

One other point brought out last year was the fear that the zoning ordinances provided in S. 3295 would be used to restrict development so severely that they would amount to a taking of private property without just compensation. S. 1267 represents an effort to avoid such a result, and, I think, evidences the intent of the authors to fully protect the property rights of the private landowners of the area. I certainly support such an approach, and hope that the legislative history will further reflect this intent.

I have asked my attorneys to review S. 1267, and they have made a number of suggestions which are consistent with this intent. To the extent that my remaining comments become somewhat technical, I am reflecting their advice as well as my own feelings.

One important question to be resolved, which I do not believe is clear in the bill, is whether any further subdivision at all is to be allowed. Certainly everyone is in agreement that uncontrolled subdivision could destroy the scenic values of this area. Some existing subdivisions have probably contributed to fears that unless some legislation is passed, these scenic values will be permanently lost. But proper subdivision is not a bad thing. For one thing, it may provide homes available for rental to the tourists who come to the area. For another, it may encourage centralization of homes, rather than having them scattered all over the area. If they are properly located and set back from public view, such centralization may be an advantage.

Senator CHURCH. May I just interrupt there for a moment to say that I think the standards that the Secretary has submitted for the record this morning will make clear that future construction of homes is not precluded as long as it fits a pattern that provides suitable protection.

Mr. BRECKENRIDGE. Senator, that is my understanding.

Senator BIBLE. And I might interject there to say that I would hope that the committee would make a Thermo-Fax, or whatever it is, of the proposed guidelines, as the Secretary calls them, and furnish you with a copy of them to see if they do say what you are trying to do. Because I have learned time and time again, as a result of many hearings in this difficult national recreation area and park area, that so often the people with whom we are talking and with whom we are trying to hammer out a bill and work the bugs out of it, are not on the same wavelength, and we don't completely understand each other. And I think we should make it abundantly clear so that everybody understands what we are trying to do in this bill. And I would suggest that a copy of these proposed guidelines be furnished to you for later comment by yourself and your lawyer.

Senator JORDAN. And the record will be held open.

Senator BIBLE. The record would be held open, I would think, for a period—we have plenty of time, because we are going to have a week's vacation during Labor Day, and I am hopeful that we can move this bill, which has had many years of intensive microscoping, so that I think it has evolved into a very fine bill now. We have a few bugs to work out.

Senator CHURCH. May I suggest 2 weeks?

Senator BIBLE. I would think that that would be about right. We would hold the record open until, say, September 5, which I think would be sufficient.