

Conscience clear over legal costs

I FIND it difficult to understand the letter from Julie Boyd (DN 11/6).

She appears to be blaming me for ratepayers' losses through our having won court cases against Council in protecting our interests.

If anyone can show I have ever done anything wrong to anyone, I will make an apology, and accept responsibility.

Ms Boyd and many others are unaware of the history behind these events going back to 1991.

Those in charge at council are, without doubt, completely responsible for the really staggering losses.

I reject absolutely, any blame or responsibility, which lies completely with senior council officers and some elected councillors.

On behalf of my family, we sincerely regret the losses to ratepayers, but they also are in part responsible in that they never offered us support.

Indeed, the Kingscliff Ratepayers Association has strongly opposed our every effort since 1999.

Surely it is time that those responsible accept responsibility.

Our repeated success in many court cases over the years, and the fact that we have never paid costs to council while they have had to

pay so many of ours, indicate who is at fault.

I hope to continue making accurate historical facts available to residents, to allow them to be properly informed, without personally actively participating in future shire affairs, apart from our legal problems.

I am sure my successors, who are knowledgeable, qualified, capable, patient, and with adequate time and resources, will continue to pursue our vision, no matter what.

HARRY SEGAL,
Sydney

Long time to react

DN
15.06.07

RE: letter Mr Brinsmead (9/6/07).

In September 1999 the following names established themselves as supporters of the white shoe brigade and wore the label "The Balance Team" ... L Beck, G Lawrie, W Marshall, W Polglase, P Youngblutt, G Davidson and R Brinsmead. By March 2004, and financed by Tweed Directions, the group consisted of ... L Beck, G Lawrie, W Polglase, B Bell, J Murray and R Brinsmead.

So why Mr Brinsmead's letter (9/6)? What took him so long — 1999 to 2005 — to organise/engage the Segal family in talks with the council if he was so concerned about the legal costs?

By all accounts he had the necessary numbers from 1999 to 2005.

What were the stumbling blocks (or should I say who) that prevented him from raising his motion prior to the dismissal?

All that time and no-one approved the shopping centre.

It's not only a sewage treatment plant that smells.

DOT HOLDOM,
Kingscliff