

OTHER - DS

Exhibit G

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: August 15, 2012 12:55 PM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: RE Community Funding given back to Kingston

IS Kingston guaranteed to get at least the same percentage back from the slots that Gan gets now, as I suspect I have not heard this mentioned by anyone, and with a private concern to be running these sites, would this money NOT go to them in their agreement?

Also, I cannot see how many jobs will be created as Rideau Carlton has automated SO MANY of their jobs in gaming such as 21.

[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: Kingston Casino Input
Date: August 10, 2012 6:05:21 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 10 August, 2012 16:26:14 EDT
To: "dshipp@cityofkingston.ca" <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Kingston Casino Input

I attended the public meeting. I did not speak. I am in full support of a casino in Kingston.

We don't have nor do we need 20 years to study this. Get Gan's stats, quickly. That's a better comparison than many other types/places of casinos.

We anticipate and expect a certain percentage of negative social consequences, including costs (as with any social element to which we may become addicted). I don't hear Council demanding that the bingo halls, liquor/beer stores etc. be closed. This is not a question about keeping any given business afloat (that is Not Council's role). So, measure those negatives/costs from the social perspective and weigh those cons against the pros (diversification of new business, jobs (I don't know of many (in fact none) current casino employees who regard their jobs as bad jobs.

If the pros outweigh the cons it's a yes. Otherwise it's a no. Isn't that straight forward.

I urge Council not to sit on the fence. This opportunity may never present itself again. You have an obligation as representatives of our City to make a decision in the best interest of resident taxpayers and I urge you to consider a yes vote. I also urge you not to vote on morality.

Our wonderful City will still be wonderful even with a casino in our backyard. We do however have an opportunity to make it even better with financial support from a new source. Not many businesses share their revenue (any revenue) with the Municipality. Move forward or we will be a poor old City for years to come.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: time to lead
Date: August 22, 2012 9:05:03 AM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 22 August, 2012 8:50:51 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: FW: time to lead

Dear Mr. Shipp;

This e-mail to you is my **support of getting a Casino in Kingston.**

I have been following this debate in the papers and listening to discussions at city council meetings and am disappointed in the child like antics and comments of some councillors opposed to a Casino in Kingston. I also cannot understand why the business community down town is opposed to a Casino, built down town or in the out skirts of the city. I also have serious concerns how some councillors believe that 45 speakers at a public meeting speaking against the casino is a sign that the majority of Kingstonians are opposed to a Casino.

I believe a Casino could bring extra cash flow to the city and with councillors working together that some revenue from the Casino should go to help the less fortunate in the city. Building a Casino on brown field is another thing the city could look at doing, which will also improve the image of the city. As for downtown business Association rather than worrying about a Casino's negative impact what about the negative impact the Empire Theatre leaving the downtown will have in that area, the city and KEDCO should also take some blame for this.

The Casino in Kingston can work, city has to grow with new ideas, the tax base in Kingston needs help and if by making the Casino a positive thing it sure would not hurt. If you don't gamble no need to go to Casino but many people consider it entertainment.

thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: mgerretsen@cityofkingston.ca
[REDACTED]
CC: mgerretsen@cityofkingston.ca
Subject: RE: time to lead

Date: Mon, 20 Aug 2012 12:26:50 +0000

[REDACTED]

Thank you for weighing in on the casino debate. Mayor Gerretsen has urged anyone interested in this issue to voice their opinion by visiting the City website at this [link](#) to vote online, participate in a Telephone Survey by calling 613-546-0000, or by sending in your comments to:

Daniel Shipp,

City of Kingston,

City Hall, 216 Ontario Street,

Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

E-mail: dshipp@cityofkingston.ca

Please note that the deadline for comment has been extended to September 5, 2012.

I will review your comments with Mayor Gerretsen when he returns from a conference late this week. Thank you again for your feedback.

With regards,

Rose Pennock

Administrative Assistant to the Mayor's Office

City of Kingston

216 Ontario Street, Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3

613-546-4291 ext. 1400

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: August 19, 2012 9:15 AM
To: Gerretsen,Mark; George,Kevin; Hector,Dorothy; Berg,Sandy
Subject: time to lead

Mayor/Councillors:

The pros and cons regarding whether a Casino is a bad or good thing for any community can go on and on forever, at some point council will have to make a decision. I do not see why council has to extend the time to make a decision on this matter, city councils in other communities are able to move forward within the timelines. It is time for elected council to make a decision based on what they feel is best for the community, that is why you were elected to make those difficult decisions. I don't believe another public meeting will bring any additional value to the table that has not already been heard. Too much emphasis is placed on public meetings, most of the time it is the one's opposed to an issue that have the largest number of attendees or organized special interest groups. It is time councillors to make a decision and not let the one's that yell the loudest in the minority influence how a council member votes.

There are a group of councillors that are opposed to a Casino and nothing is going to change their mind, they have their own agenda in mind and will do anything to stall the process in their favour.

I am in favour of a Casino in Kingston, I believe the good out ways the bad, if Casino's are legal in the Province why would a community not want one if it will bring in extra revenue and jobs at the very least, especially here in Kingston to stop some drain on the tax payer. Council should invite casino developers to make their pitches, other cities seem to get these things.

Thank You,

[REDACTED]

This E-mail contains confidential information intended only for the individual or entity named in the message. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. If this communication was received in error, please notify us by reply E-mail and delete the original message.

Office of the Mayor

AUG 29 2012

August 29, 2012
City of Kingston

To the Mayor and Council, Kingston.

I wish to make known some observations that come to my mind.

Discussion about allowing a Casino in Kingston seems to be mainly about not having it downtown. I am sure that anyone operating a Casino would want easy access to a motorway; no competition from bars and restaurants and plenty of parking space so they would not want to place it downtown Kingston. I am in favour of a Casino in Kingston.

I see no reason why income to the City should not be shared with our neighbouring towns as there should be more income available from the larger facility.

I would suggest that consideration be made to permanently closing Ontario Street in front of City Hall. There will be less confusion for traffic knowing that the road is closed rather than occasional closing of the street. Lights or traffic walks will not be a good solution for this pedestrian area.

Thought should be given to stopping coaches from parking in front of City Hall. Perhaps one of the parking lots (all are for sale I think) should be used for coach parking.

Thank you for your attention to these matters and thank you for your work for the City.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: Casino economics.
Date: August 11, 2012 8:15:08 AM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 11 August, 2012 6:24:56 EDT
To: "dshipp@cityofkingston.ca" <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Casino economics.

Based on knowledge from similar situations, will a casino be econometricly viable?.

A blind man on a galloping would see that it should be.

Having said that, managing the project would be all important.

With that understanding if I had to vote it would be yes.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Jaynes, Janet

From: Arjoon, Kevin
Sent: July 20, 2012 10:57 AM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: FW: Casino

Here you go.

Kevin Arjoon

Deputy City Clerk, City Clerk's Department
City of Kingston

Phone: 613-546-4291, ext. 1262

karjoon@cityofkingston.ca

www.cityofkingston.ca

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Hector, Dorothy
Sent: Friday, July 20, 2012 10:56 AM
To: Arjoon, Kevin
Subject: Fw: Casino

For the public record

Dorothy Hector

Councillor Lakeside District

City of Kingston

613-634-1732

@DorothyAHector

<http://www.dorothyhector.com>

(Via blackberry)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 20, 2012 10:31 AM
To: George, Kevin
Cc: Hutchison, Rob; Downes, Rick; Gerretsen, Mark; Schell, Liz; Scott, Jeff; Neill, Jim; Hector, Dorothy; Paterson, Bryan; Glover, Bill
Subject: Casino

Count me in as supporting the notion that city of Kingston indicate that it would be interested.

Lets not make the same mistake twice.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Javnes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: CASINO
Date: August 20, 2012 7:17:13 AM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 20 August, 2012 6:11:36 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: CASINO

MEASURING THE BAR:

Gananoque population of 5200 (adults population interested in Casino - perhaps 2500)

- population does not support local casino
- Casino has not attracted americans!!
- 65% of Casino attendees (at least) are from the City of Kingston & Region,
- There would be no job loss to anyone working at the Gananoque Casino as they could commute to Kingston
- I do not think there are any overnight attendee stays for the Casino as there are no other attractions in Gananoque.
- There is a free bus 'daily' from Kingston to Gananoque. There are weekly bus trips from Kingston to other Casinos in the Province - well used.

Kingston did not get the Casino in the first instance because the serving Mayor was 100% against it coming to Kingston as were both Reeves for the Kingston and Portsmouth Townships. Little or no input was solicited from the population.

The negative population of Kingston has dominated the City for at least 50 yrs.

- Will there be challenges in having a Casino - YES - Can the city handle the problems as they occur - YES.
- Adult population to draw on from Kingston and Region 120,000.

At the dismay of the 'negativees' of Kingston, Kingston has become a 'week-end-away' city for the Province.

Would the Casino and its proposed 'upgrade' to more social/recreational activity attract more visitors, yes, especially Americans.

- More jobs, another social outlet to attract more visitors would prevail.

If anyone wants to attend a Casino, there is no 'Social Movement' that exists can stop them from attending.

The Central Location of the City of Kingston for this part of the Province is where the Casino should be.

I personally, am not a gambler and go to the Casino's for the entertainment they offer (musical performances etc.)



Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED] AM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: casino in Kingston

I think a casino in Kingston is a bad idea, it's too close to Gananoque Both casinos would be competing for the same business. Splitting the business would mean both would not do well.

[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: casino
Date: August 14, 2012 6:20:58 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 14 August, 2012 17:25:23 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: casino

No! No! No!

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 30, 2012 4:23 PM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: Casino

My husband and I would like to state **we are in favour of a casino** in the City of Kingston, if people want to gamble they will find a way, therefore we do not see any reason for the City to benefit from a casino.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: casino in Kingston
Date: August 10, 2012 6:05:33 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 10 August, 2012 16:33:29 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: casino in Kingston
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

I am one of the frequent adult visitors to the casino in Gananoque.

This is one of my forms of entertainment. I know my limitations and respect them and have an enjoyable outing doing so.

I recognize many Kingstonians present!

I am fed up with a society that now sends its children to school to let the teachers raise them and I am fed up with those complaining about everything from alcohol to nicotine to gambling being the responsibility of the elected officials.

When do we once again take responsibility for our own actions?

I am IN FAVOUR of a casino in this city though my preference would NOT be in the downtown core but rather along Sir John A towards the 401 or along the 401 for easy access from passersby.

Whether it is gambling or drinking or smoking, if one is determined to become addicted he/she will do so without direction from city Councillors! After all there is a free bus from McCoy? that will take them to Gananoque.

Our city could use a break as well.

Do these folks in Gananoque not use our facilities? could the employees not still be gainfully employed with their experience?

I VOTE YES

[REDACTED]

Jaynes, Janet

Subject: RE: [CASINO SURVEY REF# 308818 DM]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 7:37 AM
To: Contactus
Subject: [CASINO SURVEY REF# 308818 DM]

THE FOLLOWING COMMENT WAS POSTED VIA THE WEB SITE

Date & Time: Friday, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Reply Needed?: NO

Message:

Vote YES on the casino question...

Economic benefits for Kingston. Jobs. Taxes. Casino revenue sharing with OLGA. No financial risk for city coffers.

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: Casino
Date: August 11, 2012 8:43:52 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 11 August, 2012 19:58:57 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Casino

I think it would be foolhardy for council to turn down an opportunity to host a casino. Why?

1. Would generate revenue for the city
2. Creation of local jobs
3. Additional tourist and business attraction advertising the city
4. There has been a nearby casino operating for the last 10 years and yet crime rates in the city have dropped. So the argument that unlawful activity will rise is unproven.
5. Gambling is an accepted social activity. Lottery ticket booths and bingo halls are already frequently visited by people in Kingston. I don't remember any protest when they opened.
6. If we are going to turn down a casino because of possible gambling addiction then why should LCBO stores remain open because of alcoholic addiction or stores selling cigarettes because of nicotine addiction? For those who are a problem gambler, there are steps that can be taken at the casino that would prohibit that person.
7. For seniors, the disabled and shut-ins it can be a positive and enjoyable social activity where they can get around because of the wide aisles and washroom cubicles and flat floor. They make new friends, have a little fun, food and excitement and, with all the security, feel safe.
8. There is a small group of people in this city who continue to be against anything new and want to stand still rather than move our city forward. If council had listened to them before we would not be enjoying the benefits of the development of Block D, Springer Market Square and the K-Rock Centre (where by the way I am a club seat ticket holder for the Frontenacs and have attended over 30 shows). We would still be looking at weeds and a make-shift parking lot on Block D, would

not have a wonderful skating rink to use in the winter at the market, and certainly would never have had an opportunity to see such stars as Elton John, Bryan Adams, Il Divo and Johnny Reid come to the old Memorial Centre.

9. Location of a casino has not been determined. Arguments about it affecting downtown businesses is premature and unfounded.

10. A "no" vote would kill any chance of further investigation and let this opportunity and possibilities (hotel/convention centre/casino?) pass by again.

11. Our loss will be another city's gain because car and bus loads of Kingston people will continue to daily attend a gambling facility wherever it is located. Why would we not want to keep that revenue here to benefit our own city?

[REDACTED]

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: September 4, 2012 9:35 AM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: local Casino input

Hello there,
i put some thoughts into a response, just though i'd email it as well just incase my survey submission didn't work:)
Thanks for taking the time to ponder this question:),
[REDACTED]

- #1. I strongly agree that there should be a Casino in the Kingston City limits, with a very strong condition. If approved, please LOCATE 'IT' NORTH OF THE # 401, with conditions that the owners of the Casino pay for the new infrastructure/plumbing to get it there. Over time the City can benefit from those improvements with future developments and obviously increase the current tax base of whatever location is chosen in the mean time. Look at a map of the City and note all the space above the #401.
- #2. It 'absolutely' does not need to be anywhere south, especially downtown. Cab drivers/City Transit would/could also benefit. Not everyone in a "family/group unit" likes to exclusively gamble, see/play sports, see shows, go to a pub or shop till they drop, compromises are always made for the enjoyment of all.
- #3. It would not be in walking distance of the general public or in the face of those opposed.
- #4. We pay property tax bills in the City limits, we love all that Kingston has to offer, however creating/expanding/diversifying City tax base/revenue can lessen future burdens of property ownership for all if the accounting/budgeting is done in an honest fair/sustainable manner for all parties involved. eg. if I received a \$1/hour raise it would not be wise to look for new expenses that exceed the 'exciting' new influx of revenue.
- #5. If approved, I hope it is going to be a tasteful endeavor with attention to detail and maybe a bit of a "GREEN" footprint. eg. last year walking down a road in Kingston, saw a bus stop pole on a slant over a ditch, flanked by gravel at the edge of a busy traffic area with no sidewalk; I thought who would want to stand there (very unappealing and maybe even a bit dangerous) hmm, if your going to be a 'bus stop', be a 'good bus stop'.
- #6. Life is full of personal decisions/choices eg. if I shouldn't consume alcohol or smoke anymore, question is would I be more successful if I proposed/succeeded in closing down all alcohol/tobacco manufacturers/distributors; what if I had had a bad experience with the pharmaceutical industry would I throw 'the baby out with the bathwater'; in general 'everything' costs (money/time and the aftermath, be it positive or negative), ...to gamble/lotto/bingo, ski, golf, shop (eek, the \$1 Store or 'do i really need another pair of shoes?'), to read, drink, decorate, eat, watch TV, collect, sleep, craft, to self-deprecate in general (activities not yet mentioned?), to accessorize, text, to be on the computer..., ...yes we are all very lucky/blessed that we get to make choices on a daily/hourly basis and maybe the best advice, when we are willing to take it or maybe on a day when we need to hear it, could be summed up in a word, 'moderation'.
- #7. Please refer to #1., DO NOT LOCATE 'IT' SOUTH OF THE # 401 The # 401 at Kingston is a goldmine (recently resembling the GTA), maybe imagine some conversations, '...why don't I drop you off at the Casino while I go golfing' or '...why don't I drop you off at the Casino while I go shopping' or maybe for some it's just a short stop on a road trip to some place else and most definitely not everyone need bother at all, peoples choices can be mixed and matched. Thank you in advance for asking. 9/4/12

Jaynes,Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: August 9, 2012 2:03 PM
To: Shipp,Daniel
Subject: Casino in Kingston

I am dismayed by all the negative comments in the paper and at the public meeting about the possibility of the casino coming to Kingston. As a resident of Kingston for more than 30 years I would like to voice my support for the casino. I will not spout off statistics of crime and social implication (which I believe are minimal) or of the implication of negative effects on downtown businesses. Stats can be viewed at different angles and used to support almost any argument. What I will say is simple. Gambling is a reality in Ontario. If there is not a casino in Kingston, there will be in one of our neighbouring communities. There are lottery tickets, break open tickets and Bingo's and on-line gambling is coming as well, that is a guarantee. So to spout of statistics about problem gambling is useless, as it will be there regardless of what location the casino is in. People who want a gamble will find a venue, whether in Kingston or Gananoque. The question is what can be done to mitigate the social impacts and there are currently programs in place to assist with that. So what we are left with is simple: casino's generate money for the host communities. In these economic times the council members and the major have an obligation to represent what is the best for the people of Kingston and money in our pockets is a good thing.

[REDACTED]

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: September 1, 2012 2:07 PM
To: Shipp, Daniel

Daniel Shipp:

I am sending this e-mail to confirm my support for a casino for the city of Kingston. I have completed the on line survey as well. I believe a casino would be profitable for the city not only in terms of employment for those in need of a job but also the profits from a casino could certainly help ease the financial burden on Kingston's taxpayers. Lately, we see increases in taxes and decreases in services. I'm sure the extra revenue would be put to good use.

I find it hard to believe the DBA is against a casino, whether it is located near downtown or near the 401. Their fear of a casino depleting business in the downtown area just doesn't fly with me. Regardless of where it would be located, I think it would bring in more business. If it were located in Kingston, I would certainly spend an evening out, going to dinner at one of our many great restaurants and then on to the casino for a little fun. I consider it another form of entertainment, just like going to dinner and a movie downtown...oops! soon we won't be able to do that when the Empire Theater relocates. That relocation will certainly deplete some business downtown. Too bad the DBA wasn't as forceful objecting to that move as they are about having a casino!

I also would like to remind councillors that the fact that a mere 45 or so people attending a meeting expressing their dissent for a casino in Kingston should not be considered the majority!

Councillors need to listen to the proposal from OLG, ask their questions, and then vote. Their vote should be based upon whether a casino is beneficial to the city of Kingston. They should not be basing their vote on whether it is morally right or wrong. If you don't like casinos, then don't go. We need to move forward and attract different businesses to the city. We can still hi-lite the city's great history, great downtown shops and restaurants and also have the opportunity to add another form of entertainment.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: casino proposal
Date: August 14, 2012 7:05:31 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 14 August, 2012 18:59:59 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: casino proposal

Dear Mr. Shipp,

Bringing a casino to Kingston is an extremely bad idea. Greed seems to be the carrot in this case as City Council is looking for ways to bring money in other than through taxation. Unfortunately, gambling is not the answer. It would be detrimental to all Kingston citizens and to the student population. Adult entertainment in the form of gambling and all the depravity it would bring would cause families to flee Kingston to find a safer place to raise their children.

Surely a city such as Kingston with all the availability of water could find another form of amusement/entertainment that would be safe and welcoming for people of all ages.

Please vote against this horrible proposition to have a casino in our midst. There is one that is close enough as it is. Let that one become a Vegas-style casino.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: Casino
Date: August 14, 2012 1:31:20 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 14 August, 2012 11:22:50 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Casino

"Hello"

I think we should be focusing on the ill and living as opposed to encouraging our mid-aged and younger individuals to become sick and liable to addiction.

Today where does our municipal funds sit?

I am against developing a casino here in Kingston because I don't want to see us lose the reputation/title that we have as a historical and heritage city.

[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: Casino in Kingston
Date: August 12, 2012 9:26:37 AM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 12 August, 2012 0:20:27 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Re: Casino in Kingston

A very definate NO.

August 13, 2012

Letter of Objection to a Casino in Kingston

This letter, respectfully submitted, will confirm that I object to the City of Kingston obtaining, or participating in the obtaining, either through partnership or financial commitment, of a Casino for the City of Kingston, for the following reasons.

1. A Casino in Kingston was formally rejected by the citizens of Kingston twice before. It was rejected in a Block D proposed package offered by a private developer. It was rejected again 10 years ago when it went to Gananoque. Now it is here for a 3rd time and again the citizens are saying "NO, we don't want it!"
2. If Casinos are such a great venue and money maker, what is the real reason the OLG is unloading them? Is it because they have lost their appeal to all but the die-hard regulars, profits are down and they want out?
3. The OLG has stated that it wants the "new operators" to build, not something like what is in Gananoque, but a larger venue structure to include a convention center, live theatre auditorium, fine dining and a hotel, similar to what is found in Las Vegas or Atlantic City. Kingston does not have the \$75 to \$125 million dollars for that.
4. With the cost over-rides common to Kingston with the Grand Theatre, the KROCK, new Police, Fire and Public Works, they all show a track record that makes those numbers realistic, if not on the low side.
5. That kind of expense, just to get started, would go a long way in paying for a very much needed 3rd crossing bridge over the Cataraqui. A bridge is something of need. The Casino is just a frivolous house of fantasy we do not need. We need to move people and reduce congestion, not create more traffic.
6. The "payback" from running a Casino is not a guaranteed investment. If Gananoque only got 34 million over 10 years, it would take 30 or more years for the City to recoup their investment and Casinos don't last that long.
7. If you partner with someone like, say MGM, or any of those who make a living out of these things, the City share of the profits would only be about 10%, after expenses and the MGM & OLG have taken their share out. Gananoque & Leeds County were left to divide up less than 10%, usually between 5 and 8%. Not a good rate of return.
8. Consideration must be given to all essential services that we, the municipality must provide, which ranges from water & sewer, fire & police protection, waste disposal, plus streets and traffic issues.
9. There is not a viable location in downtown Kingston for such a facility. The parking area alone of the Gananoque Casino is greater than any site Kingston could provide and Gananoque is a small Casino.
10. The OLG specifications indicate a one stop, self-contained, all inclusive site. People going to a Casino have one thought in mind and it is not to shop for clothing or other sundries. They go to the Casino, they enter, they play, they eat and do everything at the Casino, then they go home. Where do you find any financial benefit or gain to the local merchants in that? The Cities only gain is a share of the Casino profit pot, if any, after expenses.
11. Over the years Kingston has had a rather good relationship with our neighbours to the east in Gananoque and Brockville. That has already started to deteriorate because of this Casino issue. A "hate Kingston", "anti-Kingston movement" is already forming there. Council must remember that as part of our catchment area for mercantile trade, commerce and educational activities, we would do well to think long and act rationally before we lose our neighbours, both financially and socially.
12. The government of today is NOT the government of tomorrow. Today's government is cash strapped. It wants the brass ring, but at our expense. Tomorrows government may change the rules of the game they are trying to sell us on today. Past history does repeat itself. During the past 10 years, the Councils of the City of Kingston, through commitments to building construction, grants to the hospital and Queens, recreation facilities, dog parks, infrastructure, the M Centre, etc. etc, has already spent over 500 million dollars. The citizens of this city cannot, nor should they ever be expected to be saddled with the cost of running a Casino. Especially when they have said NO 3 times. The job of Council is to manage the City, it does not have a mandate to run a Casino.

Commissioner's Office
Sustainability & Growth

AUG 15 2012

RECEIVED

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: Casino Objection
Date: August 14, 2012 1:31:57 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 13 August, 2012 17:54:04 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Casino Objection

Letter of Objection to a Casino in Kingston

This letter, respectfully submitted, will confirm that I object to the City of Kingston obtaining, or participating in the obtaining, either through partnership or financial commitment, of a Casino for the City of Kingston, for the following reasons.

1. A Casino in Kingston was formally rejected by the citizens of Kingston twice before. It was rejected in a Block D proposed package offered by a private developer. It was rejected again 10 years ago when it went to Gananoque. Now it is here for a 3rd time and again the citizens are saying "NO, we don't want it!"
2. If Casinos are such a great venue and money maker, what is the real reason the OLG is unloading them? Is it because they have lost their appeal to all but the die-hard regulars, profits are down and they want out?
3. The OLG has stated that it wants the "new operators" to build, not something like what is in Gananoque, but a larger venue structure to include a convention center, live theatre auditorium, fine dining and a hotel, similar to what is found in Las Vegas or Atlantic City. Kingston does not have the \$75 to \$125 million dollars for that.
4. With the cost over-rides common to Kingston with the Grand Theatre, the K-ROCK, new Police, Fire and Public Works, they all show a track record that makes those numbers realistic, if not on the low side.
5. That kind of expense, just to get started, would go a long way in paying for a very much needed 3rd crossing bridge over the Cataraqui. A bridge is something of need. The Casino is just a frivolous house of fantasy we do not need. We need to move people and reduce congestion, not create more traffic.
6. The "payback" from running a Casino is not a guaranteed

Investment. If Gananoque only got 34 million over 10 years, it would take 30 or more years for the City to recoup their investment and Casinos don't last that long.

7. If you partner with someone like, say MGM, or any of those who make a living out of these things, the City share of the profits would only be about 10%, after expenses and the MGM & OLG have taken their share out. Gananoque & Leeds County were left to divide up less than 10%, usually between 5 and 8%. Not a good rate of return.

8. Consideration must be given to all essential services that we, the municipality must provide, which ranges from water & sewer, fire & police protection, waste disposal, plus streets and traffic issues.

9. There is not a viable location in downtown Kingston for such a facility. The parking area alone of the Gananoque Casino is greater than any site Kingston could provide and Gananoque is a small Casino.

10. The OLG specifications indicate a one stop, self-contained, all inclusive site. People going to a Casino have one thought in mind and it is not to shop for clothing or other sundries. They go to the Casino, they enter, they play, they eat and do everything at the Casino, then they go home. Where do you find any financial benefit or gain to the local merchants in that? The Cities only gain is a share of the Casino profit pot, if any, after expenses.

11. Over the years Kingston has had a rather good relationship with our neighbours to the east in Gananoque and Brockville. That has already started to deteriorate because of this Casino issue. A "hate Kingston", "anti-Kingston movement" is already forming there. Council must remember that as part of our catchment area for mercantile trade, commerce and educational activities, we would do well to think long and act rationally before we lose our neighbours, both financially and socially.

12. The government of today is NOT the government of tomorrow. Today's government is cash strapped. It wants the brass ring, but at our expense. Tomorrow's government may change the rules of the game they are trying to sell us on today. Past history does repeat itself. During the past 10 years, the Councils of the City of Kingston, through commitments to building construction, grants to the hospital and Queens, recreation facilities, dog parks, infrastructure, the M Centre, etc. etc, has already spent over 500 million dollars. The citizens of this city cannot, nor should they ever be expected to, get saddled with the cost of running a Casino. Especially when they have said NO 3 times. The job of Council is to manage the City, it does not have a mandate to run a Casino.

Respectfully submitted,



[REDACTED]

Daniel Shipp
City of Kingston
City Hall, 216 Ontario Street,
Kingston, ON
K7L 2Z3

Re: Public Input: A Gaming Facility in Kingston

To: Mr. Shipp, Mayor Gerretsen, and members of Council

My name is [REDACTED] and I am a [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I am currently in the process of developing what was once a parish church into a Mission of the community in the Inner Harbour and Williamsville neighbourhoods. I am writing to personally oppose the proposal of a gaming facility in the city of Kingston. As a person of faith and a concerned citizen, I believe the rational for hosting a casino in our city does not uphold the vision of sustainability as outlined in the Sustainable Kingston Plan and reinforced in Kingston's Strategic Plan, is not an ethical or viable means of economic development, and is not grounded in responsible stewardship practice. It is not my intention to discuss the moral implications of those individuals who participate in gambling. It is with sincere concern for those who struggle with gambling addictions, the targeted demographic(s) of the gaming industry, and the impact on the community which impels me to speak against the invitation of a casino in Kingston.

In the first six months of my ministry I have taken the opportunity to familiarize myself with the neighbourhood of the Good Shepherd Mission and the city of Kingston. I participated in a variety of events hosted by the city, read both the aforementioned plans, and attended the conference for Sustainable Kingston. I am encouraged by the city of Kingston's plan "to help achieve our community's vision of becoming Canada's Most Sustainable City"¹ and mission statement "to enhance the quality of life for present and future generations by providing progressive, professional services and leadership that reflects the needs of all those who work, live, visit or play in the City of Kingston."² With this said, sustainability of this kind requires city officials, community leaders, and the citizens of Kingston to actively participate in the economic, environmental, social, and cultural frameworks as outlined in these two plans. Since the conversation about a casino has been brought to the public forum, many people have come forward with concerns and statistics detailing the social, economic, psychological, and spiritual impact of casinos. Assuming these concerns and statistics have been made known I add: When we entertain the idea of building a casino in our city as a means of generating revenue, our focus becomes on how much money we can make off of the local population and does nothing to

¹ Kingston's Strategic Plan 2011-2014 (p. 3)

² Kingston's Strategic Plan 2011-2014 (p. 7)

empower and equip them to become full participants in both the Strategic and Sustainable Kingston plans. The economic drive to generate revenue from gambling preys on the vulnerable, the ageing population, the poor, and is rooted in a ideology of consumption rather than creating responsible citizen participation in the four pillars and the guiding principles of the vision to make Kingston the most sustainable city in Canada.

Sustainability cannot be attained if we treat people as consumers. Sustainability requires focus on generosity and facilitating stewardship practices that engage members of our community to take responsibility for our city through the sharing of our time, talent, money, resources, and abilities. Both the plans are upheld with sound principles focusing on the gifts and assets of our city and the people within. It is through our active participation we can begin to implement Kingston's plans to create a viable, attractive, and sustainable city. A casino will not create active participation from the members of our community. Casinos produce and recycle revenue without the ability to add anything to the principals outlined in Kingston's Strategic and Sustainable plans. It seems to me the idea of building a casino is a "get rich quick" means to support our local economy that robs us of our faith, not only the provision of God, but in the plans themselves and in the people of our city who are the foundation of sustainability.

I fully recognize the urgency of cash flow and financial growth as a means to facilitate the vision we have for sustainability. The Church itself is not immune to the financial pressures of a tight economy. The Church has also had to participate in planning processes focusing on economic sustainability, while at the same time holding true to the mission we have been given through our faith in Jesus Christ and his teachings. We are often faced with the urgency to provide our basic needs at the same time upholding the command of righteousness and the need to do what is right even when it is difficult. It is my understanding Kingston is in a relatively stable economic position with room for growth. If we want to grow economically, while at the same time accounting for the other three pillars of the Sustainable Kingston Plan, we will have to take the long road. This road is built on patience, hard work, determination, community participation, and faith. It also means we must do what is right, equitable, and just. We cannot afford buying into the ideology of scarcity whereby we expect payback for what we give; the basic premise of all gambling. It is stated very clearly in the Sustainable Kingston plan "achieving sustainability for Kingston will not be easy. We need to fundamentally change the way we live and to challenge long held assumptions about growth and consumption. This requires broad community engagements...and embracing...a set of values based on open and extended discussions regarding changes in the cultural, economic, environmental, and social dimensions of our city."³ A casino shuts down this conversation as it focuses solely on financial revenue with no proven outcome. To this end, a casino will simply reinforce the long held assumptions about growth and consumption we are trying so desperately to change. In moving forward with a casino I believe we would be gambling with our integrity and I have to ask is the potential income from a casino worth the social, economic, environmental, cultural sacrifices the city of Kingston would have to make? Are we willing to gamble away all the accomplishments already paving the way to become the most sustainable city? We have to ask who benefits from the revenue, who will suffer, and is it worth it?

³ Sustainable Kingston Plan: Designing Our Community's Future...Together (2010 p. i)

Finally, I believe sustainability requires approaching economic, social, environmental, and cultural development through the lens of generosity, equity, and the sharing of our gifts and resources. The governance of the city of Kingston consists of political leaders who have been entrusted by the people of Kingston to be stewards of all our resources as exemplified through these four pillars. According to the Merriam-Webster online dictionary stewardship is “the careful and responsible management of something entrusted to one's care”⁴ and is upheld in the very principles of the Strategic and Sustainable Kingston plans. “Sustainable Kingston encourages all of us to be wise stewards of our community – for the benefit of our children, our grandchildren and the generations to come.”⁵ This responsibility extends beyond financial revenue to include the preservation of our society, culture, environment, and the citizens of our city. A casino is by no means a responsible stewardship practice. It exploits the most vulnerable, does not have predictable outcomes, and is a system infused with injustice. It will not take into account the quality of life of the people of Kingston. Good stewardship and sustainability have to be based on using the gifts and assets of our citizens in a responsible way.

From a Christian perspective “there is only one essential stewardship question: Will we make use of resources entrusted to us to serve God’s mission, or for purposes that we ourselves devise or that are thrust upon us by an economy that depends absolutely on growing consumption to sustain it? When we have turned inward to focus on our wants and needs, when we have used the language of stewardship to address our own religious agenda instead of God’s mission, when we have reduced the challenge of stewardship to servicing the existence, program and practices of the church, then we have squandered the treasure of God in a far country.”⁶ I believe this statement rings true in the present conversation. Does a casino make use of the resources entrusted to the city of Kingston to uphold its mission to enhance the quality of life of the people in Kingston and will it support the already established gifts our city has to offer? What agenda is a casino based on? Will we squander the richness of our already established economical, environmental, social, and cultural treasures that make Kingston a unique and vibrant place to live and visit?

“Stewardship is more than giving money, it is giving time and skills and prayer and thought...it is giving to all the good causes that will help bring salvation to the world. It also includes the way we earn our money and the ways we spend it. Good stewardship means budgeting our time and energy and attention...it means analyzing life’s priorities and counting costs; it means being aware that some day we shall have to give an account of ourselves...”⁷ Which begs the question is the City of Kingston willing to hang our hat on a casino as a responsible way to earn money, manage our municipal economy, encourage how we spend our money, and are we prepared to accept all the social consequences that come with it? Are we willing to sacrifice the suffering of a few for the perceived greater good without actually knowing if the revenue will promote long term sustainability? Will our city become a casualty of the effects of a gaming facility? Will our local businesses become obsolete? What cultural significance does a casino bring to our

⁴ Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/stewardship> (Sept 5, 2012)

⁵ Sustainable Kingston Plan: Designing Our Community’s Future...Together (2010 p. ii)

⁶ Anglican Church of Canada *Stewardship: a faithful response to God’s mission* [online] <http://www.anglican.ca/gifts/stewardship> (Sept 5, 2012)

⁷ The Meaning of Stewardship, By Bishop Demetri Khoury [online] <http://almoutran.com/2011/06/3581> (Sept 5, 2012)

community? What about increased social problems such as poverty, addiction, and higher suicide rates? No matter the scale of the consequence are we willing to sacrifice our commitment to the principles outlined in our own plan for sustainability?

Casinos are not designed to use what we have been entrusted with in wise and responsible ways. The economic model of casinos is not based on generosity and the sharing of our individual and collective resources. The casino may improve the amount of cash flow to our city (although this is debatable) but it does not protect and enhance the quality of life for our citizens. Gambling is not good stewardship in so far as it relies on the economic exploitation of our people. It is based on taking money that would better be used in supporting the developing pillars of our plan for sustainability.

I am strongly opposed to a casino in Kingston. I value the hard work that has gone into developing and implementing the plans the City of Kingston has developed to propel us to our vision of sustainability. As a person of faith, I do not believe building a casino is a responsible stewardship practice and I have fear for the well-being of the people most affected by the consequences of gambling. It is my prayer that Kingston becomes a sustainable and vibrant city based on its God given strengths, leadership, diversity, and the people who live and visit here.

Prayerfully Submitted by

██████████

██

Jaynes,Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 24, 2012 9:43 AM
To: Shipp,Daniel
Subject: Public input re: casino

Hello Daniel,

I have just completed the survey regarding the casino issue and am very happy to have had an opportunity to share my views, thank you!

I did notice that the wording of the survey title states "support for a gaming facility" and the "the City seeks public input on support for a gaming facility in Kingston". I would suggest that this wording is biasing the respondent towards support rather than illiciting their own opinion. I would suggest changing the wording to remove the word support, something like this... "Public Input on a gaming facility in Kingston". "City seeks public input on a gaming facility in Kingston"

While I am opposed to this idea, I hope that you don't completely disregard my suggestion, as I would make this suggestion either way. I wouldn't want the wording to say "Opposition for".

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 24, 2012 6:21 PM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: casino

I am a home owner in Kingston and of course I would like the additional income to our tax base but I feel strongly against Kingston pursuing a casino while Gananoque still has an active casino. Kingston had it's chance and said "thanks but no thanks", now after Gananoque, who said yes when we said no, have taken the heat and all the risk Kingston wants to bully it's way in at the demise of Gan's casino. I vote NO. Not until Gan closes their casino or the OLG allows two in the same area.

[REDACTED]

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 24, 2012 10:11 AM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: FW: Locating a Casino in Kingston

Here is a copy of the remarks we recently sent to our Councillor. I understand that you are compiling responses regarding the location of a casino in this city. As you can see, we do not support any plan to locate a casino in Kingston.
Thank you,

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 10:08 AM
To: bpateron@cityofkingston.ca
Cc: mgerretsen@cityofkingston.ca
Subject: Locating a Casino in Kingston

July 17, 2012

To Bryan Paterson, Trillium District Councillor

When Kingston was considering the possibility of locating a casino in Kingston several years ago, Brian Yealland, Chaplain at Queen's University, focused support to strongly reject a casino. He cited numerous reliable sources to support the benefits of keeping Kingston without a casino. We totally agreed with this stand and still do.

My husband and I would like to advise you that we are **very much against locating a casino here**. I have been following the campaign in Toronto to locate a casino somewhere on their lakeshore. It is interesting to note that whenever there is a letter of support for the idea, it is always signed by someone connected either with a government or the lottery commission.

All the arguments advanced about providing jobs, tourism benefits, etc., never address the many negative effects, such as encouraging gambling addictions, possibility of money laundering or other criminal activities, etc., but always dwell on (purported) economic benefits for the local tax payers.

I note from your profile on the city council web site that you work with youth in various organizations, so I would imagine that you personally, would not be in favour of locating a casino in Kingston. We would like to add our voices to a strong rejection of locating a casino here in Kingston.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

cc Mayor Gerretsen

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 28, 2012 11:27 AM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: Problem with "Public Input: Support For A Gaming Facility In Kingston"

Good morning Mr. Shipp,

It may have been unintentional, but there is a problem with the title of the City's current campaign to gather input about the possibility of a gaming facility in Kingston.

I am glad that residents are being included in the conversation.

Unfortunately, the title "Public Input: Support For A Gaming Facility In Kingston" gives the impression that council has already concluded that it is going to support the gaming facility and that they are just surveying the population to record opinions that are going to support that position.

I'm only moderately opposed to a casino in Kingston, I can see the pros and cons on either side of the debate. My primary concern is that the City has not used a neutral starting point in its search for public opinion on this issue.

I don't use the press to communicate with government, but I can see other people potentially using this argument to publicly criticize the municipality. Kingston is generally a very well run municipality and a great place to live, so I feel disappointed when I see these little missteps in local politics and administration.

It's probably too late to reconsider the labelling of the current survey, but I hope this is taken into consideration in future campaigns.

I appreciate the challenges city staff and council face in planning, marketing, and conducting public consultations, so I hope this message isn't misinterpreted as a personal attack on anyone.

I wish you the best of luck with the remainder of this initiative.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 30, 2012 3:54 PM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: Casino vote

Please leave the casino where it is, even though our city has grown in size since 1999, the present site is the best and great for Gan!

Thank You !

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: August 3, 2012 3:44 PM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Cc: Gerretsen, Mark; Reitzel, Brian; Berg, Sandy; Schell, Liz; Glover, Bill; Hector, Dorothy; Hutchison, Rob; Scott, Jeff; George, Kevin; Downes, Rick; Osanic, Lisa; Paterson, Bryan; Neill, Jim
Subject: A resident's view on the proposed casino

Dear Mr. Shipp, Mayor Gerretsen and City Councillors:

I am gravely concerned that Kingston is considering hosting a casino. My concerns relate to the wide socioeconomic consequences of a casino. Please consider the following facts, drawn from a number of sources and cited in the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) and Problem Gambling Institute, 2012.^[1] In the past 20 years, 38 casinos have been built in Ontario in addition to 17 racetracks with slot machines. In Southern Ontario, 93% of residents are within a one-hour drive of a casino or slot machine facility. During this time, the number of services created to deal with the impacts of problem gambling also grew exponentially in response to the growing social problems caused by the availability of gambling facilities. In 2009-2010, the OLG (Ontario Lottery and Gaming) spent \$18 million on what they term 'corporate responsibility': funding for research, education and treatment of problem gambling.

In Ontario, 4.8 per cent of adults (449,000 people) have moderate or severe gambling problems. An additional 9.6 per cent (860,000 people) are classified as "at-risk" for problem gambling. The highest rate of moderate and severe gambling problems (6.9%) is among young adults, aged 18 to 24.

It is critical to understand that problem gambling is not just about losing money. Gambling problems can have far reaching effects. A 2001 survey found that one in six Ontario adults report a problem resulting from either their own or another person's gambling. So even though a minority of all people who gamble have a problem, the number of people adversely affected by a gambling problem is much higher. Alarming, only a small percentage of people who have gambling problems use Ontario's specialized counselling services, which means many people don't get help until the problem causes a crisis. Families may experience financial difficulty, emotional problems and physical illness. Family violence is more common when families are in crisis. Gambling problems can lead to partner, elder or child abuse. The stress of gambling problems can cause stress-related health problems, for both the person who gambles and the family. Rates of suicide are higher for people who gamble excessively and for their family members. Bankruptcy, a common consequence of a gambling addiction, has serious adverse effects on individuals and families. In a Quebec study, 28 per cent of people with severe gambling problems had declared bankruptcy and one-third had debts between \$75,000 and \$150,000. A further 35 per cent were about to declare bankruptcy.

In response to the argument that a casino would help Kingston's economy, I would say that the costs of increased health services, family violence services (e.g. Children's Aid, women's and family shelters), justice services, and policing (particularly in light of the recent report that up to 25% of calls to Kingston City police are related to mental health issues) far exceeds any revenue generated by a casino. There may be some jobs created in the tourism sector, which is already vulnerable to larger economic changes, but how do these compare to the loss of jobs by people whose lives are destroyed by a gambling problem? Personal bankruptcy is not good for the economy. It is common knowledge that for people who have an addiction, the availability and accessibility of the addictive substance plays a strong role in their ability to abstain. There is already a free shuttle bus to the Gananoque Casino to service anyone who does wish to gamble, but placing a casino in Kingston

removes the thought and planning that may just serve as a much-needed barrier to the person who could be at risk, or is already in the throes of a gambling problem. What I wish to emphasize is this: *You cannot put a price tag on the value of the mental, physical and financial wellbeing of Kingston residents.*

Please weigh this decision very carefully and consider the human consequences of building a casino. In my opinion, the Gananoque Casino is close enough and Kingston would do well to focus on more socially and culturally sustainable tourist attractions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: Casino response
Date: August 11, 2012 8:14:40 AM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 11 August, 2012 7:15:09 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Casino response

I am sending a copy of the letter I sent to my city councillor, Jeff Scott. It explains my response to the proposal for Kingston to be considered as a contender for a casino.
Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration in this important decision.
[REDACTED]

Hello Jeff,
I am writing to you, my city councillor, in order to voice my opinion about the upcoming discussion as to whether Kingstonians want a chance to obtain the right to host a casino here. I think it is great that the general population is being asked and is given a voice in this very important decision-making process.

As I am unable to attend the public meeting next week, I hope that this email is sufficient to count as a legitimate opinion outside of the prescribed meeting.

I am NOT in favour of having Kingston as a location for a casino, in place of the one in Gananoque. While I can appreciate that Kingston would benefit financially from such an enterprise being in our midst, I am afraid that the potential problems associated with this type of business would outweigh the community's financial advantage. I think that Kingston has enough problems to contend with (social, legal, mental, economic, etc.) and adding to the mix would be detrimental to the fine quality of life found here.

For those who feel compelled to gamble, Gananoque is just a short, pleasant drive away. For those without transportation, I believe there is free transport available. Let the Gananoque location continue to be successful. "If it isn't broken, don't fix it" might be an appropriate adage to adopt here.

Thank you for your time reading this. I hope you will take my opinion into

consideration while casting your vote on behalf of your constituency.
Regards,



KOH 150

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: August 9, 2012 12:20 PM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Cc: John Gerretsen
Subject: Casinos - Exploitation of people

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Daniel Shipp, Sustainable Initiatives Coordinator
City of Kingston
216 Ontario Street
Kingston, ON K7L 2Z3
dshipp@cityofkingston.ca

Dear Mr. Shipp,

May peace come to this house of government, the kind that only God can give. I am grateful for the people who give of their time and energy to serve our city, province and nation. Thank you for this opportunity to submit my opinion.

I am definitely against having more casinos built, especially in the Kingston area.

Have you stopped to think of the reason the Ontario and local governments have been considering this expansion? It is because of the huge amount of money, 34 millions of dollars in ten years that poured into the Gananoque and the Township of Leeds and the Thousand Islands coffers, as well as into other municipalities, money which patrons gambled away. How many families or seniors' lives were dramatically affected because of this? How many people had trouble paying their own debts because of gambling away their hard-earned cash and pensions?

Every time I see the existing casino shuttles ready to whisk away people free of charge, leading them into temptation, I am grieved.

Ontario has a huge debt load. **Surely the province and our municipality can come up with godly solutions to paying their own debts without increasing the debt load of their constituents!** Paying fair taxes is our duty, and stewarding them well is yours. But **we expect you to protect our citizens. Surely you do not want to exploit them!** That is why I am also against the government advertising for LCBO and lottery tickets as well as casino expansion. Enough is enough!!!

Recently, I have worked hard with a senior who is now 85 years old and was addicted to a different form of gambling – to lottery offers that came in the mail “promising” thousands and millions of dollars in prizes if she just sent in a cheque for about \$30. They let her win a small amount a few times, but this senior refused good advice, sent in many of those cheques over the years and was hooked until she became in debt with a worse depression and memory problem. Her life and apartment were such a shambles that she had to move into a nursing home.

Thank God, she allowed me to be her Power of Attorney and I was able to have her back taxes done for her so her full pension could be restored, pay her bills and to screen her mail for her. Since the Lord has broken

the gambling addiction over her life and she has begun to follow God's financial plan instead, she is full of joy and hope. She brings her tithes into the Lord's storehouse so it can be stewarded well, and she has given help to her daughter and others in need. Now she is out of debt, and even has money saved. Thanks be to God. His way is always best, to love Him wholeheartedly and our neighbour as ourselves. She is actually in better shape emotionally than she had been for years, too, thank God.

Now I am not against a friendly game of cards with friends, once in a while, considerate of one another's finances. But our province and municipality certainly does not need to have casinos or to seduce people into going to them and possibly developing a gambling problem and losing piles of money in order to get millions extra for government budgets. We also do not want to attract predators to this city.

Wakey-wakey!!!

God can make a way where there seems to be no way. Our country and our city's forefathers knew that, and were unashamed to call on the name of the Lord for help. Almighty God rolled back the waters of the mighty Red Sea, and those who put their trust in Him are blessed mightily as He does that in their circumstances today. I know since I adopted His financial plans, seeking His righteousness and kingdom first, that God has taken good care of me, even in my widowhood. Many businesses are finding that too. Thank God we can experience living in His kingdom here on earth and every month I have peace and joy and my needs are met, and I have been able to give and lend to others rather than borrow at interest.

"This is the King's town," the Lord said to me New Year's morning, 1981.
Kingston is blessed to be a blessing,
and to lovingly protect and serve its citizens and visitors.
When we honour Him, the Lord will provide.
"Trust Me, just trust Me," says the Lord.

Respectfully submitted in the name of Jesus, our Lord and King,
[REDACTED]

Jaynes, Janet

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: September 1, 2012 2:37 PM
To: Shipp, Daniel
Subject: No casino please

Windsor said that they are sorry they ever got into the casino business. I urge council to vote no against a casino anywhere in Kingston and environs. A casino will not enhance local business but take away from the business which they now enjoy. Please add my vote against any casino. Hoping that this council has some backbone and intelligence and are not being led around by the nose by the mayor. There is a lot of public anger against plans like these that continue to spring up after being voted down previously. Please record my vote and my husband's as **NO CASINO.**

From: [Shipp, Daniel](#)
To: [Jaynes, Janet](#)
Subject: Fwd: Casino
Date: August 17, 2012 12:25:03 AM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 16 August, 2012 19:23:42 EDT
To: <dshipp@cityofkingston.ca>
Subject: Casino

Greetings,

Mainly, I'm more against a casino in Kingston because it will change the makeup of our historic city and of course, traffic will increase because the city will market itself with access to a Casino. They want to draw business into the city and a Casino might just attract more.

My question is: what sort of city do we want Kingston to be? We all know money talks (Casino will bring in more money), but some things are more important than money.

The first thing that struck me when I moved to Kingston in 1996 was the wild life and marsh life.

I grew up in a mining town as a child. A lot of the wild life - and even regular birds that we should see normally - weren't making their homes there. The land was too damaged.

If you wanted to go and see nature, you needed to take a drive outside the town for quite a ways. As a child, I thought my hometown had been devastated by forest fires. Not so. It was industry. Though today, my hometown has outdone itself in diversifying and in

reforestation, I can never forget the dull place I grew up in. It made an impact on me very young.

A Casino is hardly the same thing, you say. Agreed, but the long term effects of building a Casino in this city won't be measured by wishes and dreams of a financially successful city. It will be measured by future generations who've not had

the privilege of growing up in a historic city filled with nature and marshes within. People will have to pay to get to see anything.

Traffic will increase and so will more streets and highways.

Yes, businesses will come to Kingston, but we'll have a "hodge-podge" of unknown elements growing as well. Perhaps human trafficking, drugs, crime will move in with the new faster city.

We could've marketed Kingston on it's historic value. Perhaps I'm a dreamer. It will be a sorry day when a Casino comes to this city.

Once here, there will be no turning back.

--

[REDACTED]

Mr. Shipp,

I am saying no to a casino in Kingston.

Mr. Shipp

Regarding casino:

I'm not very good at writing, I'm more vocal.

I would like to see a casino in or near Kington, out Division. It would be good unless you get good parking downtown cause we all know parking in downtown Kington sucks. As far downtown businesses worrying about losing sales, I don't shop downtown cause the types of stores we have, do not cater to the average person, who have a limited income or people on pensions, what we need downtown is a department store, I do not go pay for Giant Tiger, I shop at Walmart since S&P left.

When my husband and I go to Gananoque, we sometimes go on the boatline, shop in their stores, eat, then

go to casino (last) also
we fill up with gas,
gas is a lot cheaper there,
we also get our groceries
there, we go once a month
and spend about 3-4 hundred
dollars, ~~we go once a month~~
I would sooner give that
money to Kington.

People are going to spend
money in Gan, why not
keep that money in here.

As for people with addictions,
smoking, drinking, drugs, shopping
for lottery tickets, are also
an addiction.

I read, a beer store may
be opening up, that is addiction,
about the jobs we will
create, not counting the
taxes that casino pay out,
suppliers, selling their produce
to the drinks, food, the
casino gives back and we
need the money.

I have spoken to people
at that casino, who visit
Kington from Toronto and
other ~~prop~~ places but go to

Gan, cause they like it,
Maybe someone should
count all the empty
places on Princess St, I did
and wonder, what if, we
had a casino, could these
empty stores, get rented.
As for the store owners
and anyone else who
doesn't want one, the
next time their rent or taxes
go up, they don't want to
complain, anything that
can bring people or money
to Kington, grab the idea.
If we get one or not,
people like casino and if
we don't^{them} I will still
shop in Gan, even though
I live here.

Thank You