

Creative Places + Spaces Conference  
October 17–18, 2003  
- The Distillery Historic District -  
Toronto, Ontario

---

Glen Murray, Mayor, City of Winnipeg, speaking on Political Will

Thanks very much. It is terrific to be in Toronto. This is a city I have a great deal of love for. It's an extraordinary community. It's got a cosmopolitan depth. It has got a texture and a richness. It has got a community of inclusiveness and celebration like very few other cities in the world and those of you who live here and who have built this community should be very proud. As a Western Canadian, I'm very concerned about the future of this city. Toronto supports the health care system, and the highways of Western Canada; it is integral. It is the largest tax engine in this country and it supports much of our public infrastructure in the largest sense of the word. And it really is important that all Canadians see themselves as Torontonians and Montréalais and that we see each other as citizens of our cities and champion of things. I think there's very little room left right now for Toronto bashing in this country and I think it's something that's hopefully past us. If I actually get through this in half an hour, you'll see a miracle. But I'm going to try. I sort of feel like R2D2 up here revealed.

There is something that happened yesterday that very much disturbed me in the discussions. It particularly disturbed me because in the dialogue that I was hearing yesterday, people were talking about city government like it was someone else's property. And people were asking, "Well, how do we change things? How do we deal with government?" as if it's some monster you have to battle. It's simple, the answer is three words: Take It Over. If a gay man can be elected to office in Winnipeg in 1989 and become mayor in what was arguably a more socially conservative community just north of Canada's Bible belt, I think you can have radical change in Toronto.

I don't want to talk to you today about Winnipeg's plans for a new deal, although I will mention some of them. You can go to our Website and download them and they're all 30-40 pages. I've written some of them, and people who are brighter than I have written others. Take a look at them. I'll briefly list off what this new deal is about, because it's a lot more than taxes. I will invite you to go to our Website and look at what we're trying to do as a community because there's a very rich mix of policy initiatives. But I don't want to talk to you about that in depth because you can all read and you don't need me to read them to you. Go to [www.winnipeg.ca/newdeal](http://www.winnipeg.ca/newdeal).

What I want to talk to you about and what I think is the most important thing that we never talk about in politics, is values. The creative community and artists have to relate values to their work and thoughtfulness to their work, and we should expect that of

politicians. We need value-based government. And we need to understand what is really going on, not simply the labels of political parties or the programs of political parties because they're really irrelevant. The Red Book is not really important. It's the value sets of politicians and whether those value sets fit with your value sets, and what polarities are emerging. I really do believe that the world evolves between competing ideas that synthesize and detach and conflict and compete and harmonize. And as change occurs, polarities become wider. And then we get consensus and we move forward. We are living in a period of incredible conflicts and tensions, in a world of human ideas and political ideas, and very little writing is occurring on political ideas. We still think of socialism and capitalism. And, really, politics has evolved to something much more different than that.

When I ran for Mayor in 1998, and again in 2002, and I have sympathy for anyone who does that and you should give a round of applause to Barbara and David and John and the others for standing for public office. It's an extraordinary personal commitment. I did something with a very predictable response. I had a theory that I wanted to test out. So I decided that the first thing I was going to, against the shock and anger of my campaign team, was to announce that I was going double arts funding in the city; a simple idea. The public responded to this with incredible hostility. The editorial cartoon in the paper the other day was Murray's public art campaign and it was a chalk drawing outlined a corpse on a street. It met immediately with the response that this flake is going to go out and spend money on public art, our City is going to go down the tube and, you know, this guy isn't serious about fixing the streets. It was an absolute statement that this wasn't about public art, that it was about wasteful spending and why isn't more money being spent on police and pipes and pavement. That really didn't surprise me. I decided to make it my personal mission in the middle of an election campaign, where I wasn't facing any competition. This dialogue actually changed that. It actually resulted in some democratic reaction from the utilitarian community. I'll tell you what I mean by that in a moment. But that was very important. And it spoke to the biggest challenge in creating change and creating a creative city.

I believe that active citizenship is the absolutely fundamental foundation of a civil society. A civil society isn't something that is invented out of osmosis. It is the personal decisions that you make. If you see yourself as a consumer and not a citizen, you will not live in a civil society. If you see yourself as a taxpayer and not a citizen, you will not live in a civil society. If you see yourself as a voter and not a citizen, then you will not live in a civil society. And a civil society is important and essential to a creative society. So if you are not out knocking on doors for a candidate, if you are not out asking tough questions at town hall meetings, if you are not drafting the most brilliant treatise on art as a regenerator of community and forcing that in the face of every candidate you come across, then you're not yet being a citizen. You live in this privileged era, which we unarguably inherited from our parents and grandparents who suffered through holocaust and war and poverty and displacement. We are the generation that is living with the greatest amount of material wealth, education and health of any generation to occupy our country's history. That doesn't mean we're all included. It does not mean that all ships have risen equally, but it does mean that we should be able to pass on a massive legacy to our children and grandchildren given

how much we inherited from people with so little. And if we cannot use our creativity to redefine this country and becoming a shining example in the world on this continent of what democracy in the small d biggest sense of the word, and inclusion and social justice can mean, then we have failed and we have really let down our children because we have no excuses.

We have a series of drives for increased funding. I want to tell you I am a fiscal conservative. In Winnipeg, we've gone from a government of 11,000 to 8,000 people. We've reduced our debt by a third. Our credit rating has gone from single A to double A. I do believe that government must live lightly on the land, must not occupy more space in the economy than is necessary and must deliver and support people creating change in their lives. To some people that will sound like a rather conservative notion. I'm also a radical liberal and an inclusionist in the way that I approach it and that is probably the only conservative thing about me. Because I really do believe that the point of government isn't to mount an endless amount of bureaucracy. It's to deliver community change, which means that you have to put the resources out in the community. It doesn't mean we spend a lot less, but we put a lot more control and resources back into community so that people can create change. And I'm going to give you some examples of what I mean by that. I just want to go very quickly through a number of policy initiatives that we're undertaking. We've got a public art strategy. We have doubled arts and culture funding and we have made our Arts Advisory Council a completely autonomous body. We've gotten politics out of art, at least the politicians out of art, maybe not the politics out of art. We have a comprehensive environmental strategy, a huge housing strategy. The community has built 1,000 new homes or rehabilitated them, not one built by government, all built by community, by people who live in citizen-created neighbourhoods. We're the only city in Canada that's a full partner in housing funding. We match the federal government dollar for dollar. We have a home grown economic development strategy based on local creativity, supporting local entrepreneurs and trying to develop exports out of our economy because that's the only way you create wealth, and the community is not moving the same dollar around the city, but is creating an idea or a product and selling it to somebody else and bringing new capital in, which finances more creativity. We have an equity and diversity strategy to reflect the face of our community and our government institutions and leadership. We have a comprehensive immigration strategy. We are the only city in Canada with a Memorandum of Understanding with the federal Department of Immigration. It supports a refugee program where we sponsor and accelerate the placement of refugees to our cities from areas that are war-torn or where people's lives are at stake. We also have a Centre Plan and a downtown development corporation that's a unique partnership, which assembles land for the redevelopment of education, cultural and entrepreneurial opportunities in our downtown, and which has been very successful. All of this is captured in a document called Plan Winnipeg. What we're doing right now is what everybody is calling the New Deal. As soon as you talk about how you pay for it, all of a sudden you get everyone's attention. We get 50 people out to the environmental public hearings. We get 650 people out to meetings about taxes, which tell you something about our value sets as well.

But I want to talk about three divisions, three value sets, three concepts that are creating tension in the world. In the last 300 years, when we stand back and look, we see massive change. When Canada was formed in 1867, we were a planet of empires, of closed mercantile trading systems. If you said to someone in 1870 within 50 or 60 years the empires of the world will fall apart and will be replaced with nation states and we'll all be autonomous elected democracies and there'll be this new polarity of nation states, they would have thought you were not sane. When I was born in 1957, if someone had suggested that some time in the next century, nation states would become weak shells of themselves and we would live in an increasingly integrated internationalised, globalised community where borders were less important and cities would emerge in the next century as power centres in clusters of activities, in the middle of Pierre Trudeau's national energy policy, tariff policy, strong borders, the United States' commitment to using armour and the Soviet Union's absolute centralising nationalism, you would have looked like a complete flake.

But I think by 2057 it will be an even more different world than it is now. If you look at the integration in Europe, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and how important cities are, you would conclude that the other end of globalisation is localisation. The idea that will resonate is that community capacity is the most essential determinant, and that we have gone from governing from the edge to governing from the centre. In the last century, and most of my lifetime, how big the armies were, how strong the tariffs were, how reinforcement occurred from the edges of countries and the borders determined personal, and economic, and military security. Today that doesn't matter. We can move capital on the internet in a split second and billions of dollars around the world. People can move across borders like never before. Cities have to be places of choice to live in and increasingly, we have to compete for citizenry, for talent, for creativity and investment like we and no other generation has before, because of the mobility of ideas, of people, and information technology capacity, which is instantaneous. Creativity is universalised and localized all at the same time. So in this century, strong universities, strong downtowns, great cultural institutions, healthy children, clean water, clean air, safe communities, strong entrepreneurial capital resources and support for diversity and human imagination become absolutely critical components. So rather than governing from the edge, we now govern from the centres, the centres of excellence, the clusters of human imagination and innovation and they are very urban. Cities are the most important tool nations have to build quality, success and prosperity in this century. But we don't think that way. We still have governments that are nation states, that are embedded in the ideas of governing from the edge and not governing from the centre. We have to change that in our generation.

There are certain realities those of us in civic government live with and I am going to present some slides. I'm going to do this very quickly, just to illustrate the great infrastructure deficit in my city. The goal is not to have fewer potholes, but to have no more next year. We would have to increase our spending by 188 million dollars in our system to do that. That would be a 54 percent tax increase on property taxes. We didn't think that was a good idea, at least not a successful re-election strategy. So You can see the huge efforts we're making and the shortfall. How do you pay for this problem? Here's the other

problem. If we lower the tax engines, we can't even afford the lubricant to keep the pistons going. 6.8% of revenues in my city – it's actually less Toronto – under six percent - of all taxes paid stay in the hands of local government. The Feds and the provinces do very well, Cities do not. You cannot sustain city governments on that small slice of the pie. You just can't. You can see it's shrinking. There's no country in the world in which cities don't retain at least a hundred percent more of the revenue that Canadians retain. Property taxes in the States count for about 20 percent of the revenues on average; 50 percent in Canada. What's happening to our great glorious huge slice of the tax pie? It's shrinking. It's been really fun being mayor through that. I mean we put it in red for a reason. You can imagine the envy I have looking at the escalating federal revenue which is being taken out of my community at a rate faster than the GDP is growing. The province is right behind them. So it's no wonder we talk about a national crisis that's affecting Toronto, which is experiencing the same crisis. As a matter of fact, in Toronto, you would see a GDP growth rate much faster than Winnipeg's because the economy is much stronger, and Toronto has much more access to larger pools of capital. In the nineties Winnipeg was declining in population; Toronto was growing. The federal and provincial governments will continue taking an even greater share. And no one points to them and asks for the kind of accountability that they ask for from us. We do service-based budgeting now. It's part of this New Deal. We broke our entire city government down into 136 different services. We took all the revenues we have and all the revenues we want and we rationalized revenues against expenditures. Police would be paid for with liquor taxes because 80 percent of police calls are liquor-related. We want a 7 percent liquor tax. After what I saw last night, if we had held this conference in Winnipeg, I think we would have done quite well. We need growth revenues. We want to replace dead-weighted property taxes with revenues attached to growth. So we want two percent of provincial income tax. We want a one percent sales tax. Sales tax is exempted from children's clothing and food - property taxes are not. Property taxes are a heavy tax on people's shelter, which is another basic need. We want radical reform of taxes. I'm not going to talk to you about that now. If you are interested, I'm coming back to Toronto some time to do a tax workshop. But I'll just leave that.

I want to talk about the other problem, the other polarity that I think affects creative cities and the ability to create arts and culture. There are two sets of ideas. One is the new dynamic of consumption politics and what I call intergenerational politics. In a consumption-based political system, where growth in the economy is measured and success is measured by how fast the economy grows and the growth of the GDP. That's your measure of success. In intergenerational politics you look at how much you have developed. I think Jack Diamond says this very well. It's difficult for mayors to sell an idea when only half of the capacity of your city's infrastructure is being used, and there is pressure to add on. That would be consumption. Ideally, you would use the maximum capacity of the infrastructure and the systems you've got so that they balance out before you expand. Consumption-based politics is based on increased consumerism and the mentality that every time there's a downturn in the economy, you should "Shop." Intergenerational politics is citizen-centered. It encourages citizens to get involved, create change, become more engaged, become more creative, find, and add value without

necessarily adding increased consumption of resources. Richard Florida speaks about that so well and Jane Jacobs and others, so I won't try to do that. Consumption-based fragments us as consumers and taxpayers. Intergenerational politics treats us as a whole person, as having a complex relationship with government, not simply the payer of government bills. Consumption politics is all about today, how much we consume today, what we are doing today. It's an instant gratification politic, which works well in four-year terms. Intergeneration politics is tomorrow-centered. What is the condition of our water? What do we want to pass on tomorrow to our children in water quality and air quality? How much is our deficit? How do we deal with how much of the money we're using today is being taken from future generations? And how do we rebalance our consumption in government? What are the deficits in education of children? What are the dropout rates? What do we pass on to the next generation? It is thinking in terms of tomorrow because everything that we do in government today has little impact on you. The big impact is on the next generation of Canadians, Americans and citizens of other parts of the world. Consumption politics, as I said, is really based on a set of values. And every single political party in the Federal Parliament today is consumption-based. There is no intergenerational politic that's real or central. To give you an example, GDP is an interesting thing. For example, you are going through a messy divorce, have a terrible relationship and have involved all kinds of lawyers in your lives, or you smoke heavily and don't exercise at all and live far away from work and drive a huge SUV every day. Boy, are you great for the GDP! Just think of all that economic activity that's registering as lawyer's fees and health care costs. That's all measurable economic activity. Now if you're walking to work and are fit and you have this nurturing loving relationship and you live close to work and you don't live out on the edge of urban sprawl but in this compact historic building that's been there for years that you've helped revitalize, you are terrible for the GDP. You are a GDP disaster area. Look at the average artists. Just what do they do for the GDP? I mean they don't I know they're all going for the glamour, the money and the limousines, but you have to think about value in a different kind of way. Now I'm going back to where I started with this entire idea of why do people react to ideas about art with satire about crime in the community? Well the other piece of it, I think, is what I call the polarity between utilitarian and creative value sets. If you have a set of utilitarian value sets that drive your politics and your politicians - and you saw that in a previous presentation when the first thing that happened when the Democrats lost and the Republicans got elected, was that all non-essential spending was frozen, and that wonderful Massachusetts modern art project was in danger of going right down the tube, because it was considered non-essential. Sewage treatment plants yes, but no more art. And that speaks to the utilitarian value set and it is pervasive in my community. When I moved to Winnipeg, I was in my late 20s, and I lived downtown in this cement block ugly building called Holiday Tower North. It's really a tribute to utilitarianism. There is no sense of design or warmth. It was pretty awful. And I looked out at a sea of parking lots. But then I went and got lost trying to find my way home. And I walked around the historic warehouse district and banking district and looked at the old parks and the old buildings and said, "They used to think about this city differently." They used to build amazing architecture and they lined the trees with these magnificent elms and they have this great sense of public space. There was a time when this city thought itself a great place to live. And then I looked at the new construction and the utilitarian, boring, poured

concrete formula of nowhere, at the sea of gravel parking lots that populated the central business district and I said "It's been a long time since people took pride." And then I got to understand the discount mentality that pervades many Canadian cities. Build it cheap, build it ugly. There is no tolerance in government to do it differently, and part of that is driven by taxes. If you impoverish city governments, you impoverish the cultural values and the economic possibilities for change, you create a utilitarian set of values. Utilitarian is price-based. Creative cities are value-based. Utilitarians, as Oscar Wilde would say, are the people who know the price of everything and the value of nothing. And I would argue that they run much of our governments today. And that by saving 10 percent and building it ugly, it means you are not leaving a legacy that anyone is going to celebrate. And when you think of the cities in the world that you want to go to and live in, where you'd want to spend your money, where you want to participate in the creation of wealth and ideas, they're the beautiful places. Can you image if Paris had built its bridges like Winnipeg did for 30 years? I mean just try to imagine wanting to go to the Île de la Cité across the midtown bridge if you've ever seen it in Winnipeg. The idea of utilitarian values is that geography of nowhere. It's the K-Marts, it's the 'everything looks the same'. And that is what city councils do to try and increase their tax base and because it's easy, and how can you be antidevelopment? Especially when you're poor. Number two: ethos and a sense of place. Every city's unique. When cities lose their sense of ethos Toronto has a history like no other city. It is a place different than any other place. It can be things that only Toronto can be. Winnipeg can be things that only Winnipeg can be because of its people, its geography. Because of what you've already got, you have a unique set of possibilities. If you have a utilitarian value set, the ethos of your city doesn't matter because you place no value on your history and you do not understand your present. What you want to be is just like everybody else. Utilitarian values are necessity-built. Build things that are only functional, the things that are necessary. A minimal cost to cross water, that's all a bridge is. Creative values look at beauty. Make it beautiful. As my friend Garry Hilderman says, "Make beauty necessary and make necessity beautiful". And I think that's true. And it's not a price value. I mean you can do cheap ugly and cheap beautiful. If you go to artists, they can do anything on a shoestring. Utilitarian values are about fear of difference. Creative values are about the celebration of difference. To be creative you have to entertain difference. If you are building utilitarian structures and only function, difference doesn't matter. As a matter of fact, it's annoying. We like cookie-cutter utilitarian, build them all the same. You can build them cheap if you can mass-produce them. Utilitarianism is about homogeneity, and creativity is about heterogeneity and diversity and mosaic as opposed to melting pots. And those value sets drive it; you will see it reflected in the Republican Party in the U.S. And when you see the impoverishment of cities, the inability, where every city government's major focus in Canada is trying to get through the next budget without raising property taxes and trying to build up more broken streets and insufficient policing, there's no creative capacity there, there's no long-term planning, there's no long-term engagement. The horizons are extremely short and your entire political process becomes gripped with crisis management. And you cannot eventually sustain even the growth and development levels that you have now. Tax pressures become the huge focus and that changes the relationship between elected officials and the public. They become taxpayers – the only relationship – because you can't provide them with anything else but a huge

backlog of un-repaired streets and broken-down parks and it becomes a question of how much am I paying? I don't feel like I'm getting value any more. So distrust sets in, right? People want referendums so city governments can raise taxes. The entire thing becomes a cynic-based taxpayer-based approach to government as opposed to a citizen discourse about citizen engagement, about values and about opportunity and about hope and partnership. There are also some really undermining ideas in a utilitarian culture that are very dangerous. Maybe I can give you an example of where I drew the line in the sand. There's a bridge in Winnipeg, which I'm very proud of, and it's referred to in the tabloid media as the "Mayor's million dollar crapper". There's a toilet on this bridge. We spent two years consulting our public. I wanted to start to build a city that people would take pride in. So we were replacing the Provencher Bridge that connects the historic centre of Saint-Boniface with the historic centre of Old Winnipeg and we wanted to realign the grand boulevards. We built this beautiful vehicular bridge so that people could drive their cars back and forth and all that kind of functional utilitarian stuff, all very important. Utilitarian values have their place. But we consulted the community and we got architects involved in building the bridge. We decided we wanted to build an inhabited bridge. There are only three in the world. The last one was built in 1770. So we wanted a bridge that you could walk on, dance on, sing on, eat on, have music on, have martinis on. And that was a kind of exciting idea. And we wanted to make it a really beautiful designed bridge. It's referred to as the 'Leaning Tower of Penis' right now. It has not been well-received by the utilitarians in our community because "what use is a bridge if you can't drive a car on it?" they ask. And all the plumbing for the restaurant and all the natural gas hook-ups cost about a million dollars but of course it came down to the toilet. When you've had three martinis, there is the need for a toilet and we in Winnipeg don't see ourselves as barbarians and thought the idea of indoor plumbing might be a good idea. I'm actually having inscribed plaques on both the toilets on this bridge that say, "This is where our value sets changed". This bridge and this toilet became the symbol of change. It challenged our community to take pride in itself again, to go back to building beautiful and to building people-centered structures and artistic structures and creative places. And we've done that with Red River College, which is a Brownfield Development.

There are three people I think have contributed very significantly to my thinking. One of them is Hannah Arendt, the author of *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, a trilogy of books. She's an amazing woman, if you ever had a chance to read her stuff. She starts with the Dreyfus Affair, the Rothchilds, the rise of fascism in Europe, and she attaches it to utilitarian values where religious spiritual diversity, human diversity, minorities, gays, and political diversity become irrelevant in the utilitarian system. Jane Jacobs talks a lot about the incredible need to regenerate cities. Many of you have read her and know her and hopefully celebrate her. Richard Florida's idea of creativity is an extension of that. But these are three people who attack the idea of utilitarianism. And it's like when I hear people arguing we need more immigration in Canada for economic reasons. Well, you know, my grandmother came here not for economic reasons, because all of her brothers and sisters were killed in war. And at 18 she didn't speak English. She wouldn't qualify to come to this country today because she doesn't speak English or French, doesn't have high school and doesn't have a tradable skill. But now if she had an engineering degree, we'd bring her, we

just wouldn't let her practise, that's all. It's like the whole gay marriage thing. Consider the arguments against it from the Alliance, who use the argument that gays don't have children. Well, okay, I don't know where you've been but let me see. The utilitarian value set for family is 'have sex to have children'. That's it. Now not being heterosexual, I won't even ask for a raise of hands of how many of these people's sex life is only about procreation. But that's the utilitarian value set. And as someone who's been a parent and taken a lot of children from relationships that didn't work out and prevented kids from ending up on the street, I love parenting. It's incredibly important. But it's not about why I love my partner. I don't want to have to reduce the intimacy of my love down to the utilitarian set. No more do I want to reduce my city's value set down to only those things that are functional. But we have a whole official opposition in Ottawa who is working from the utilitarian value set, which is why people like Joe Clark are appropriately disturbed because that is not the tradition of Bill Davis, you know, at least not when I lived in Ontario. And quite frankly I find it very disturbing and we ought to really worry if Mike Harris ever becomes Prime Minister of this country.

But to us as creative people, it's not that you want to attack utilitarian values. Most of the 188 million dollars that I'm trying to get is to fix sewers and to rebuild streets and replace bridges. You've got to do that. A lot of that money is to have more paramedics and more firefighters and more police officers because, you know, we need them. But if you only develop a three 'P' government – Police, Pavement and Pipes – you're dead in the water today. The average 25-year-old is going to look at you and say, "Mr. Mayor, your city sucks. It's boring!" You have to add value. And you have to invest in arts and culture and people. And again I'm not going to spend a lot of time on that because I think others have already done that. But I would just say ditto to all of that. So how do you create that creative capacity? Because if we have a utilitarian value set, and we don't challenge it, then the only purpose of immigration will be to grow the economy, art is propaganda, discourse and dissent interfere with efficiency and discipline and government, and as I said, families are for procreation. Utilitarian Gods and big-box religion is what we've become and it goes right in there with big-box retail. Functionality and consumption is what it's all about. And you get that sense now when you look at most of the development in the last 20 years in our cities that that's what's driven it. In Winnipeg, we did this tax new deal and we're trying to find more money for arts and culture and for creative and to do value-added, and in the process, we realized that we were taxing that poor healthy person in that nurturing relationship who rode his bicycle to work for all of our roads, all of our streets, all of our landfills on the value of his home. So we thought we should tax that guy more when he drove his SUV so in the plan, we put ten cents a litre on gasoline tax, five new, five existing. We cut bus fares in half. We raised the road rates. We charged for garbage. We reduced transit fares in half. We took all of the tax and user fees off quality-added, health-added, art-added creative activity. We eliminated our taxes on arts and culture. We put taxes on hotel rooms and taxes on liquor and those things as I said. And that was to shift our tax so that our tax revenue could reward activities and creativity in the community and penalise polluters and penalise people who speed through intersections and red lights. When you speed through, you get a huge ticket now from the city government. We're also trying to do something else.

Some things have become symbols, but I don't want to get lost in the idea. The bridge was a powerful symbol because as one engineer said, "You will never be able to build that bridge in this city and if you do, you will not get re-elected." I love challenges like that. Not only doubling arts funding, and I hope we can even go further than that, we introduced the public art policy. We did something that was very powerful. We took a group called Art City which does nothing but engage kids in the creation of art. It's a storefront operation right in one of the poorest neighbourhoods. One artist named Wanda Koop came along and said, "I want to engage kids." We gave them \$100,000 a year forever with no strings attached, and built it in. All they have to do is send us a letter every year telling us how they spent the money and we send the auditor out. And we find out they bought ten tons of plasticine and 35,000 gallons of watercolour paint and stuff like that. But it's not funded-driven. We're doing the same thing with Manitoba Theatre for Young People. It's not classrooms and it's not a structured program. It's just kids doing art. And we're trying to do that with incubator and residential programs for artists and those kinds of things. At the other end we're trying to build a Human Rights Museum. Not as Richard Florida suggested to be a dead place where we hang dead things, but to be a centre of learning about the journey of becoming Canadian, whether you were Aboriginal People who, when I was born, couldn't vote in this country, or Chinese people who just shortly before I was born couldn't participate because of the Chinese Exclusion Act, or Seiks who in 1908 lost the right to vote and didn't get it back for almost 50 years, or Jews who had quotas going on at almost every university in this country. We were not a country that celebrated diversity in my lifetime and I'm only in my early 40s. So it's been a huge change. We wanted to have this Human Rights Museum to be about social justice, human rights, art and creativity. We're trying to build it right now, trying to build a national institution not in Ottawa. It is the hardest thing to do. It's like only 20 percent of Canadians go to Ottawa. Do you think the 80 percent of us who don't want to fly zip could actually have cultures paid for by the federal government in our community? And I think it's important to our inclusion as a nation that our national cultural policies build powerful cultural institutions that can fund creativity, not more dead museums, not another war museum as important as those institutions are, but something that can be a foundation across the country. So I would disagree with some. You've got to do the Art Cities, but you know you need Sydney Opera House and the Guggenheim. You need transformational things. We just got rid of mosquitoes by larviciding for 20 kilometres. Twenty communities are now larvicided because I was tired of hearing about Winnipeg and mosquitoes. So they're gone now. You're safe to come. But you need a couple of cultural institutions and creative people, entrepreneurs of different types to transform the image of your city. Your waterfronts are important. Powerful, beautiful cultural institutions are important. This building was built by somebody who was pretty darn proud to be a Torontonian and felt that that kind of investment was celebratory and important as a high art form of citizenship. To all of you, look around the room. Look at each and every one of you. Look at your capacity. Look at the special gift that you have whether you're a politician, an artist, and a public administrator, whether you're a candidate or whether you're a voter, you're all citizens and you all have an unending imagination, an unending capacity for change and creativity. You can go back to your communities and be the drivers of a vision that can transform your community. And if you are infectious – I know, so many of you are – and if you can communicate as artists in your own personal sense, you can transform the

dialogue in your community and create something extraordinary. We are on the edge of a new renaissance in cities. This is the urban age. You are the architects of the new renaissance.

I want to thank you for getting together. I want to thank you for taking the time to participate in this. So God bless and keep you safe. And thank you for including me today.