

1. City Staff have a concern with which we agree that the OLG has listed the specific games that will be initially conducted but has also included a clause that will permit them to add games at any time in the future without consulting the municipality. This could mean the potential introduction of slot machines, video lottery terminals, etc. on site within the Bingo Hall.

2. City Staff point out that the agreement could run 16 years and can be terminated with 60 days notice by OLG but cannot be terminated by the city. We agree with city staff that this is unacceptable.

3. The OLG has not permitted amendments to any agreements signed with other municipalities. Again this is unacceptable as it does not give consideration to differing community values.

4. The City Staff note that the role of the city in this new agreement is onerous with no opportunity to charge back expenses incurred. We agree that this makes the agreement unfair.

5. A summary of our professional survey on possible gambling expansion in June 2012 conducted by Nordex Research has been provided to you. I would like to highlight some of the results:

First, the expanded gambling plan is not popular in London, quite the contrary, it is unpopular by more than a 2:1 margin (59:26).

Second, if a vote were held on the matter at city council, respondents would seek a "no" vote by a 5:2 margin: fully two thirds (66%) of respondents want council to vote "no."

Third, the leading rationales to bolster opposition are *the addictions issue (7:2)*, *the family issue in terms of negative social and financial outcomes (4:1)*, and *distrust of private, perhaps foreign, corporations owning and operating the new gambling facilities (3:1)*.

Fourth, the leading arguments in support of expanded gambling facilities are not generally resonating with respondents: not the jobs issue, not the additional revenues for municipalities, and not the tourism issue. All are producing split opinion, including up to 50% negatives. In addition, gambling as a benign form of "community recreation" is effectively rejected by respondents (5:2 neg).

Fifth, Our group of Citizens Against Gambling Expansion would request that a referendum be held prior to approval of any gambling expansion. Our survey showed that Londoners support a referendum or plebiscite on the expanded gambling issue (4:1).

I sincerely believe that I speak for the silent majority today. I believe people will take your response to this effort by the OLG to expand gambling into consideration when they vote later this year. Thank you for listening to our concerns. If you see me leaving shortly, it is not because I am not interested in the further proceedings but because my mother who will turn 90 in a few weeks will be having surgery at 2:15 pm. today.

Thanks.

Dale Mackness

Embargoed until Monday July 9, 2012, 12 noon

Casino Research Summary
Nordex Research™, June 2012

Nordex Research was commissioned to conduct a survey on the pending expansion of casino gambling facilities in the city of London. We conducted the survey during the period June 18-22, 2012. The sample size is N=300, which can be regarded as reliable +/- 5.5% at 95% confidence levels using 65% and 35% response set proportions.

Nordex posed 15 questions, plus demographics, canvassing responses to arguments in support of new/expanded gambling facilities and arguments in opposition.

What are the most important things we've gleaned from the research?

First, the expanded gambling plan is not popular in London, quite the contrary, it is unpopular by more than a 2:1 margin (59:26). Indeed, 43% of respondents in the survey are "not at all satisfied" with the plan.

Next, if a vote were held on the matter at city council, respondents would seek a "no" vote by a 5:2 margin: fully two thirds (66%) of respondents want council to vote "no."

The leading rationales to bolster opposition are *the addictions issue (7:2)*, *the family issue in terms of negative social and financial outcomes (4:1)*, *distrust of private, perhaps foreign, corporations owning and operating the new gambling facilities (3:1)*, and *a demand for a referendum or plebiscite on the expanded gambling issue (4:1)*.

Third, the leading arguments in support of expanded gambling facilities are not generally resonating with respondents: not the jobs issue, not the additional revenues for municipalities, and not the tourism issue. All are producing split opinion, including up to 50% negatives, which means these issues are not viable for gambling supporters. In addition, gambling as a benign form of "community recreation" is effectively rejected by respondents (5:2 neg) And, the idea that gambling and a performing arts centre can be linked financially is also not viable, according to respondents.