

MEMBER 1980

TEXAS PRESS ASSOCIATION

The EAGLE LAKE HEADLIGHT
(USPS 165-750)

P. O. Box 67 - Phone 234-2783
CITY OF EAGLE LAKE, TEXAS 77434
Published Weekly - Every Thursday
at 123 North McCarty Ave., Eagle Lake, Texas 77434

FREDERICK FINKA, Editor-Publisher
JEFF FINKA, Associate Editor and Sports
Second Class Postage Paid at Eagle Lake, Texas

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
In Colorado and adjoining counties... \$7.50
Elsewhere in Texas... \$8.00
Outside of Texas... \$9.00
Single Copies 15c

Any erroneous reflection upon the character, standing or reputation of any firm, corporation or individual published in these columns will be corrected upon it being brought to the attention of the publisher.

(POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Eagle Lake Headlight, P.O. Box 67, Eagle Lake, Texas 77434)

Sheriff's Deputy Ken Hollan To Resign Nov. 30

Colorado County Sheriff George (Doc) Mueller announces this week the resignation of one of his deputies, Kenneth Hollan, effective at midnight Nov. 30th.

In his letter of resignation, Hollan said that "it was a matter of economics." He said that he planned to take a position with the city of Columbus at more pay and to work part-time at another job. His wife, who was the first female deputy for the county sheriff's department, recently resigned also to return to driving a truck.

MR. GOODWRENCH SPECIAL

Offer Ends Dec. 31, 1980

LUBE JOB - FILTER
OIL CHANGE

\$15.95

CONSULT YOUR OWNERS MANUAL FOR RECOMMENDED MAINTENANCE INTERVALS.

Mr. Goodwrench will drain your GM car's crankcase, put in five quarts of the right oil for seasonal weather, change your oil filter and lubricate your car's chassis - all for a special price. And he'll also check your car's differential and transmission fluid. Mr. Goodwrench has the right oil, the right filter and the right lubricants for your GM car. So come in for the Mr. Goodwrench special and "Keep that great GM feeling with genuine GM parts."

KEEP THAT GREAT GM FEELING WITH GENUINE GM PARTS.

Lake Motors, Inc.

223 S. McCarty Eagle Lake Ph. 234-2513

THE GRILL

Next to Eagle Lake Drugs
Hwy. 90A Eagle Lake Ph. 234-2502

TRY THE
Breakfast
Specials
At The Grill

Fried Chicken ★ Snacks ★ Cold Drinks
SERVING
The Best Coffee In Town!

24 YEARS AGO LET'S LOOK BACK

(Aug. 16, 1956)

The Mill-Bauer Funeral Home has purchased a new Cadillac ambulance and hearse and was picked up by O. L. Mill. Mr. Mill is co-owner of the local firm with W. L. Bauer. The American Rice Growers Association held its first rice sale of the season with top bids for two lots of Century Parola rice for \$7.35 and \$7.08. Pvt. Rodrigo Rodriguez, son of Mr. and Mrs. Benito Rodriguez, completed four weeks of individual combat training in July at the Marine Corps Base in California. Miss Lisa Gine Snelling was honored with a letter of commendation from the home of Mrs. C. R. Curry. A daughter was born for Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Dearing. Jina Dianne was born on Aug. 5 in the Lakewood Hospital. Clyde Brown, superintendent of the Cherokee plant of the Tennessee Gas Transmission Company, scored impressive wins over 2 opponents in near golf to win the coveted title of club champion. Funeral services were held August 8th for Ben. E. Fries, 76, who died at his home in Garwood. Services were held at Triola Funeral Home in El Campo with interment at Nada Catholic Cemetery. Services were held August 8th for Miss Clara Welhausen, 98, former resident of Eagle Lake. A large crowd gathered at the Eagle Lake Community Center to watch the beautiful presentation of the new fall fashions from Epps.

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

Drive Thankfully

The Pilgrims were lucky they didn't have to drive to their Thanksgiving dinner. Holiday traffic can be tough. So be extra careful driving to and from your celebration. Relax, obey speed limits, and be alert for other drivers. It's a great life... so Drive Thankfully.



Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Based on this vote, I must

congratulate the House and Senate for their courage and leadership in passing this bill.

By Cong. J. J. Pickle

Cong. Pickle Comments On Rev. Sharing

On the heels of the election, many observers felt the House and Senate would not accomplish much during the lame-duck session which began last week. Others feared that with many members not returning next year, some irresponsible spending decisions might be made. Unfortunately, that fear may have been realized when the House overwhelmingly passed the bill reauthorizing the federal revenue sharing program for three years. I was one of only 23 members voting against the bill on final passage.

Revenue sharing is a popular program which provides federal monies for state and local governments. I can understand its popularity because many of our counties and cities have used the monies well. I have no argument over how the money is spent.

But I voted against the bill simply because it is another example of spending money the federal government does not have - helping local governments stay in the black with federal dollars stained with red ink. The bill as passed would provide \$4.6 billion a year to some 11,000 cities and counties for each of the next three years. States would receive \$2.3 billion in FY 83, if Congress appropriates these funds. The states are not receiving revenue sharing in the current 1981 fiscal year.

I was just about prepared to accept the inevitable and vote for local revenue sharing only. But a crucial amendment by our Texas colleague, Jack Brooks, to eliminate state revenue sharing was defeated. It is not pleasant to vote against something, especially when city and county officials who are personal friends urge me to support revenue sharing. But in the interests of fiscal responsibility, which is the long run is for more beneficial to local and state governments and all our citizens, I maintained my position against revenue sharing.

Let Us Thankfully

Thanksgiving is truly an American Tradition. We have, therefore chosen this as the most appropriate time to thank you for your friendship, good will, and patronage. May you have a most enjoyable Holiday Season.

We will be closed all day
Thanksgiving Day
Eagle Lake Dairy Delite

The T. J. Smiths

Rock Is. Fire Dept. Ham-Bean Dinner Dec. 13-14

The Rock Island firemen are planning a Ham and Bean Dinner on Sat. and

Sun., December 13 and 14 at the Rock Island Fire Station. Serving will begin at 11:30 a.m. through 2:00 p.m. each day. Adult tickets are \$2.50 and children tickets are \$1.75. All proceeds will benefit the R.I. Fire Department.

For All Your Insurance NEEDS Call Robert and Maxine Griffith

Eagle Lake and Strickland
Insurance Agencies

Office at 223 East Main

Phone 234-2509

Attend in Church of Your Choice

CHURCH OF CHRIST
Columbus, Texas
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ROCK ISLAND BAPTIST
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

UNITED METHODIST
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

GRACE LUTHERAN
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. MARTIN'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. JOHN'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. PETER'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. MICHAEL'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. ANNE'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. JOSEPH'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. MARY'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. ELIZABETH'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. CATHERINE'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. AGNES'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. MARGARET'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. ANTHONY'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. MICHAEL'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. ANNE'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. JOSEPH'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. MARY'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

ST. ELIZABETH'S
CHURCH
10 a.m. Sunday School
11 a.m. Morning Worship
10:30 p.m. Evening Worship

Hansel & Gretel's 758-3623 • Garwood, Texas Sandra Huvar, Owner GRAND OPENING

In new shop next to house.
Turn at Arco Station on Hwy. 71 and go three blocks to brown building.

Fri. & Sat., 9 to 5 - Sun., 1 to 6

Christmas Originals

by Hansel & Gretel's
- Including -
WREATHS

Ready Made or Make Your Own
Select from our large supply of Silk Flowers, Garden, Greenery,
anything to make any type of arrangement

We also have a fine selection of

Ceramics • Paints • Greenware • Have Kiln

Civil Suit
Contests Terms Of
Hartfield Will

A civil suit filed in District Court at Columbus Nov. 20th contests provisions of a will made by Otto E. Hartfield and Frieda Hartfield on Aug. 18, 19