

HARLEY O. STAGGERS  
2D DISTRICT, WEST VIRGINIA

HOME ADDRESS:  
KEYSER, WEST VIRGINIA

CHAIRMAN:  
COMMITTEE ON  
INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN  
COMMERCE

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, D.C. 20515**

February 12, 1975

Mr. Emerson Phares  
Emerson Phares Lumber Company, Inc.  
P. O. Box 329  
Elkins, West Virginia

Dear Emerson:

Thank you very much for your letter of recent date together with the enclosure.

I have read your communication with much interest and noted your comments concerning the proposed tax on gasoline and oil imports as well as gasoline rationing. Others have also expressed similar sentiments.

Needless to say, I am glad to have the benefit of your views, and I shall keep them in mind.

It was also thoughtful of you to send me copy of your letter to the Federal Aviation Administration relative to identification markings on fixed wing aircraft.

With very best wishes and kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY O. STAGGERS



P. O. BOX 329 ■ ELKINS, WEST VIRGINIA 26241

TELEPHONE 304/636-2400

January 30, 1975

FEB 1 1975

The Honorable Harley O. Staggers  
U. S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C. 20515

My dear Congressman:

The subject of this letter is whether we should have increased taxation on gasoline, or whether we should resort to rationing. Certainly we all realize the imperative need for this country to reduce its importation of foreign fuels, and the resulting need to reduce our balance of payments. Very frankly, I do not feel that we have any choice but to take the route of increased taxation. I say this while realizing that gas rationing has its theoretical allure of being fair to all; rationing may nibble at the problem, and it may even prove useful in short-term emergency which is plainly visible to the entire citizenry. We all remember only too well the problem of black marketing which accompanies a typical rationing program, and subsequently becomes more unfair than ever. Another disadvantage of rationing is the bureaucracy which would be required, and likely there would be no end to that type of organization.

On the other hand, various taxes imposed on imported oil, to drive up oil costs and cut consumption, does amount to a form of rationing---by price instead of by coupon. No one doubts that it, too, will be painful. However, this does save the very conspicuous price of rationing and its bureaucracy, and increased taxation should be of great import in trying to improve our deficit financing situation. I can see the potential of some of this tax money being rebated to the lower-income people in the form of a tax cut, to help offset the increased cost of their fuel. Also, increased taxes would provide funds for developing alternate energy sources; rationing would do nothing in this direction. Rationing by price is self-enforcing, whereas gas rationing would force black markets to multiply faster and faster, the longer the program dragged on; a rationing program of anything like five years or more would surely cause this country to experience another Prohibition-type era.



The Honorable Harley O. Staggers  
U. S. House of Representatives

Page 2  
January 30, 1975

We note with interest that, in general, the Congress is opposed to the President's increasing the tariff on oil by \$3.00 per barrel within three months. However, the only other method of helping this undesirable fuel situation---at least as suggested by the Congress---appears to be gas rationing. Rationing just won't do the job, and we hope you will be able to agree with the concept of rationing by price, even if it does mean going along with the President's proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Emerson Phares".

Emerson Phares

EP:asr



P.O. Box 329 -- Elkins, W. Va. 26241

January 29, 1975

Office of Chief Counsel  
Federal Aviation Administration, D.O.T.  
Washington, D. C. 20591

Re: Docket 14130; Notice 74-36

Gentlemen:

We do not very often become bothered by most of your proposed rule makings, but the above-mentioned Notice does raise our ire almost to the breaking point. As you know, this new proposal would require that fixed-wing aircraft display identification markings on the under-side of the left wing in 18-inch letters and numerals. I should not have to refresh your memory to remind you that this is the type of marking which was required up until a few years ago; subsequently, your agency decided that the markings would better serve their purpose if moved to a horizontal surface, such as on the fuselage, or on the tail, where size permitted. This change was accomplished by the entire industry, and we went to the trouble of the necessary painting, expense, etc.

Now, your people are coming back to say that that was an error, and maybe the marking should be returned to the former location. We note with interest that one of your petitioners for this change is an environmental group from Seattle, Washington, and that it is also desired by the Experimental Aircraft Association members, so that the present-sized numbers will not clutter up their fuselage---and, of course, the tail of those small aircraft is too small to use the larger numbers.

I cannot, in any way, see how your agency could yield to such inconsequential groups or reasons; this environmental group wants to be able to distinguish the number of aircraft creating noise problems or violating a minimum altitude requirement. Surely your group will consider that the ability to see an 18-inch number at a specified distance is not going to be that much easier than to see the same markings in a 12-inch size; whomever concocted this study of putting the characters on the under-side of a wing is assuming that the aircraft he wishes to identify is passing almost directly overhead. If that aircraft should be off to either side of an observer's location, he loses this ability to properly read the



characters; conversely, the aircraft markings as are currently required would not be visible directly overhead, but would be readable off to either side.

I can sympathize with the need for various changes in regulations, because certainly the progress that has been made in this field in the last twenty years creates a need for updating policies. However, when your people come out with something like Notice 74-36 it tends to make reasonable-thinking people wonder if the agency does not have more people than they require, and are simply trying to keep busy. There is no objective way to justify the tremendous cost to the industry of this proposed change when this cost is compared with the little real good that it would accomplish. With the continual increase in the budget sought every year by the FAA, I feel it would behoove our Congress to scrutinize very aggressively the budget of the FAA; certainly there must be a lot of fat which could be trimmed off your agency, and it is this kind of proposed rule-making which brings it to my attention.

In summation, there must have been a good reason why the current marking system was adopted, and surely this was done after considerable study. If it was a mistake, then certainly another mistake is not the answer. Please, we solicit your understanding, and we hope that the markings will not have to be changed again.

Respectfully,

Emerson Phares

EP:asr

CC: The Honorable Jennings Randolph, United States Senate  
The Honorable Robert C. Byrd, United States Senate  
The Honorable Harley O. Staggers, U. S. House of Representatives