is Josephine Del Deo and I am a resident of Provincetown. I have been living there as a year-round citizen for a period of 10 years. From 1950 to 1955, I operated a shop selling handwoven materials which I made myself. For the past 7 years, my husband has run a very successful restaurant in Provincetown. We are now completing a home which we built ourselves and we have every intention of living in Provincetown the rest of our lives. I consider my two children fortunate to have been born in this part of America and I am here today to make a personal plea to your committee to help those of us who love and cherish this land to protect and keep it forever as a truly special part of the world.

I emphasize my tenure on the cape and the nature of my residency, solely to establish in your minds the fact that there are many, many persons and families, who live here as we do, who do not favor the dismembering of the proposed national park.

There has been a constant propaganda on the part of town officials of the lower cape, in particular, to the effect that all those opposed to local schemes of real estate speculation and short-term expansion programs are "outsiders and do-gooders," and in general, people whose main portion of the workyear is spent so far from the cape that they could not possibly know what is good for their respective communities.

The inference which follows this premise is that only those citizens born, bred and brought up on Cape Cod with ancestral roots in our sandy soil can qualify to recommend legislation, or understand the local interests of the people.

Since I have lived here I have noticed that the reverse is often the case. It is the citizens with the family tree that are exploiting the land of their heritage and the later arrivals who have tried to save it. I think we should all recognize that this kind of propaganda is a deliberate smokescreen and that the real test of a man's qualifications for a job is not the length of time he has had it, but the intelligence and enthusiasm with which he serves it.

When John Snow, chairman of the Provincetown Board of Selectmen, spoke at the Washington Senate hearings on the park last June, he began his statement by saying, "Now, I am not a planner, I am a

lawyer. I am also a town official and I am a Cape Codder." It might be well to point out to the committee that Mr. Snow is also a real estate agent and if he does not boast of being a planner, he might do well to incorporate planning in his list of attributes as chairman of the board of selectmen.

He approached the committee at that time with several proposals. The first was a matter of the request by Provincetown to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to acquire from the State, roughly half or about 1,400 acres of the province lands. This proposal was introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature early in the summer, and fortunately, was defeated.

A second bill, H.R. 3290, was put forth which asked for approximately 700 acres of the same province lands, an area which constitutes the very heart of our most heavily wooded and scenic landscape. I am sure this committee has had the land I speak of pointed out to them, or at least is familiar with it on the map. Although it may not seem an unreasonable amount of land to keep out of the park, it is the location and quality of this land which is important.

It would be a highly desirable area to include in the national park for it contains many of our loveliest little ponds, beech groves, and foot paths. Since 1893, these province lands have been considered by the Commonwealth to be a public park under the jurisdiction of the department of public works. This has been clearly pointed out by Representative Allen Jones, assistant Republican floor leader in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, who stated recently in a letter to me—

As you probably know, the province lands were purchased from the Indians in the area of 1654 and in 1893, the legislature provided that these lands should be a park for the people of the Commonwealth, because of the unique character of the lands.

I beg to propose if this land is so highly valued by Massachusetts for scenic and recreational purposes, then it should also be valued by our Federal Government for the same purposes.

In conclusion, the feeling in Provincetown has been so strong against the taking of these lands that petitions and letters to the Massachusetts Legislature have served to stop the second bill from passage. It is our sincere hope that pressures will be sufficient, or that the Cape Cod National Seashore Park will be passed in time to save this land for the people of the United States.

Persons who are of my opinion, have been and will be accused of opposing progress, of denying others the right to a decent piece of property on which to build a home, and of cutting off our fellow citizens from economic opportunities.

I have examined my conscience many times as I have driven through the one badly overcrowded area in our town and asked myself if I am helping to deny those people an opportunity to better their situation by recommending that the lines of the national park be established as originally planned. The answer is "No," for several reasons: firstly, there is already ample room within the existing township of Provincetown for new homes to be built. And I would like to refer the committee here to item 2 in a letter written to Senator John Powers, president of the Massachusetts Senate, dated September 26, 1960, by local taxpayers which amply covers this subject.

Some of this land has not been properly assessed and a large portion of it is owned by a few individuals who have held it for some time, probably in lieu of more profitable use. I think I may safely state here that the land that would be acquired from the province lands is certain of being turned over to a developer, one such has already been named by our town manager, and will not afford the individual residential homeseeker much choice. He will be forced to buy land back from the developer at his price and I presume these prices will not be overly modest. I cannot see much in this project except for the type of motel units and resort attractions that we already have a superfluity of and which will be built and run by the same people who already own the motels and resort attractions. There is not much here for a poor man crowded into a 50- by 30-foot lot.

Secondly, there is the very important item of providing work for the towns in the construction industry. Of course, this cannot be denied. Selectman Frazier of Wellfleet has compiled a very imposing list of facts and figures on this subject. He points out the large amount of Wellfleet economics which leans on building expansion. Naturally, it is foolish to deny that business expansion will be cut by the national park. It is exactly for this reason that the park is being established.

The only question is, at what point and where should we curtail appetites of land developers? It is important to remember, as the economic report on the park bill pointed out, that construction will run out eventually anyway. If it runs out in this generation instead of three generations from now, then we have sacrificed, it is true, but many generations of Americans after us will benefit by our loss.

I think it is irrelevant to point out that zoning laws will restrict private development. Zoning laws will protect only so long as they cannot be changed and changes are easy enough to institute through private pressures from one administration to another in the local town meetings. However, changes in the Federal rulings will be much harder to come by and therefore, the land will be much better protected in the long run under a national park.

Lastly, the question of what is progress must be met squarely. Progress does not mean simply a steady advance forward regardless of circumstances. It means, according to Webster, to advance forward and increase in proficiency. To recommend the taking of the province lands in Provincetown will not increase our proficiency for reasons I have shown, but it will increase our tax rate. It will destroy a valuable section of land which should belong to the national seashore park, and it will go down in the annals of our history as one of the land grabs which contributed to the emasculation of a noble effort to create a unique park on Cape Cod for American citizens.

Madam Chairman, and members of the committee, I urge you to give this matter your immediate attention and to exert all possible speed in voting the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park into reality.

Mrs. FROST. Thank you, Mrs. Del Deo.

Our next witness is Miriam DeWitt.

Mrs. DEWITT. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to speak in behalf of the national sea-

shore park. I have a prepared statement which I would like to submit for the record, and I will just give a brief summary.

Mrs. FROST. Have you presented it to the committee already?

Mrs. DEWITT. Yes, I have.

Mrs. FROST. Without objection, the statement will be made a part of the record.

(Statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. MIRIAM HAPGOOD DEWITT, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

I am in favor of H.R. 9050 to establish a Cape Cod National Seashore park. Selectmen of several lower Cape Cod towns have proposed drastic changes in the boundaries set forth in this bill. These changes would cut out many of the park's most beautiful and valuable sections. I oppose these shortsighted attempts to dismember the park.

Such wholesale boundary changes are undesirable from every point of view. The park is already small for a national park. If these revisions are permitted to cut up the park, the remaining area would be a crazy quilt that would be impossible to administer effectively. Far more important, such a shredded piece of land would frustrate the chief aim of the park, namely, conservation. The boundaries were chosen, only after careful consideration, with this end in view. Moreover, the people who now live in the areas that would be excluded from the park would forfeit the rural charm of their surroundings when the time came for the subdivider and his bulldozer to clatter up their narrow, winding roads. The towns would in large measure lose their greatest economic asset—the beauty and historic character of this land and of these old communities. The people of the Nation would lose a unique landscape. A few people, it is true, would turn a dollar.

These areas are not needed for expansion. Present park boundaries leave to the towns all the space they will require in the foreseeable future. They do not need unlimited acreage in which to spread out over the hills and seashores. Such so-called growth merely drives away the visitors who form the backbone of the region's economy. The towns can continue to grow and prosper within a restricted area if they plan to make the best use of their natural and historic features. Scattering of houses is bad conservation, bad aesthetics and bad economics.

Although the whole small area of the lower Cape should be thought of and planned for as a whole, I should like to confine the remainder of my statement to the Provincetown end, where my husband and I are voters and taxpayers, and where our memories go back to early childhood. I can still see the old town, with the harbor on one side and the woods and dunes on the other, as it looked nearly half a century ago, when my father first brought his family there for the summer. My parents took part in the revival that made this little town internationally famous as a cultural center. The Provincetown Players put on their first play in our house and my mother and father wrote and acted one of the early plays produced in the old fishhouse on Mary Vorse's wharf. That same summer Eugene O'Neill's first production, "Bound East for Cardiff," was played on the wharf to the sound of waves, with the harbor in the background.

Only a few years after our arrival, my husband's family spent the first of a long series of summers—and many winters—there. They followed in the footsteps of an uncle, who had discovered the town in the 1890's and was one of the first artists to settle in Provincetown. Although my husband and I have lived in many places, Provincetown is home for us and our two sons.

I bring in this bit of family history because some of my opponents on this issue claim to speak with more authority because they were born there. They say no one "from away" can know what is best for the town. But they are there by accident, while we come by choice, often from far away. We come for the special things Provincetown has to offer: unspoiled woods, dunes and ocean beach, and, side by side, the historic life of the harbor and the bustling cultural life of the town. Many native Provincetowners agree with us that to spread houses and motels over the wild back country that has always been in the public domain would destroy the Provincetown we love.

Annexation by the town of a belt of woods and ponds (part of the State-owned province lands) that separates and protects the town from the shifting sand dunes is being vigorously promoted by a small group of town officials and

businessmen. Without prior public discussion or a thorough study of the consequences, they had a bill introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature to cede these State lands to the town. It had already passed the lower house and was due to be acted upon by the senate before the people of Provincetown knew what was happening. When the extent and location of the lands to be taken and the plans for development were belatedly published, they were greeted with a storm of criticism. There is a widespread feeling that if this land is developed, the people of Provincetown will be trading a priceless part of their heritage for a mess of pottage.

Present plans call for building on these province lands several motels, a shopping center, an 18-hole golf course and over 400 homes. Proponents argue that the town needs more land so that Provincetown's young families can build their homes there instead of moving to Wellfleet and Truro. They say that additional land is needed to provide facilities for the influx of tourists that will be attracted by the park. They claim that by thus broadening the tax base, taxes will be lowered. On the contrary, the great cost of developing this difficult land would almost certainly put its price beyond the reach of local young people, while tax increases that would undoubtedly follow to cover the high cost of services for such a large and scattered development would drive still more of them away.

Town Manager Lawrence has acknowledged that the land would cost so much to develop that local enterprises could not do the job. It would have to be developed by an out-of-town syndicate, which would reap the profits of the operation. Vast sums would indeed be required to clear the land, build the roads over sand and peat marsh, dredge the shallow lakes and fill the bogs, build water mains, import hundreds of tons of loam for the golf course and plant grass and other cover to hold the sand—this last no easy job, as Provincetowners know from long experience.

After all this expenditure, Provincetown might find itself in a bad financial squeeze. Golf courses do not pay for themselves in taxes, nor do most homes. As several studies have borne out, most residential developments are not self-supporting. The ones that pay enough taxes to cover the cost of services are \$25,000 to \$50,000 houses on half-acre to acre lots. If such a squeeze did develop, the town would be forced to change its present plans and permit much more commercial construction in the area at the cost of still more of the special character that now draws people to Provincetown.

There is no need for the town to embark upon such a hazardous adventure. Within the present boundaries of the town there is still a large acreage of developable land, that, with good planning, could provide many housing units and commercial facilities at far lower cost to build and maintain. They would meet the town's needs for a long time to come. Provincetown does not have to lodge all of the tourists who would visit that end of the park. There is ample space elsewhere within easy driving distance.

It seems clear that the backers of this development have given too little thought to its effect upon the town. Development of these province lands would be both an esthetic and an economic catastrophe.

Plans for Provincetown should be an integral part of a master plan for the lower cape as a whole and should be linked to the establishment of the national park. Their central idea should be to preserve and enhance the special character of the town. Plans thus far formulated almost totally neglect Provincetown's two chief assets: the old fishing village strung along the harbor and the cultural heritage and present cultural life of the town. Much could be done to enhance the town's special flavor and banish the honkytonk that has spoiled some sections.

But the men who want to take this land out of the public domain are thinking in narrow terms. They do not see the connection between esthetics, conservation, and economics. They will not see that people require spiritual along with physical nourishment.

One of our country's most distinguished artists, a Provincetown resident, was quoted as saying to Town Manager Lawrence at a recent citizens meeting: "There's something for the human spirit out there. All you want to do is make money. \* \* \* Maybe this town doesn't need what you are trying to do for it. This town doesn't need to be developed."

Many of us in Provincetown believe, like him, that this wild and lovely bit of country should become a part of the national park, to be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations.

Mrs. DEWITT. My name is Miriam DeWitt. I am a voter and property owner in Provincetown. I first came here in 1911 as a child and have spent much time here since then. I was not born here, nor were my ancestors, like those of some of the witnesses who have appeared here. But if it is of any help, my ancestors settled in Massachusetts 304 years ago.

I am in favor of the park with the boundaries approximately as proposed originally in the Saltonstall-Kennedy-Keith bill. I believe the park is the only means to preserve the beauties so many witnesses have described against the pressure of the greatly expanding, rapidly expanding population. I would prefer the cape as it was a few years ago, without a park, but that is impossible. I oppose attempts to dismember the park. Such wholesale changes are undesirable from many points of view.

As Mr. Thompson so ably pointed out, the park is already small for a national park. The disconnected patchwork that would remain after the changes would be impossible to administer effectively, and would be ineffectual as conservation. These areas are not needed for expansion. Mr. Thompson gave the figures on the amount of undeveloped land in Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, and Eastham.

After 300 years, there is still approximately as much undeveloped land as there is developed.

With good planning—and I believe this is the key to the whole crux of the situation on the cape—this land will meet the needs in the foreseeable future. The alternative to planning is to continue to scatter houses all over wood and moors. This is bad esthetics, bad conservation, and bad economics.

Pictures in the current issue of the Cape Codder show what is happening now on large areas of unspoiled country. It will destroy the beauty and character of the area and right away drive away those who are attracted by these features.

Mr. McNeece compares the charm of the cape to a Currier and Ives print. If we continue to scatter houses in the present haphazard fashion, I fear he will some day find a cluster of split level ranch houses in the foreground of his picture.

Spreading houses all over the landscape will make a mockery of conservation, cluttering up in a short time large sections of unspoiled country. It is bad economics because not only will a widespread rash of houses and roads eventually drive away substantial property owners, but it will also raise taxes. Residential property does not as a rule carry its share of the taxload, especially if it is scattered.

Speaking of Provincetown, Mr. Snow said its young people are moving out because of a lack of land, but the population of Provincetown has been declining since 1910. Certainly there was plenty of land then. He stated that sections of province lands were needed for purely residential use. However, I doubt that Provincetown could raise taxes enough to support such an uneconomic use. This piece of wild land would be incredibly costly to develop and service. Undeveloped land closer to town would be much easier and cheaper to develop.

Incidentally, Mr. Snow said that Provincetown needs to expand its accommodations for tourists driving down the cape to Provincetown, but at the same time the development of these province lands would be purely residential. The two statements seem to conflict.

By the way, every summer I hear people wailing because there are so many vacancies.

In reply to a question by Representative Ullman, Mr. Frazier says there were so few residents of Wellfleet he knew how all of them stood on the park. Seventy-five percent of the taxpayers are non-residents, he said, and their opinion could not count, he implied. On a matter of such moment, which affects them so vitally, shouldn't the people who mainly support the town have a voice?

Mr. Snow stated that 90 percent of the residents of Provincetown were for the taking of a part of the province lands. I believe he is in error.

As Mr. Bultman said, until last September, very few people knew anything about the proposed taking of the section of the province lands. At that time, some of the details were published locally and produced an immediate critical reaction. Many residents both native and from away oppose the taking and have said so publicly; so do many resident property owners. The selectmen do not necessarily represent the people on every issue and I am certain that on the question of boundaries they speak for a minority.

In closing, I should like to correct some of the statements made by Dr. Winslow.

I believe, and I have been assured that people with property in the park will have the vote. She said people would not be allowed to pick berries as in the province lands. That is not the case.

Also, I think the point should be cleared up. Some witnesses seem to think that homes would be taken away from people. This is not the case. They would be allowed to retain their homes.

I believe the figures given on the Truro town vote on the park were incorrect as quoted by one of the recent witnesses. I haven't the figures here, but they were put into the record at the Washington hearings.

One other point. Several people have mentioned the fact that the Atlantic Ocean provides very poor swimming. I have swum there for many years, and so have many of my friends. I have found it very gentle, except in stormy weather.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. Frost. Thank you.

Our next witness is Ross Moffett.

#### STATEMENT OF ROSS MOFFETT, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. MOFFETT. Madam Chairman, members of the House Subcommittee on Public Lands and Congressman Keith, my name is Ross Moffett and I have been a legal resident and voter in Provincetown for 45 years. I have been a property owner here for 35 years. While I am at it, I may say also that I was born and raised on a farm in the State of Iowa, where I still have interests. I settled in this area because of the unique charm and quiet and deliberate life of the friendly people I found here.

The setting and the kind of life I have mentioned continued here without threat of dissolution up to, I would say, the end of the Second World War. Since that time, with the influx of visitors brought in by modern travel facilities, and with the almost feverish drive to bulldoze and cover the lower cape with houses, motels, and commercial

establishments of all kinds, the beautiful and traditional Cape Cod I have known so long has been disappearing with ever-increasing rapidity. In the earlier days, there seemed no necessity for a national park. In the present day, there appears no possibility of saving any desirable feature of Cape Cod except through the establishment of such a park.

I wish to express my wholehearted endorsement of the proposed park with boundaries substantially the same as those defined in the bills introduced into Congress in September 1959. I am opposed to such revisions of boundaries as were proposed by town officials at the June 21, 1960, hearings in Washington, for I think these would give us a botched and patchwork park which would be unsatisfactory to nearly everyone now and down through the future.

We in Provincetown have been much concerned lest the fine woodlands in the State-owned province lands be kept out of the park. I would say that these unspoiled woodlands should not be turned over to developers for motels, hotels, and so on, but they should be included in the park. They would constitute the park's valued northernmost feature.

There is need for the park to be speedily established, for during the past year local developers, for reasons I cannot fathom, have bulldozed and torn up several areas within the proposed park lands.

Knowing the lower cape as I do, I would like to say that the inclusion in the park of the whole width of the cape in Truro and Wellfleet is, I believe, a wise and farsighted provision of the original bills. In particular, the section of the proposed park that lies west of Route 6 is, in my opinion, the most desirable and handsome portion of the park.

There is one other matter I would like to comment on. This involves the so-called 10 percent clause by which, under certain conditions, the towns would have been allowed a 10 percent refund of this park area in private ownership. This provision was in the 1959 bills which I have endorsed, but as you know, it has been deleted. Its omission, I am inclined to think, is a mistake and I think this committee should consider restoring this provision. We would then get some moderate revision of boundaries determined over a period of time by conferences with the towns and the Government officials.

As it is, we have proposals for cutting out sizable patches here and there arbitrarily and without regard for the park as a unified and organic whole.

I hope that the House committee will report favorably on a bill for a Cape Cod National Seashore, without significant boundary modifications. Such a park, I believe, would be of great value to Cape Cod and to this Nation.

I wish to thank this congressional committee for permitting me to give my views on this proposed legislation.

Mrs. Frost. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Jack Tworkov.

#### STATEMENT OF JACK TWORKOV, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. TWORKOV. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Jack Tworkov. I am an artist and I have been coming to Provincetown since 1923. I think you can believe me when I say



that I speak for most of the people who summer in Provincetown.

Two years ago, I purchased a home here. My entire family spends its summers here and my wife and I now plan to spend at least 9 months of the year here. As a family, we consider ourselves fortunate and enriched by this contact.

I have already seen in this period many changes take place that have spoiled the original contour and charm. But the recent proposal of the town to acquire some of the province lands for commercial expansion fills me with the utmost concern. I see in it a plan to heartlessly exploit an area that is rare and beautiful and which has already been set aside by the State as park land for mere private real estate appropriation.

The province lands are a most unique stretch of wood and dune and a source of spiritual comfort for all those who seek it. It has been a magnet for poets and painters for generations and accounts for Provincetown's special and steady popularity. It also provides excellent hunting grounds for the townspeople.

The plans propose to erect five large motels, a large shopping center, a golf course and other similar enterprises—on this very land. All the effort and planning look very much like a last-minute land grab by real estate and development companies before the national park becomes a reality.

It has already been publicly stated that the town plans to give this land to a large development company. The argument, then, put forth by some that the land will be sold to individuals for private dwellings, is therefore, most unlikely.

To permit indiscriminate resort building around the park area would defeat the very purpose of the national park—this would even be true of the most exquisitely planned resort area. There is still plenty of land available for purely private building.

Provincetown already has a large number of summer dwellers. Many of these own their own houses and in the upkeep of these houses employ local labor and patronize local shops. This gives some stability to the town. A heavier tourist emphasis only aggravates a transitory and parasitic use of the town's resources—here today and gone tomorrow—with no real concern of the town's welfare and appearance. And at the end of a short summer season, a ghost town is left. This is already partially true and would only become many times more intense by the proposed plans.

If the town needs revenue, efforts should be made to establish suitable year-round employment. This would create a healthy and even flow of activity the year round and would solve a fundamental economic and moral problem for Provincetown. As it is, anyone with ambition and especially the young cannot remain here because "there is nothing to do."

I also respectfully request the committee to disregard the labeling as "crackpots" and "ne'er do wells" all those who now speak in the name of the public's interest. That leaves only those motivated by selfish concerns as the "practical" ones.

We are a rich nation, but we are already the butt of world criticism because of what seems to be our materialistic emphasis. Of what use are our riches if we cannot afford, in this instance, to maintain and preserve an area of great beauty and hallowed traditions, such as is

not to be found easily anywhere else? Do we always have to yield to the demands of private business?

It is, then, for the above reasons that I am for the establishment of a national seashore park without any of the proposed deletions or retrenchments.

Thank you, Madam Chairman, I should like to make one other remark.

In this hearing, there were people speaking against establishment of the park I recognized. So many of them also spoke for the preservation of the area, which is exactly what we are speaking for. Now, the whole thing comes down to a question of this: how the park will be administered. If it is true, those dangers they foresee in the administration of the park, then I would be against the park myself. If it is true that the administration of the park would bring in millions of people, if it would bring in some necessary areas around the park, if it would increase the number of motels, and all the things that are already destroying the cape, then I would also be against the park, or at least there would be no way of choosing between two evils.

In other words, we can't really be for the park unless the administration of the park includes plans for the preservation of the area. If this is merely to open—I do not know how to put it. I have seen other seashore areas completely destroyed and turned into slums. And I would certainly not like to see this happen to the cape.

Mrs. Prosr. Thank you.

Our next witness is Mrs. Werner.

*miter*  
STATEMENT OF MRS. M. R. WERNER, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mrs. WERNER. Madam Chairman and members of the Committee on Public Lands, Congressman Keith, my name is Hazel Hawthorne Werner. I am a writer by profession. I have been a summer resident of Provincetown for 42 years, a year-round, voting resident of Provincetown for the past 8 years. During the warmer seasons of the 42 years I have lived on the sand dunes in a region to be included in the proposed national seashore park. For the sake of conservation of the beloved natural features of this region I am wholly, and without reservation, in favor of the passage of bill H.R. 9050.

The incoming Secretary of the Interior, Representative Udall, in a recent report to the House, said:

The one overriding principle of the conservation movement is that no work of man, save the bare minimum of roads, trails, and necessary public facilities in access areas should intrude into the wonder places of the National Park System.

That the outer beach and the now privately owned sand dunes between the province lands and Pilgrim Spring State Park are a wonder place is indisputable. A stranger to this area may not understand why the artists and many townspeople of Provincetown regard the province lands also as a wonder place, and why we urge its inclusion within the boundaries of the park.

It is because they are unique. Thousands of towns in our country are so alike that someone set down from the air, blindfolded, would not know his whereabouts, not one town from another. A person so set down in the back lands of Provincetown can at once exclaim, "This must be Cape Cod." He may go on, "The smell of bay leaves,

these curious small oaks, this ground cover—what is it? like nothing I've ever had underfoot before. This quiet under the wind. These sandy hills. This dust-free air. This must be near the end of the Cape, this must be Provincetown."

I do not make this point for lyrical effect. I contend that such a recognition of a local terrain is good for local business. I contend that if my colleagues in protest against a proposed commercial development in the province lands stress aesthetic reasons against this development, their argument has economic weight. The appearance of our natural, unexploited landscape is vital to our economic success. To despoil our landscape is to spoil our only remaining big business, the tourist business.

The stranger set down blindfolded is also likely to say, "And here are the artists."

Let the promoter and developer beware when they disparage the term of "artist." To do so is bad for business. Once through the whole country the name of Provincetown meant fishing. Today it means painting. The artists to whom we owe this association of ideas have come here because attracted by a special, unspoiled, and very particular beauty, a 65-mile-out-in-the-Atlantic beauty. The tourist trade has trusted their choice. The least damage by commercialized development of the back lands puts in jeopardy the town's attraction to artists, and hence puts in jeopardy this profitable association of ideas in the public mind.

For this reason, I respectfully urge that the province lands be included and conserved within the boundaries of the National Seashore Park.

Thank you.

Mrs. FROST. Thank you, Mrs. Werner.

At this point, the Chair would like to thank the several members of the panel for very constructive statements.

Are there questions of the panel?

Mr. ULLMAN. I would just like to add my word of commendation and assure them their full statements will be considered.

Mrs. DE DEO. Will the official record contain the appendix to my statement?

Mrs. FROST. Was that a newspaper clipping?

Mrs. DE DEO. Yes; it was.

Mrs. FROST. The rules of the committee will not permit that to be made a part of the record, but it may be made a part of the file.

Mrs. DE DEO. All right.

Mrs. FROST. Our next witness will be Henry Lyman.

#### STATEMENT OF HENRY LYMAN, PUBLISHER, SALT WATER SPORTSMAN, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. LYMAN. My name is Henry Lyman of Canton, Mass., and I am publisher of Salt Water Sportsman, a monthly magazine devoted to marine angling along the coasts of the United States. I have served in the past, and still do serve, on various committees and boards at the Federal, interstate, State, and local levels as an adviser on marine sport fisheries matters.

I have already submitted a statement expressing my views in favor of the seashore park and I would like to emphasize one or two points in that statement.

I am extremely familiar with the Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina and was in on the ground floor, as it were, when that park was established. This area is very similar to Cape Cod. It has been stated earlier here that there are no national parks comparable to the ones contemplated on the cape. The area is not only similar, but the objections to establishment of the park were brought up just as they were brought up in the past 2 days here.

I would like to emphasize that control of commercial enterprises at the Hatteras National Seashore has remained in the hands of the town completely. The zoning of the towns and the town fathers of the towns concerned have complete control over all establishments, commercial or otherwise, in the area. So it is up to them as to how the area developed, it is not up to the National Park Service.

I would also like to add to my statement the fact that not only has employment increased in the area which seems to be a worry here on the cape, but also the season for summer people has increased by almost 2 months. This has meant an upsurge in the economy, prosperity in the area, and general happiness all around.

The town fathers here on Cape Cod, I suggest, should look into the situation at Hatteras, consult with the Dare County Chamber of Commerce, with the towns involved in the Hatteras area, and with the North Carolina Board of Conservation and Development. These agencies all have facts and figures which will show that the national park in that area has been a tremendous shot in the arm to the economy, without development of undesirable and nontypical businesses in that beach section.

That is all I have to say, Madam Chairman.

Thank you.

(Mr. Lyman's statement follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF HENRY LYMAN, PUBLISHER OF SALT WATER SPORTSMAN MAGAZINE, BOSTON, MASS.

My name is Henry Lyman of Canton, Mass., and I am publisher of Salt Water Sportsman, a monthly magazine devoted to marine angling along the coasts of the United States. I have served in the past, and still do serve, on various committees and boards at the Federal, interstate, State, and local levels, as an adviser on marine sport fisheries matters.

I would like to go on record as being heartily in favor of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. In my travels along the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts, I have noted with growing concern the vanishing shoreline. I am referring to erosion of land; I am referring to the tremendous increases in industrial developments, real estate developments, and loss of tidal areas through drainage or fill.

Although losses of coastal areas through this alleged progress has destroyed much scenic beauty, there are other factors involved which are even more important. Let me consider my own particular field of salt water sport fishing, which is the fastest growing sport in the country today. Boating also is booming, but I would like to point out that the boat and engine manufacturers themselves state that more than two-thirds of their customers list fishing as the primary reason for purchase of boats and motors.

Fewer and fewer access points to a beach are available to anglers on any U.S. seaboard today, yet the army of surf, pier, small- and large-boat fishermen is growing rapidly. In 1955, according to the survey made by the U.S. Department of the Interior, there were 4,577,000 marine anglers in this country. In 1959, according to the Sport Fishing Institute of Washington, D. C., the number

I assure you that I have absolutely no personal ax to grind. As a resident, I have watched the disintegration of the cape and I am sure you are all aware that any kind of further delay will mean that the developers which are championing the authority and legality of the retroactive clause in the act may prove to Mr. Thompson's horror to be so devastating that the bill will be nothing but so many words, unless action is taken very, very quickly.

If anything which was said in the letters cited earlier today is fundamentally incorrect, either in detail or in substance, I will, of course, make any corrections necessary as and when these errors are proved. In the meantime, I am offering these letters as part of my testimony today for the record of your committee, and I am sure that you can find all the evidence of accuracy or inaccuracy that you may wish to ascertain.

I do not think I have to apologize today for being a professor. In fact, there is a gentleman who is seeking more and more advice at this moment and seeking more and more advice from professors, who has had more responsibility than the selectman from Wellfleet.

I think if Representative Keith had sought to meet and learn the views of some of the proponents of the park—of course, you have declared yourself as a backer of the park, but since an opponent of its original intention—I think, Representative, you would have had other views presented to you than those which you chose to hear, which were by the opponents of the park.

For instance, if we look at the map which is presented today, which apparently Congressman Keith is in agreement with, it becomes apparent that Mr. Thompson's evidence is really very important indeed.

Mrs. FROST. Mr. Chermayeff, we would prefer that you keep your remarks to the legislation, rather than to the individuals who have actually—

MR. CHERMAYEFF. I am coming to that, if you will excuse me.

Mrs. FROST. All right.

MR. CHERMAYEFF. This is a necessary introduction because the point that has been made in relation to conservation, which is really the great issue of the legislation, is quite simple.

If you look at the map of the proposed deletions from the park, it would be quite impossible to get anything in the way of conservation into so small an area of land. Conservation would then be just a word. It would not have any serious meaning because the ecology of wildlife cannot jump quarter mile gaps with residents, their pets and cars and so on. The pockets which are proposed, furthermore, in the single area, on a point made by Mr. Thompson, which is the largest single area and most conforms to the true pleasures and purposes of a park area. So to take the largest area and then to carve it up would indeed be to destroy the potential conservation of the park as intended by the bill.

There is the issue also, of course, of the conservation of towns. Their anxieties, I think, are very well founded in some respects and I suspect that minor adjustments in fringe boundaries could, as a matter of fact, be usefully made.

But the provisions of the pockets within the park area would, of course, create endless conflicts administratively, from the point of view

of access and control between the three people who would be involved: the park, the township and the private owner.

I would, finally, like to say again as a planner, an architect, something further on the potential of the town. It has already been partially touched on.

The small scattering of houses on acre-up lots which sounds so attractive and so undisturbing, as a matter of fact, does not quite work out that way. A road goes just as far if it feeds 6 houses as if the road feeds 12 houses in the same frontage. So that in the end, what would happen is that the low density proposed, the kind of scattering of houses in the woods on these large lots, would make the towns run short of land very soon. They would want more land because this is a most uneconomic way of using land, and it is most unproductive to the towns, because these remote and scattered taxpayers require proportionately greater service than the more compact township.

We have made some preliminary studies in order to put these contentions to a test. There is ample room, for instance, in Wellfleet, which as a town, has historic value and a new harbor actually created by Selectman Frazier's energetic procedure. Both of these may be developed within the existing boundaries of the town, more residential area could be gotten and in fact the population of Wellfleet and its economy could treble and quadruple without any extension of land whatsoever.

I would like, if I may, without trespassing further on your time, because I have put these documents in, just merely to quote quickly from what I did write down.

The fact of accessibility to the cape, the great highway system, means that not only is the cape generally accessible, but it is accessible in less time. The meaning of this is that the cape really has only two alternate choices. It either becomes a partly controlled resort area with very closely knit development, or it will, in fact, become a dormitory suburb for industry on Route 128, which is within 5 minutes' commuting time from the cape. This is clearly the choice and much as I sympathize with the nostalgia for the immovable past, I know that the cape has to make a decision at this moment and the decision may not be postponed much longer.

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

(Mr. Chermayeff's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF SERGE CHERMAYEFF, PROFESSOR OF ARCHITECTURE,  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

I am appearing before this committee in a dual role: first as a resident in Truro during the last 18 years and, second, as a professional and member of the faculty of the Graduate School of Design in Harvard, which contains regional and city planning, landscape architecture, and architecture.

I do not wish to trespass on your time by discussing again general points in connection with the bills for the establishment of a Cape Cod National Park. These have been amply aired.

If it is in order, may my testimony before the Senate committee at Eastham now on record be made part of my testimony today. Also the testimony I offered both at the House of Representatives and Senate committee hearings in Washington, D.C., this year (appendix 1).

Your committee should know what has been happening since the park proposals have been made. I hope that you may have seen at first hand some of the degradation the cape has suffered during this time.

The cape now stands in danger of being destroyed by unscrupulous and cynical developers more rapidly than ever, paradoxically as a direct result of the Cape Cod Park proposal.

I wrote to Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall on August 8, 1960, following the Washington hearings in June. Nothing being presented at these hearings changes the view I then expressed in respect to boundaries, and I ask for this letter to be made part of my testimony today (appendix 2).

The acceleration of depredation of the designated park area was such that I wrote to Chairman Aspinall again on November 21, 1960, and reported specific acts which amounted to a challenge to the legality of the retroactive clause in the bills as drafted. I ask that this letter also be included as part of my testimony today (appendix 3), with the following corrections:

Page 2, item 2: Mr. Halperin has since informed me that the unimproved land in question was for two houses for their own use by two families, but that the purchase was not made. The price asked for 5 acres was \$18,000.

Page 2, item 3: Mr. Walling broke ground this November for two houses (one under construction) for rent or sale.

Page 2, item 4: The Duarte acreage off which top soil was stripped and sold is closer to 200 than 100 acres.

As a footnote I might add to this item: When Mr. Duarte, the developer, sold the top soil to a contractor, Mr. Duarte, the member of the planning board, sold the town of Truro down the river.

I should like to add something further to the point on conservation and recreation: Many people who are otherwise proponents of the park have expressed fears as to the nature and extent of recreation facilities to be provided.

There is no doubt that this issue is a problem peculiar to the cape. The Department of Interior's provisional policy statement issued in March last in response to letters from Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, would, I believe, be much strengthened and well wishers be reassured, if the emphasis on conservation was less equivocal than presently stated in the bill.

I respectfully offer an amendment to section 8: that subsection (b) (1) be revised to read as follows:

"The park shall be permanently preserved as a primitive wilderness, and no development of the park or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken by the Secretary which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in the area described in section 1 of this Act or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as he may designate. Where such development does not interfere with the objectives of conservation, the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of Cape Cod National Seashore Park as he deems especially adaptable for such uses, including swimming, boating, sailing, hunting, fishing, hiking, the appreciation of historic sites and structures and natural features of Cape Cod, and other recreational activities of similar nature."

May I summarize briefly the points of greatest urgency, for we are beyond the 11th hour.

1. Means must be found to prevent further spoliation of the designated park area pending legislation, if the declared intentions of the bill are to be more than just words. A precedent for such action may perhaps be found in other national park situations. In any case a speedy passing of the bills cannot be urged sufficiently.

2. The park area must on no account be trimmed down. If anything, it should be increased to protect great views of dunes and estuaries.

3. The Mid-Cape Highway should, as far as possible, be within the park.

4. No pockets of land under town jurisdiction should be permitted within the park area. These will destroy conservation measures and create insuperable conflicts between the interests and controls of the park, the town, and the interim period residents.

The areas proposed for exclusion will not benefit the towns; they will merely provide fat profits for the owners of this unimproved land.

The interim bona fide residents within the park area have ample protection under the bill. The towns have ample opportunity for expansion within approximately the designated boundaries.

Preliminary studies made show unequivocally that with proper planning the towns have nothing to fear and everything to gain if they pull their economy off the highway, where cape visitors' money is collected during the summer to

be spent elsewhere, and out of the woods, where it is relatively unproductive and expensive to the towns.

5. A master plan should be encouraged and financial aid provided for this purpose, for the cape as a whole with special reference to the lower cape.

The lower towns must be encouraged to conserve, improve, and develop what they have as town entities, as in the case of Provincetown and Wellfleet, or to develop actual town nuclei, as in the case of Truro and Eastham.

In any case the towns should recognize that they have a potential all-year-round economy as the result of the cape's new accessibility.

In closing may I suggest the cape has only two alternatives:

First is to continue to be exploited by real estate developers who know full well its future promising to themselves alone. The cape as we know it will vanish forever within a decade and be replaced by an endless suburban sprawl, a dormitory for Route 128 industries within 45 minutes commuting time.

Second, to be a great natural asset for the Nation, together with towns which are both historically valued and which could further be constantly enjoyed as resort towns of special character and small scale.

#### APPENDIX 1

##### SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY OF SERGE CHERMAYEFF

Since the Cape Cod National Park hearings at Eastham in December, I believe some subsequent observations can be usefully brought before the congressional committees at this time.

I offer these as matters of emphasis rather than necessarily new points.

1. In spite of provisions to make the proposed bill retroactive to September 1959, a great deal of house building has been "rushed" this winter within the designated park area. By no means all of this is for owner occupancy. To my knowledge some has been deliberately constructed for commercial purposes (i.e., for summer rent).

2. The above, almost overtly a challenge to the legality of the retroactive provision, is, I believe, a reflection of organized opposition to the park—organized in the sense that very vocal, active, and influential groups led by Mr. Nickerson and Selectman Frazier have been exploiting the uncertainties and delays since that time.

3. It has become quite obvious to this witness since the Eastham hearings that the opposition has abandoned any genuine intention of a compromise with the long-term public spirited objectives of the park, and is in fact filibustering the park out with the assistance of a local minority whose objectives are entirely self-centered and short term, and which can be properly described as a real estate lobby reluctant to miss a killing on property cheaply acquired.

4. The general climate of opinion and view of action taken, readily seen and felt by anyone spending their time regularly within the designated park area, makes the action more urgent than ever. All delay permits the erosion of the resources scheduled for conservation at an ever increasing rate and the retroactive clause is legally weak, threatens to immeasurably increase the cost of acquisition.

5. It is my particular wish to emphasize two aspects of the park proposals discussed in my previous testimony:

i. That the most serious consideration be given to the clarification and provide separation of the issues of conservation on the one hand and public recreation on the other. The latter should perhaps be unequivocally be limited to the great beaches and possibly gull ponds. The "pond public recreation facilities" will in dimensions alone prove difficult to control and continue in what, it must be emphasized again and again, is a very small terrain indeed.

ii. The same consideration of limitation considered with the need, both of conservation in the park area, as well as conservation implied in so many statements of Cape Codders concerned with preserving the amenities of the lower cape townships in their present "villagish" "uncommercial" and charming form.

The Harvard Graduate School of Design study of Wellfleet makes it clear that in the interests of both the park and the townships, Route 6 should be within the park. Such a provision, coupled with wise zoning regulations, based upon intelligent master planning could guarantee the useful coexistence of both park and town within the physically limited area of the cape.

I urge further that purely quantitative and arbitrary provisions should now be abandoned and specific carefully considered planning issues be defined. A

characteristic administrative absurdity is the Wellfleet selectman's proposal for an area for exclusion which on the north coincides with the Wellfleet-Truro line—utterly irrelevant to geography, topography, and good sense.

Having no reason to change my mind on the major points offered at the local hearings, I respectfully submit the material contained in appendixes 1, 2, and 3 of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, pages 194-199 to the congressional committees at this time.

## APPENDIX 2

AUGUST 5, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,*  
*House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I am taking the liberty of addressing you directly on the issue of the Cape Cod National Seashore because the larger part of the evidence presented at hearings held to date has been directed by the opponents of the park.

Unfortunately, in some instances private interest pleaded the opposition's cause under the guise of concern for public good.

This was the case in Wellfleet and Truro. I live on the town line between the two and have firsthand experience of what has been going on ever since the park proposal was made known.

The well-organized opposition concentrated its arguments on details and deliberately ignored the provisions and safeguards of the bills in respect to these, but above all it ignored cynically the basic aim of the national seashore, namely conservation.

Selectmen's proposals, which include the withholding of large areas of historic interest in the heart of the proposed park, such as Thoreau's Cape around Gull Pond in Wellfleet, do not have the support of the majority of established house owners in this area. Most of us feel amply protected by provisions of the bill. These proposals have been put forward by owners of unimproved land looking for spectacular profits or by builders of summer rent shacks erected since September 30, 1959, dateline provided in the bill.

Compromise boundaries discussed between selectmen and Congressman Keith in fact have little justification either from the point of view of residents in the area or from the point of view of the public interest at large.

The area originally proposed is on the whole a most reasonable one, even if some modest adjustments in a few particulars require to be made on the periphery.

As a professional planner I respectfully submit the following points for the most serious attention of Congress:

(1) The eventual conservation of the largest possible area without pockets of a heavily populated kind within the conservation area, already very small and ecologically speaking vulnerable. It should be noted that conservationwise the most promising portion is the full cape width between Truro and Wellfleet.

(2) The concentration of recreation facilities involving traffic and crowds to a strictly limited number of beachheads, which provide in any case the overwhelmingly largest portion of the cape's attractions.

(3) The placing of the Cape Cod Highway within the park area, with the consequent preservation of cape scenery for the visitors to enjoy: the vast majority of whom come by car.

(4) The containment of the lower cape townships in strictly defined boundaries which might convince them to plan the proper use of their ample resources; ample for an expansion of their economy and population, and the preservation of their character.

The town boundaries proposed under the bill, with minor adjustments, more than suffice to meet the needs of the foreseeable future, if the present fashion for small house scattering with eroding effect is replaced by a more appropriate concentrated planning related directly to the national seashore bill.

(5) To urge that the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore be linked to master planning of the lower cape as a whole. The lower cape presents an opportunity for the development of conservation and economic growth simultaneously which may prove to be typical of other situations which will inevitably arise in many parts of the United States in the immediate future.

The cape presents a wonderful opportunity for a demonstration. It would be tragic if it were to be missed, for the losers will be not only the people of the United States but the Cape Codders themselves.

Respectfully yours,

SERGE CHERMAYEFF,  
*Professor, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University.*

## APPENDIX 3

NOVEMBER 21, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,*  
*House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I wrote you with regard to the Cape Cod National Seashore on August 5 and my testimony made purposely brief at the June hearings in Washington is now a matter of record, in addition to observations of general principles which were made earlier in the Senate hearings at Eastham, which are now part of the record of all hearings.

I am formally requesting herewith to appear before your committee at the forthcoming hearings in Eastham in December.

Since the unavoidable postponement of action in the last Congress much has happened on the cape which is of serious consequence to Cape Codders, be they either proponents or opponents of the park. So disturbing have these developments been that I wrote to Director Wirth on August 9 to draw his attention to these developments which were basically challenging the retroactive closure clause in the bills as proposed. I am taking the liberty of repeating substantially my report to Director Wirth to your committee and to urge you before the hearings to make a thorough survey of the depredations of the cape during the last year or so.

By far the larger part of the destruction has actually taken place within the designated area and since September 30, 1959.

Here are a few examples:

1. Long Pond, Wellfleet: 21 lots of very narrow frontage are up for sale. (One sold to a Mr. Hughes from New York for \$6,500—just over an acre.) Agents: Lesser, partner with Selectman Frazier in real estate and/or Walling (see Horse Leach below).

2. Herring Pond, Wellfleet: Two lots of some 5 acres together sold to a Mr. Halperin by Breuer. Agent: Lesser. Mr. Halperin is putting up two houses; one for rent.

3. Horse Leach Pond, Truro: One lot bought from Phillips by Walling. Intention: To build a house for rent. Mr. Walling already has five houses for rent in this area.

4. Truro, east of Route 6: North of radar station, some 100 acres with ocean frontage subdivided into small lots. Topsoil sold to road contractor, with the result that there is enough road surface to serve a sizable town. Owner and agent: Anthony Duarte. Mr. Duarte is a member of the Truro Planning Board.

5. Highland Light area, north Truro: A grid subdivision of small lots. Agent: Anthony Duarte and others.

These and similar operations are in large part conducted by two declared and persistent opponents of the park, whom Congressman Keith invited at a Truro Town Hall meeting, this year, in person, naming Mr. Frazier as the coordinator, to prepare boundary counterproposals, declaring himself—sight unseen—ready to go along with these.

These peculiar proposals were presented at the Washington hearings.

In view of the long postponement of any action on the park, it appears necessary for the Government to go on the record immediately on at least a few points:

1. Is the retroactive clause enforceable, and is it the Department of Interior's intention to enforce it, if and when the bill is enacted? The innocent buyers of inflated value property must be protected from the real estate sharks.

2. If the retroactive clause is in any way vulnerable then the Government is in fact, if not in law, being blackmailed and the cost of a public amenity is being deliberately raised by private speculators. Is this an offense?

3. The depredations listed above (and others) occur in the largest and deepest tract of the proposed park area. If conservation is to remain a primary objective of the bill, then the Department of the Interior may have been remiss in not providing proper interim protection. There is indeed some indication that the spoiling of Cape Cod has actually been accelerated since the park announcement was made. Much talk about preventing roadside "honkitonk" has taken away attention from the more fundamental destruction of natural resources.

As you know, I am one of a number of enthusiastic supporters of the Cape Cod Park bill. We can no longer be sure that the objectives for which we have been fighting are obtainable. Indeed we have evidence that one of the original sponsors has apparently either abandoned the original intention or has no comprehension of the conservation issues involved.

If the bill in Congress is not to degenerate into a conservationwise empty gesture, some unequivocal clarification and action by the Department of Interior is required in the interim.

Respectfully yours,

SERGE CHERMAYEFF,  
*Professor of Architecture.*

APPENDIX 4

WELLFLEET, MASS., June 25, 1960.

The Editor,  
*Cape Codder.*

DEAR SIR: The congressional hearings on the proposed national seashore bills, S. 2636 and H.R. 9050, provided a surprise for some of the Cape Codders who went to Washington to testify.

The unveiling by the selectmen of the lower cape towns, aided and abetted rather curiously by Representative Keith, a sponsor of the bills, of alternative boundary proposals for the congressional subcommittee revealed an astonishing jigsaw puzzle of unrelated bits and pieces.

Marked with yellow tape over a giant air view photograph of the whole lower cape, the sum of obviously unconnected town proposals looked like something in which wildlife, poachers, game wardens, residents, visitors, tourists, and probably police and delinquents might play madman's hide-and-seek.

The later proposals at Eastham make things worse.

There is, unfortunately, a serious side to this lunacy which claims to improve the Cape Cod condition.

Surely "togetherness" of so many public servants could have produced something more unified and sensible than completely separate and independent town interests: suggestions of land allotment unrelated to each other or to the purposes of the bills under discussion.

If anyone doubts the contention of this startled observer let him take a careful look at the proposals thus made by the selectmen and publicly blessed at the hearings by Representative Keith.

A fair sample of the proposals' quality is the Truro bottleneck between the only possible whole cape width of park, through which all visitors will have to run the gauntlet of honkitonks along a mile or so of Route 6. Who is this good for?

Or look at the two islands and two strips of town properly surrounded by park, miniature West Berlin to plague our future, plugged by the Wellfleet selectmen.

One of these slices irrelevantly right through the middle of Thoreau's pond paradise, along the Truro-Wellfleet town line.

This could benefit no one except owners of unimproved land in this land, anxious to make a profit. Surely one of the major assets slated for conservation could have received equal attention from the fathers of Truro, and with better reason.

Although some of the proposals were obviously of a different category and offered with genuine concern for the good of the particular town, I respectfully suggest that Cape Codders look carefully again at the bills as presently drafted. They will learn that all house owners living within the boundaries of the park could have ample protection without change of these boundaries.

If they further care to consult any competent and imaginative planner acquainted with the problem, and read the economic report on the lower cape's future, they will learn that the towns' area outside the park, as designated in

the bills under discussion, are ample for all town purposes: the conservation of their character, the accommodation of the future population, the provision of new facilities essential to their economic growth of a changed and very accessible cape.

While they are at it, Cape Codders might have a careful look at the mandate their selectmen claim to have received to alter boundaries which in general are linked to proposals prepared on a comprehensive scale, with impartiality and care. Who gave them this mandate?

Is it possible that at least some people on the lower cape are being bamboozled about this bill?

Yours,

SERGE CHERMAYEFF,

*A border man who pays taxes to Truro and spends his cape money in Wellfleet with no apologies.*

Mrs. FROST. Thank you, professor.

Are there any questions from the committee members? Congressman Keith would like to say a word to you, Professor Chermayeff, in view of a statement you made referring to him.

Mr. KEITH. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

This is a rather extraordinary procedure, and I appreciate your sympathetic attention to my request.

I just wanted to correct a statement that you have in this evidence which you submit here on page 2.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. Which evidence is that?

Mr. KEITH. This is one to Congressman Aspinall.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. Which date? There are two letters.

Mr. KEITH. The one in which you refer to me.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. I hope I referred to you in both of them.

Mr. KEITH. It was dated November 21. It is the only one I happened to see.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. There is another letter.

Mr. KEITH. At any rate, you state that I declared myself, sight unseen, ready to go along with certain amendments in the proposal. And nothing could be further from the truth. You suggested that anybody who could find errors in your testimony should point them out.

The second thing is that you said I should consult with consultants.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. I did not say that, Congressman.

Mr. KEITH. With proponents?

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. No; I did not even say that.

I said you might have sought some views of proponents.

Mr. KEITH. I certainly did. I wanted to correct that on the record. It has been my consistent practice to consult with proponents and opponents, while in Congress.

I regret to say we did not have very much information submitted by you to our office, but we did have a great deal of consultation with other strong proponents of the park, and that is why I filed the bill. And in my opinion, we are much more likely to have a good national seashore, if we entertain these proposals that the towns have put forth.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. May I ask Congressman Keith a very simple question?

Mrs. FROST. I am very sorry, the rules of the committee do not permit witnesses to ask congressional members.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. May I then comment? May I answer?

Mrs. FROST. You may answer.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. I think it would be interesting to know whether the proposals have received Congressman Keith's approval for the reasons already suggested by myself because they do not permit an idea of conservation. They simply mean that there will be a bill. Now that bill may possibly appear to be useful conservation, but I suspect, and say this again without direct reference to the park authority—but since it is the knowledge of ecology and conservation it will be found there will not be any satisfactory conservation possible, and in fact, it will become a recreational park because the beach will be the only thing left. Therefore, I really question the wisdom of this proposal most seriously, and I do commend my question to your committee, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. FROST. Thank you very much, we appreciate your testimony, Professor Chermayeff.

Apparently this completes the slate of witnesses for this afternoon. Before we close, I should like to ask unanimous consent that telegrams from John P. Sylvia, Jr., of Falmouth, Mass., from Chester A. Crosby, from Clarence M. Chase, and from Cecil I. Goodspeed, Howard Sears, and Channing E. Hoxie, all against the park proposals, be inserted in the record.

Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Also, without objection, I should like a night letter to be included in the record, in favor of the park proposal, from Emmett Baker, president of the Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, from Congressman James A. Burke, 13th Congressional District of Massachusetts, and a second one from Congressman Burke, all of these in favor of the legislation, be incorporated in the record.

Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(Documents referred to follow:)

FALMOUTH, MASS., December 16, 1960.

To Representative WAYNE H. ASPINALL:

I wish to state that I am personally unalterably opposed to proposed national seashore on Cape Cod.

Attorney JOHN P. SYLVIA, JR.

OSTERVILLE, MASS.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Eastham Town Hall.

DEAR SIR: I am definitely opposed to the proposed national seashore park. Respectfully,

CHESTER A. CROSBY.

HYANNIS, MASS., December 16, 1960.

To Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL:

As a native Cape Codder and former town clerk and treasurer of Barnstable (37 years), I strongly oppose the proposed national park.

CLARENCE M. CHASE.

OSTERVILLE, MASS., December 16, 1960.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, House Committee,  
Eastham, Mass.:

As a businessman and real estate broker I am concerned about the proposed national park in the lower cape area. While my base of operation is largely in the town of Barnstable and is some distance from the area, modified or not, of the park, I believe the effect would still be felt here. The economy of Cape

Cod may be discussed as sectional but in reality is closely geared and anything that impairs one area impairs the whole cape. I believe the establishment of a national park on Cape Cod to be a grave error, that the unhappiness of Cape Cod should not be thus penalized.

CECIL I. GOODSPEED.

OSTERVILLE, MASS., December 16, 1960.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Eastham, Mass.:

Oppose establishment of national seashore park detrimental to Cape Cod.

HOWARD W. SEARS, Town Clerk-Treasurer.

SANDWICH, MASS., December 16, 1960.

Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPINALL: Being unable to be present I am sending this telegram to protest the establishment of a national park on Cape Code. The establishment of such a park would seriously affect the orderly and normal growth of Cape Cod, which we now enjoy and are able to plan and provide for in a manner most suited the overall economy of the cape, now and for the future.

CHANNING E. HOXIE,

Town Clerk, Treasurer, and Tax Collector.

PLYMOUTH, MASS., December 16, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Eastham Town Hall:

The Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc., representing over 10,000 sportsmen has repeatedly and unanimously favored the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Massachusetts sportsmen want their natural resources used wisely for the benefit of all for the longest possible time. We know that the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park would accomplish this in a fair and equitable manner.

We urge prompt and favorable consideration for the establishment of the national seashore park.

EMMETT B. BAKER, President,  
Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.

QUINCY, MASS., December 16, 1960.

HON. GRACIE PFOST,  
Chairman, House Public Lands Subcommittee:

I heartily support the legislation filed by Senators John F. Kennedy and Leverett Saltonstall and my colleague, Congressman Hastings Keith, and urge favorable action on establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Congressman JAMES A. BURKE,  
13th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

QUINCY, MASS., December 16, 1960.

Congressman HASTINGS KEITH,  
Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.:

I urge that you record me favorably on legislation to establish the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Congressman JAMES A. BURKE.