



Exception and Deputization under Today's NDP: Neo-liberalism, the Third Way, and Crime Control in Manitoba

Andrew Woolford and
Jasmine Thomas*

This essay examines the discourses of crime and safety mobilized by Gary Doer's provincial NDP government between 1999 and 2009. Through a Foucaultian discourse analysis of statements made by Manitoba NDP members in the Legislative Assembly—in particular, the language and pre-conceptions drawn on by government members when speaking about matters of crime and safety—we assess the role of Third Way and neo-liberal rationalities of crime governance in a provincial crime-control assemblage that seeks to foster “security” beyond the limits of federally defined criminal law. Based on this analysis, we discuss how the Manitoba NDP is engaged in a process of deputizing public service and communities for purposes of crime control.

The specific contributions of this article are twofold. First, after exploring the blending of Third Way, neo-liberal, and social-democratic discourses in Manitoba NDP policy more generally, we illustrate how, when speaking about matters of crime control, the Manitoba NDP blends revanchist tough-on-crime rhetoric, neo-liberal notions of risk and responsibility, and Third Way–influenced integrated and managerialist approaches with traditional social-democratic positions. In particular, we highlight the ways in which the Manitoba NDP has combined these discourses to fashion an image of its government as one that can make Manitobans safer. Second, we point to “exceptional” moments within this rhetorical blending by exhibiting those instances in which the Manitoba NDP has sought to govern crime beyond the confines of criminal law, an arena of policy making over which it has limited control. We argue, in the end, that this blending of the Third Way, neo-liberal, and social-democratic moments, as well as the more frequent use of exceptions to the criminal law by the Manitoba NDP, has resulted in the deputization of public service and communities; that is, other government departments and community groups are increasingly asked to stand in for

* We would like to thank Bryan Hogeveen, R.S. Ratner, Amelia Curran, Mariana Valverde, and the three anonymous CJLS reviewers for their comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper. This research was made possible through funding from the SSHRC Standard Research Grant Program.

the criminal justice system and to act on behalf or at the behest of criminal justice interests.¹ To put it differently, the Manitoba NDP has sought to deliver crime control “at a distance,” enlisting to the task of fostering the image of safety and security in Manitoba a cadre of experts from fields complementary to criminal justice.²

The Manitoba NDP

Even prior to its electoral victory in 1999, Gary Doer’s NDP began to position itself as a tough-on-crime party. Gord Mackintosh, as opposition justice critic for the Manitoba NDP, castigated the Progressive Conservatives (or Tories) not for their harsh criminal justice policies but, rather, for the ineffectiveness of these policies. The Tories, in Mackintosh’s portrayal, had allowed car thefts to increase dramatically, gangs to gain a stronger foothold in the province, and downtown Winnipeg to become more bereft of foot traffic because of public fears of crime in the city’s core. According to Mackintosh, rather than be tough on crime, the Tories had been negligent in their responsibility to find ways to make Manitobans safer and more secure, and had too often resorted to blaming the federal government for not implementing sufficiently punitive measures. In short, the Tories had failed to use the provincial powers at their disposal to take real action. Upon election, the Manitoba NDP presented itself, in contrast, as a government dedicated to using all of its powers to fight crime.

Of course, the Manitoba NDP faces some specific challenges with respect to formulating crime policy. In debate within the Legislative Assembly, the Manitoba NDP must respond to the law-and-order questioning delivered by the Tories, now in opposition. As well, the Winnipeg media, and in particular the two main newspapers, the *Free Press* and the *Sun*, tend to take a sensationalized and punitive stance on the issue of crime. It is also important to recognize the particular challenges of crime control faced by provincial/territorial governments, which play a secondary role to that of the federal government in defining criminal law, as spelled out by the Constitution Act of 1867. In short, it is the federal government that creates, amends, and repeals criminal law, while the provincial governments are charged with its administration. For this reason, provincial governments looking to profit by being tough on crime are drawn toward using their existing domains of authority as well as toward reframing a host of social policies to serve the purpose of crime control.

In addition, it is not a new development that the Manitoba NDP should shift away from what might be considered more left-leaning policies—in this case, approaches to crime that focus on the structural issues that create criminogenic social conditions. The Manitoba NDP has long had to compromise

¹ Donncha Marron, “Money Talks, Money Walks: The War on Terrorist Financing in the West,” *Policing 2* (2008), 441.

² Peter Miller and Nikolas Rose, “Governing Economic Life,” *Economy and Society 19* (1990), 1.

some of its leftist sensibilities in order to get elected. Previous NDP governments led by Ed Schreyer and Howard Pawley exhibited what Christopher Adams refers to as “practical moderation”—a tradition of moderation within the party intended to keep its representatives from appearing to be a radical fringe.³ This tradition involves an emphasis on fiscally responsible economic policies alongside a continuing commitment to welfare-based ideals. After the downfall of Pawley’s progressive NDP government in 1988 under accusations of irresponsible spending, however, Gary Doer rebuilt his party by combining the tactic of practical moderation with neo-liberal and Third Way discourses.

Commentators often characterize Manitoba’s former premier Gary Doer as strongly inspired by Tony Blair’s Third Way politics.⁴ The term “Third Way” refers to an attempt to transcend the division between socialism and neo-liberalism by balancing an acceptance of the necessity of the market economy with efforts to ameliorate its impact on those most vulnerable to its fluctuations. But this amelioration tends to target individual behaviours rather than the structural causes of poverty and uncertainty. This is evident in the way Third Way politics reformulates the relationship between individuals, communities, and their rights, using the principle of “no rights without responsibilities” to guide state and citizen interactions.⁵

Under Doer’s leadership, the Manitoba NDP, like reformed social democrats elsewhere, reinvented itself as “Today’s NDP,”⁶ echoing the British Labour Party’s “New Labour” sloganeering. Under this rebranding, “crime control and safety” became a fundamental mantra. Indeed, much like New Labour in Britain,⁷ Today’s NDP worked hard to represent itself as tough on crime, like its Tory opponents, yet without completely surrendering its social-democratic focus on the causes of crime. In effect, the Manitoba NDP, like New Labour, drew on a Left Realist perspective that responds aggressively to public fears of crime and the crime experiences of victims.⁸ Indeed, taking inspiration from New Labour’s promotion of “the Active Community,” through which individuals, community groups, and public agencies are responsabilized to the tasks of local governance,⁹ the Manitoba

³ Christopher Adams, *Politics in Manitoba: Parties, Leaders, and Voters* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2008), 128.

⁴ Jim Stanford, “Social Democratic Policy and Economic Reality: The Canadian Experience,” in *The Economics of the Third Way*, ed. Philip Arestis and Malcolm C. Sawyer (Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2001), 99; Jordan Timm, “The Gary Doer Phenomenon,” *Macleans*, May 24, 2007, http://www.macleans.ca/article.jsp?content=20070524_111541_5896.

⁵ Anthony Giddens, *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1998), 65.

⁶ Brian Bergman, “A Case of Prairie Pragmatism,” *Macleans*, September 20, 1999, 24.

⁷ See Ian Brownlee, “New Labour—New Penology? Punitive Rhetoric and the Limits of Managerialism in Criminal Justice Policy,” *Journal of Law and Society* 25 (1998), 313; N. Fairclough, *New Labour, New Language?* (London: Routledge, 2000).

⁸ Adam Crawford, “Joined Up But Fragmented: Contradiction, Ambiguity, and Ambivalence at the Heart of New Labour’s ‘Third Way,’” in *Crime, Disorder and Community Safety: A New Agenda*, ed. Roger Matthews and John Pitts (London: Routledge, 2001), 54.

⁹ See Jack Straw qtd. in Crawford, *ibid.*, 56: “We are trying to develop the concept of ‘the Active Community’ in which the commitment of the individual is backed by the duty of

NDP has sought to involve the public and victims more directly in the project of crime control.

But would it be fair to describe the Manitoba NDP as simply implementing a rigid Third Way crime-control formula? While there are definite borrowings from the Third Way, the reactive nature of governance has required the Manitoba NDP to draw on a larger repertoire of policy positions. Such a blended and contingent approach to crime governance has produced provincial discourses of crime that are located in multiple and often contradictory political rationalities, including those associated with neo-liberalism and traditional social democracy.

Neo-liberalism, Social Democracy, and Crime Governance through Exception

Several studies have examined the ways in which social democracy and neo-liberalism are entwined in the present era and have sought to explain social-democratic governments' embrace of neo-liberalism.¹⁰ While some suggest that we are witnessing the emergence of a distinct and new social-democratic policy orientation geared toward state intervention in the market for purposes of increasing labour-market participation,¹¹ others fear the severe weakening of social democracy in the face of neo-liberal ascendancy.¹² In particular, the mediating role of Third Way discourses between the poles of neo-liberalism and social democracy has been noted, especially with respect to the degree to which these discourses accept the market economy as central to contemporary societies.¹³

Neo-liberalism is premised on the work of thinkers such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, who promote the minimal involvement of the state in the market and the value of an individual autonomy unburdened by collective duty.¹⁴ As economic practice, however, neo-liberalism is often

all organizations—in the public sector, the private sector, and the voluntary sector—to work toward a community of mutual care and a balance of rights and responsibilities.”

¹⁰ See Claes Belfrage and Magnus Ryner, “Renegotiating the Swedish Social Democratic Settlement: From Pension Fund Socialism to Neoliberalization,” *Politics and Society* 37 (2009), 257; W.K. Carroll and R.S. Ratner, eds., *Challenges and Perils: Social Democracy in Neoliberal Times* (Halifax: Fernwood, 2005); Andrew Gamble and Tony Wright, “Introduction: The New Social Democracy,” *Political Quarterly* 70 (1999), 1; Christoffer Green-Pedersen, Kees van Kersbergen, and Anton Hemerijck, “Neo-liberalism, the ‘Third Way’ or What? Recent Social Democratic Welfare Policies in Denmark and the Netherlands,” *Journal of European Public Policy* 8 (2001), 307; Andrew Glyn, ed., *Social Democracy in Neoliberal Times: The Left and Economic Policy Since 1980* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Will Hutton, “New Keynesianism and New Labour,” *Political Quarterly* 70 (1999), 97; J.M. Ryner, “Neo-liberalization of Social Democracy: The Swedish Case,” *Comparative European Politics* 2 (2004), 97.

¹¹ See Green-Pedersen et al., “Neo-liberalism, the ‘Third Way’ or What?”

¹² See Alex Callinicos, *Against the Third Way: An Anti-capitalist Critique* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001); Nicos Mouzelis, “Reflexive Modernization and the Third Way: The Impasses of Giddens’ Social-Democratic Politics,” *Sociological Review* 49 (2001), 436.

¹³ See Shane Fudge and Stephen Williams, “Beyond Left and Right: Can the Third Way Deliver a Reinvigorated Social Democracy?” *Critical Sociology* 32 (2006), 383.

¹⁴ Jason Hackworth and Abigail Moriah, “Neoliberalism, Contingency and Urban Policy: The Case of Social Housing in Ontario,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30 (2006), 511.

violated in its implementation as it is advanced within, and adapts to, a variety of social situations. This is, indeed, part of the genius of neo-liberalism, insofar as it does not simply impose itself from without as a master framework for social and economic life but, rather, morphs so as to incorporate local economic and political tendencies and thereby extend its reach.¹⁵ This mutability is evident in the ways in which actors reshape neo-liberal rationalities, making them distinct in their local implementation.¹⁶ It is also noticeable in the lack of uniformity and coherence within neo-liberalism, as principles—such as those touting the importance of state non-interference in the market—are violated in order to promote the interests of neo-liberal capitalists.¹⁷ Finally, the mutability of neo-liberalism is illustrated in the ways it coexists with other competing rationalities, such as neo-conservatism.¹⁸ In sum, one should not expect a wholly consistent and coherent political discourse to define neo-liberalized government policy; instead, a variety of discourses is likely to be mobilized in pursuit of overarching neo-liberal goals.

The adaptive character of neo-liberalism is further captured in the work of Aihwa Ong, who defines neo-liberalism as a set of “mobile calculative techniques of governing that can be decontextualized from their original sources and recontextualized in constellations of mutually constitutive and contingent relationships.”¹⁹ This definition draws Ong to conceive not only of spaces of neo-liberalism but also of various types of exception within neo-liberal rule. In particular, she speaks of “neoliberalism as exception,” whereby neo-liberal calculations are introduced into sites to manage and administer populations previously spared or shielded from its governing logic.²⁰ As well, she identifies as “exceptions to neoliberalism” practices and policies designed to exclude or protect populations from the market-driven rationalities of neo-liberalism.

The focus on exception complements a governmentality studies analytic that places discourse within a space of complex and contingent relations rather than in a uniform political totality.²¹ For example, Richard Ericson's

¹⁵ Aihwa Ong, *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); John Clarke, “Dissolving the Public Realm? The Logics and Limits of Neo-liberalism,” *Journal of Social Policy* 33, 1 (2004), 27.

¹⁶ See Helga J. Leitner, Jamie Peck, and Eric S. Shepard, eds., *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers* (New York: Guilford Press, 2007); Katharyne Mitchell, “Transnationalism, Neoliberalism, and the Rise of the Shadow State,” *Economy and Society* 30, 2 (2001), 165; Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore, “Cities and the Geographies of ‘Actually Existing Neoliberalism,’” in *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe*, ed. Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002).

¹⁷ See Jamie Gough, “Neoliberalism and Socialisation in the Contemporary City: Opposites, Complements and Instabilities,” in Brenner and Theodore, *Spaces of Neoliberalism*, 58; Leitner et al., *Contesting Neoliberalism*; Yvonne Hartman, “In Bed with the Enemy: Some Ideas on the Connections Between Neoliberalism and the Welfare State,” *Current Sociology* 53, 1 (2005), 57.

¹⁸ Bob Jessop, “Liberalism, Neoliberalism, and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective,” in Brenner and Theodore, *Spaces of Neoliberalism*, 105; Pat O'Malley, “Volatile and Contradictory Punishment,” *Theoretical Criminology* 3, 2 (1999), 175.

¹⁹ Ong, *Neoliberalism as Exception*, 13.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Nikolas Rose, *The Powers of Freedom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

description of social regulation under neo-liberalism notes an emphasis on risk and crime prevention that shifts greater responsibility toward individual and other self-governing entities.²² Under these conditions of risk, prevention, and responsabilization, new modalities of criminalization are employed to impute dangerousness to certain aggregates, extending the reach of law. For example, Ericson describes the phenomenon of “counter law,” manifest in laws that circumvent existing laws and thus enable governance to overlook legal rights and protections that may obstruct crime control.²³ In addition, law extends its reach through practices of surveillance that allow for further data and information gathering on perceived “risky” subjects. Like Ong with her notion of neo-liberalism as exception, then, Ericson identifies not only the presumed characteristics of neo-liberal governance but also the ways in which neo-liberalism enlists a variety of spaces and strategies in the task of advancing crime control. We suggest that such practices of exception or counter law are of great appeal to provincial governments with limited jurisdiction over matters of crime and are therefore integral to the deputization of public service. Moreover, neo-liberal patterns of risk-thinking and responsabilization are central to the strategy of deputization through which more and more governmental and community agencies are directed toward the pursuit of crime-control objectives.

Thus, whereas a traditional social-democratic vision is often associated with welfare-era rehabilitative strategies that target not only individual offenders but also the broader criminogenic conditions that contribute to offending behaviour,²⁴ contemporary social-democratic approaches to crime control have come to be more politicized and alarmist,²⁵ more responsabilizing,²⁶ and directed toward the management and reform of individuals rather than of structures.²⁷ In this sense, the supposedly middle-ground approach of the Third Way appears consistent with neo-liberalism, promoting crime policies that seek to intensify everyday controls and inculcate notions of citizen and community responsibility. Indeed, several studies have noted the responsabilizing regulatory efforts of British “New Labour,”²⁸ under which crime control

²² Richard Ericson, *Crime in an Insecure World* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007). See also Richard Ericson and Kevin Haggerty, *Policing the Risk Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); Pat O'Malley, “Risk, Power and Crime Prevention,” *Economy and Society* 21 (1992), 252.

²³ Ericson, *ibid.* Laws of possession that target certain populations of drug users, allowing for their incarceration despite the fact they have not been caught in the actual act of using the banned substance, are one example.

²⁴ See Fergus McNeill, Nicola Burns, Simon Haliday, Neil Huton, and Cyrus Tata, “Risk, Responsibility and Reconfiguration: Penal Adaptation and Misadaptation,” *Punishment and Society* 11 (2009), 419.

²⁵ See Henrik Tham, “Law and Order as a Leftist Project?” *Punishment and Society* 3 (2001), 409; Stuart Waiton, “Policing after the Crisis: Crime, Safety and the Vulnerable Public,” *Punishment and Society* 11 (2009), 359.

²⁶ Daniel Gilling, “Community Safety and Social Policy,” *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 9 (2001), 381.

²⁷ Brownlee, “New Labour—New Penology?”; David Garland, *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

²⁸ See Elizabeth Burney, *Making People Behave: Anti-social Behaviour, Politics and Policy* (Cullompton, UK: Willan, 2005); Daniel Gilling, *Crime Reduction and Community*

has become a central fixture of governance transposed across all government ministries and community agencies and not located solely in Departments of Justice. The Manitoba NDP has been engaged in a similar project, albeit one shaped by its specific provincial context.

A Note on Methodology

Our analysis begins in 1999, when Gary Doer and the NDP were elected, and continues to the end of 2009, when Doer left office to become Canada's ambassador to the United States. Hansard transcripts available online from the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba were selected as the primary data source, since they offer a glimpse of the public justifications employed by NDP government members when discussing policy decisions in the face of opposition challenges and perceived public crises.

Three interrelated steps were taken to carry out this project. First, we scanned Hansard transcripts from the Manitoba Legislative Assembly (including throne speeches, budgets, oral questioning, estimates, Committees of Supply, and members' bills) to extract passages with some potential relevance to the issues of crime and safety on which we focused (i.e., housing, social assistance, homelessness, crime, inner-city conditions, addictions, children and youth, and community development). Second, we reviewed these data with a focus on discussions in which Manitoba NDP members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) sought to encapsulate the reasoning behind their policies. These statements were most frequent at certain moments (e.g., in throne speeches, during oral questioning debates, and on the introduction of new legislation). Moreover, it is in these statements that Manitoba NDP MLAs most clearly expose the truth claims, operative rationalities, and taken-for-granted assumptions that guide their policy-making efforts. Third, we examined and indexed these extracts to key in on sections in which discourses of crime and safety were mobilized in neo-liberal, Third Way, social-democratic, or blended terms, as well as moments when major policy themes were contradicted or contested by members of the Manitoba NDP government.²⁹

The analytical method employed in this study is a Foucaultian discourse analysis,³⁰ which is guided by concern for the presuppositions embedded in

Safety: Labour and Politics of Local Crime Control (Cullompton, UK: Willan, 2007); Gordon Hughes, *The Politics of Crime and Community* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

²⁹ Susan Ainsworth and Cynthia Hardy, "Critical Discourse Analysis and Identity: Why Bother?" *Critical Discourse Studies* 1 (2004), 225. Thus, our analysis remains attuned to emergent and contradictory themes so as to capture more fully the contested nature of political meaning-making. As well, what we present below are not rare statements that conveniently fit our overarching thesis but, rather, emblematic statements that reflect the point of saturation in our data collection, in the sense that the discourse presented in a selected quotation was captured in several statements (approximately 3–5) of which the chosen statement is representative.

³⁰ See generally Julianne Cheek, "At the Margins: Discourse Analysis and Qualitative Research," *Qualitative Health Research* 14 (2004), 1140; James A. Holstein and Jabar Gubrium, "Interpretative Practice and Social Action," in *The SAGE Handbook of*

thought and language and their role in constituting subjects and regimes of truth.³¹ It also draws on elements from the related field of critical discourse analysis (CDA), which serves to remind us that discourses are multiple and are often used for strategic and resistive purposes.³² Presupposed here is an understanding of discourse as “a set of common assumptions that sometimes, indeed often, may be so taken for granted as to be invisible or assumed.”³³ In other words, discourse is

[a] group of statements which provide a language about a topic and a way of producing a particular kind of knowledge about a topic. Thus the term refers both to the production of knowledge through language and representations and to the way the knowledge is institutionalized, shaping social practices and setting new practices into play.³⁴

In this essay, our emphasis is on the neo-liberal, Third Way, and/or social-democratic discourses employed within an expanding universe of crime control, as well as on the ways in which exception and counter law are mobilized within these frameworks.

The Third Way, Neo-liberalism, and Deputization for Crime and Safety

The Manitoba NDP has promoted an “integrated” approach to dealing with individual risk factors that can lead to criminal behaviour. Thus, public safety is not the sole responsibility of a specific ministry, such as the Ministry of Justice. As former minister of justice Gord Mackintosh argues,

An effective justice system is part of our government’s overall strategy for building safe and stable neighbourhoods. Achieving this end will require action on all fronts including suppression, prevention and education. Other ministers will tell you more about and describe the Healthy Child Initiative, for example, and the Neighbourhoods Alive! initiatives that are focusing on prevention and education through proactive community-based programs. The Justice Department’s role has traditionally been geared more to the

Qualitative Research, 3rd ed., ed. Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2005), 483; James Joseph Scheurich and Katherine Bell McKenzie, “Foucault’s Methodologies: Archeology and Genealogy,” in Denzin and Lincoln, *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 841; Kevin Stenson and Paul Watt, “Governmentality and ‘the Death of the Social’: A Discourse Analysis of Local Government Texts in South-East England,” *Urban Studies* 36, 1 (1999), 189; Glyn Williams, *French Discourse Analysis: The Method of Post-structuralism* (London: Routledge, 1999).

³¹ Rainer Diaz-Bone, Andrea D. Bührmann, Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Werner Schneider, Gavin Kendall, and Francisco Tirado, “The Field of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis: Structures, Developments and Perspectives,” *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 8, 2 (2007), <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0702305>; Stenson and Watt, “Governmentality and ‘the Death of the Social.’”

³² See generally Ainsworth and Hardy, “Critical Discourse Analysis and Identity”; Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (London: Longman, 1995); Gavin Kendall and Gary Wickham, *Using Foucault’s Methods* (London: Sage, 1999); Michael Meyer and Ruth Wodak, eds., *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. (London: Sage, 2001); Teun A. Van Dijk, ed., *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies 1 and 2* (London: Sage, 1997).

³³ Cheek, “At the Margins,” 1142.

³⁴ Paul du Gay, *Consumption and Identity at Work* (London: Sage, 1996), 43.

suppression element of the broader strategy. This government believes that there is room for a more balanced approach which combines suppression with crime prevention and support to communities. Firm action with respect to serious and violent crime can be balanced with community-based justice approaches that, in appropriate cases, can both be more effective in eliminating offending behaviour and certainly more satisfying to the victim.³⁵

Here the “joined-up” approach of British New Labour is reframed as an integrative and cooperative strategy. But whereas some commentators have wondered if this means that crime “may begin to lose its privileged position among other social problems,”³⁶ we suggest that under the auspices of a provincial government it reflects the potential deputization of other governance areas to the job of crime control. Since crime is a subject of great political import, and the perception of inaction on the crime front can be detrimental to a provincial party’s electoral prospects, it has become increasingly necessary for crime and justice concerns to colonize these other fields of governance. As a further example, take the following passage in which Mackintosh, as minister of justice, makes the case for an expanded project of crime prevention:

So when it comes to crime prevention, one should not look only at the efforts of justice departments, for example, but also what is taking place in areas of education and employment, indeed housing and community development generally. What we see developing over the course of the mandate is a greater emphasis on a balanced approach to public safety. We see a greater emphasis on crime prevention or stopping people from getting involved in crime in the first place through social development as well as reducing opportunities for crime in environmental design.³⁷

On the surface, such an integrated approach is appealing, especially because criminologists have long argued that criminal justice is too narrowly focused to address the broad social problem of crime. Along these lines, the limiting language of crime is often replaced in Manitoba NDP discourse by the strategic theme of “security,” which provides the semantic means to expand the issue of crime and relate it to issues of education, community, families, health, and housing:

Security, like education and health care, is a basic human need and a prerequisite to full participation in society. As a first step, we must ensure that Manitobans feel safe in their homes and in their

³⁵ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 1st Sess, Vol 50 No 41 (June 7, 2000), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/1st-37th/vol_041/h041.html (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

³⁶ Roger Matthews and John Pitts, “Introduction: Beyond Criminology?” in *Crime, Disorder, and Community Safety: A New Agenda?* ed. Roger Matthews and John Pitts (London: Routledge, 2001), 5.

³⁷ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 1st Sess, Vol 50 No 42B (June 8, 2000), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/1st-37th/vol_042b/h042b.html (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

neighbourhoods, and that our justice system is working for all our citizens.³⁸

Security is framed as an essential component of life that enables responsible citizenship. An integrated approach to crime control built upon the language of security, however, does not mean that the Manitoba NDP has directed its efforts toward an assault on criminogenic social conditions, such as patterns of income inequality and Indigenous exclusion. In fact, the goal is not empirical security of a sort that provides individual and community certainty in the face of precarious social conditions (e.g., a temperamental job market and economy) but, rather, a *feeling* of security that is predicated on a politics of inclusion/exclusion. Amidst a surfeit of media images and stories of crime, as well as of politicians reacting to cases that represent sensationalized anomalies in criminal justice, a collective sense of insecurity is fostered, leaving citizens feeling even less secure and thus more open to regulation.³⁹ Under these conditions, responsible citizens are constituted as potential or actual victims of crime whose lives are persistently endangered by the criminal Other,⁴⁰ who is either deemed incorrigible and in need of aggregate management or treated as a “transformative risk subject” to be brought in line with the prevailing normative order.⁴¹ Thus, the expanded crime-control strategy implemented under the Manitoba NDP’s integrated approach broadens individual regulatory measures rather than increasing attention to the multiple structural inducements to illegal behaviour.

Under conditions of perceived insecurity, aggregate problem populations identified through “evidence-led” or “evidence-based” research, such as youth, are targeted as a source of criminal risk, regardless of the underlying structural processes of unemployment, flexibilization, and social disconnection that produce risk. The targeting and criminalization of youth are particularly evident in the “tough on crime” rhetoric used by the Manitoba NDP in response to the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA).⁴² In such moments, party members were prone to abandon their broader crime-prevention sensibilities and offer rhetoric designed to demonstrate a no-nonsense approach to crime control. In the words of Gord Mackintosh,

I think that the new sentencing provisions [YCJA] can undermine confidence in the court system because the provisions do not afford

³⁸ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 1st Sess, Vol 50 No 2 (November 25, 1999), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/1st-37th/Vol_002/h002_1.html (Hon Peter Liba). This passage is excerpted from the Speech from the Throne delivered on November 25, 1999.

³⁹ Jonathan Simon, *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

⁴⁰ Waiton, “Policing after the Crisis.”

⁴¹ Kelly Hannah-Moffat, “Criminogenic Needs and the Transformative Risk Subject: Hybridizations of Risk/Need in Penalty,” *Punishment and Society* 7 (2005), 29; Patricia Gray, “The Political Economy of Risk and the New Governance of Youth Crime,” *Punishment and Society* 11 (2009), 443; Garland, *The Culture of Control*; Malcolm Feeley and Jonathan Simon, “The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and Its Implications,” *Criminology* 30 (1992), 449.

⁴² RSC 2002, c 1.

adequate protection for the public from dangerous young offenders. They give a misleading impression, by the way, and this should not be understated, of the impression of the length of the custodial sentence imposed.⁴³

Here the minister of justice emphasizes the dangerousness of young offenders, revealing the bifurcated response the Manitoba NDP has developed for dealing with so-called at-risk youth. The approach involves a seemingly contradictory strategy, which, on the one hand, broadens crime control through multi-departmental risk-management policies directed toward those youth perceived to be less dangerous while, on the other hand, demanding that the federal government create tougher measures for repeat or violent offenders—a passing-the-buck argument often used by provincial governments across Canada.

The nature of the provincial/federal relationship does not, however, prevent the Manitoba NDP from taking credit for high prison rates. Indeed, former minister of justice Dave Chomiak has boasted about Manitoba's high incarceration rate:

We have more people incarcerated now in Manitoba than any other time in our history. We have more police on the streets than any other time in our history. We have more Crown prosecutors than any other time in our history, and the crime rate went down eight percent last year—eight percent.⁴⁴

The Manitoba NDP thus represents itself as using those justice powers that it does have control over, such as Crown prosecutors and provincial corrections, toward an assertive policy of crime suppression. These are not soft-hearted leftists seeking to remedy a criminogenic society, the image suggests, but tough-minded crime fighters.

The combination of “tough on crime” and integrationist/preventative approaches to crime control cannot simply be viewed as a faithful rendition of the New Labour slogan to “be tough on the causes and consequences of crime”—a phrase used by left-leaning politicians throughout Europe.⁴⁵ Instead, the Manitoba NDP's local application of Third Way policy demonstrates how readily these discourses merge with neo-liberal notions of responsabilization and governance at a distance. For example, the Manitoba NDP focus on empowering communities through programs like Neighbourhoods Alive!, which provides funds to community-based agencies to address local matters such as safety and health, and Lighthouses, which opens school gymnasiums and community centres for youth-based evening activities, combines

⁴³ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 3d Sess, Vol 52 No 45 (June 10, 2002), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/3rd-37th/vol_045/h045.html#ms (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

⁴⁴ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 38th Leg, 5th Sess, Vol 58 No 24 (April 10, 2007), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/5th-38th/vol_24/h24.html#iob (Hon Dave Chomiak).

⁴⁵ Tham, “Law and Order as a Leftist Project?”

with a desire to devolve responsibility for risk management and reduce bureaucracy in certain areas of governance, as the following statement reveals:

Our Government believes in a community-based crime prevention program designed to develop partnerships among youth, police, justice personnel and the community in order to promote opportunities for youth to get involved in pro-social, recreational and crime prevention activities. Programs like Lighthouses have tremendous benefits for participants. A Statistics Canada survey of children and youth recently concluded that children who participate in organized activities outside of a school tend to have high self-esteem, interact better with friends and perform somewhat better in school.⁴⁶

Such programs are often described in terms of cooperation with the community, but governance goals are typically assumed to be synonymous with community goals—as seen, for example, in the latter part of the passage quoted above, where it is assumed that the community needs to work primarily on the character and conduct of local youth. In another example, a party member states,

I also love the idea of children and youth in the Lighthouse systems. In my former life, when I was working for Frontier School Division, a lot of what we did was we did community access programs where people in the community use the schools after hours. I have a philosophy. A busy kid is a good kid. So when you have activities like school plays, when you have gym nights, when you open the facilities for kids, what you do is you then create an environment where kids are busy. They are not getting into trouble. Then, instead of having huge costs in justice, instead of having huge costs in cleaning up the mess, what you do is you provide positive experiences for kids. It is proactive, it is intelligent activities.⁴⁷

In these examples, one can observe responsabilizing rationalities at work alongside a desire to reduce the costs of government. None of these statements is inconsistent with a Third Way approach to encouraging citizen responsibility and community involvement; but they are also indistinguishable from general neo-liberal goals.

But this does not mean that social-democratic values from the NDP's welfare era have been entirely purged. Although much of the Manitoba NDP discussion of crime prevention is targeted toward "at-risk" children and youth through programs designed to assist parents in the project of conventional socialization (e.g., Healthy Child Manitoba) or to engage young people in pro-social activities (e.g., Lighthouses), these efforts are occasionally

⁴⁶ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 38th Leg, 2d Sess, Vol 54 No 8 (December 1, 2003), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/2nd-38th/vol_08/h08.html#ms (Harry Schellenberg).

⁴⁷ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 1st Sess, Vol 50 No 29 (May 17, 2000), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/1st-37th/vol_029/h029.html (Jim Rondeau).

reframed through the logic of social welfare rather than that of community downloading or responsabilization. For example, when questioned about his crime reduction strategy in June 2002, Gord Mackintosh stated, with social-democratic inflection, that

[s]afety is not only about stronger policing, it is also about stronger employment opportunities. It is not only about stronger prosecutions; it is also about stronger early childhood education. Safety is not only about stronger corrections; it is also about housing initiatives and stronger neighbourhoods. It is not only about stronger laws, but it is about greater hope and opportunities for Manitoba youth.⁴⁸

Any of these statements could be taken to refer to the need to address the structural conditions of injustice in Manitoba. But in 2003, Mackintosh instead returned to individualizing the project of safety:

I will just conclude by saying that we recognize more than ever before the need to partner with and empower Manitobans in all walks of life, in different capacities to have crime prevention as an objective, everyone from schools, notably parents; everyone who volunteers with a youth organization, perhaps; citizen patrols; neighbourhood watch organizations; community justice workers; volunteers . . . We all have a role to engage youth and pass on community values to our youth, to pass on our ideas of limits and expectations of community behaviour.⁴⁹

Under this logic, all young people are potentially at risk of engaging in illegal behaviour, and therefore a societal response is needed that mobilizes a spectrum of individuals, social services, and institutions toward the task of responsabilizing youth. Employment, education, housing, and hope have all been deputized to this task.

In this manner, Third Way and neo-liberal discourses within Manitoba NDP political rhetoric are inconsistent, and remnants of a social-democratic past still emerge. For example, some members present the devolution of social programs to communities as an opportunity for local empowerment and improved welfare. Along these lines, in response to the 2003 budget, Marianne Cerilli (MLA for Radisson) stated,

I am proud that we created the Healthy Baby program so that low income moms can have food when they are pregnant and support when they have their children. These are our Government's real crime prevention programs because more police are great but more

⁴⁸ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 3d Sess, Vol 52 No 56B (June 27, 2002), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/3rd-37th/vol_056b/h056b.html#oq (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

⁴⁹ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 38th Leg, 1st Sess, Vol 54 No 5A (September 11, 2003), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/1st-38th/vol_05a/h05a.html#csj (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

police are not going to prevent crime. The only way to prevent crime is through social development and economic equality.⁵⁰

Here she reiterates a risk-based and deputizing line, but then expands it to suggest that social development and economic equality, and not merely individual responsabilization, are the keys to crime prevention.

Thus, vestiges of social-democratic thinking continue within the Manitoba NDP, and not solely using Third Way terminology. Several Manitoba NDP members still imagine an exception to neo-liberalism, albeit a minor one, whereby the social safety net is preserved in order to support those citizens disadvantaged by market-induced social inequality. But these moments are rare, and the Third Way influence tends to draw the Manitoba NDP more toward a neo-liberal rationality of governance whereby the responsabilization and cross-departmental management of the population takes priority. In this way the broad-based approach suggested through discourses of integration and security is compromised by a tendency toward individualization and responsabilization.

Exceptions and the Manitoba NDP

In the course of its integrated approach, and in order to deputize public-service and community actors, the Manitoba NDP has also drawn on techniques of exception that allow for civil measures to be directed toward the task of crime control. In this section we identify exceptions existing within Manitoba NDP political discourse by combining Ong's concept of neo-liberalism as exception with Ericson's discussion of counter law. Thus, we conceptualize "exception" here in terms of laws that are created to overcome the limitations of existing federal crime laws, as well as new techniques of surveillance that offer the province greater opportunity to regulate targeted groups.

Crime Control Beyond the Limits of Law

It is no surprise that exception should hold appeal for provincial governments, which have little control over the codification of criminal law but nonetheless experience a great deal of public pressure to ensure safety. In this sense the Manitoba NDP has embraced the general societal trend toward the increased use of civil regulation and surveillance for purposes of crime control. In the words of former minister of justice Dave Chomiak, "every civil authorization possible has been done on this side of the House to deal with crime."⁵¹ For example,

[t]he *Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Act* is the first of its kind in Canada and designed to help make our neighbourhoods safer. The

⁵⁰ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 4th Sess, Vol 53 No 16 (April 25, 2003), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/4th-37th/vol_016/h016.html#oq (Marianne Cerilli).

⁵¹ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 38th Leg, 5th Sess, Vol 58 No 24 (April 10, 2007), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/5th-38th/vol_24/h24.html#iob (Hon Dave Chomiak).

act makes property owners accountable and targets residential and commercial premises that habitually threaten people's safety and adversely affect people living in a neighbourhood or a community. The act places responsibility on property owners for activities occurring on their property.⁵²

This legislation has been used by activists in various neighbourhoods, including Sel Burrows, who has been celebrated at the provincial and municipal levels for his grassroots effort to chase prostitution, crack houses, and gangs from the Point Douglas community. In particular, the Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Act allows local actors to close down houses that are being used for illegal purposes. Unfortunately, the fallout has at times meant that homeowners and renters beset by unwanted visitors have been wrongly ostracized by their neighbours. It is also the case that those removed under this legislation often simply move other marginalized regions of Winnipeg. Nonetheless, the act enables the province to address crime concerns that, in strict constitutional terms, are primarily the legislative responsibility of the federal government. In 2008, MLA Rob Altemeyer boasted that

[o]ur Safer Communities and Neighbourhood[s] Act has shut down 280 crack houses, drug dens, sniff and prostitution homes. This was legislation that the opposition ridiculed and now it's been very successful and other jurisdictions across Canada are copying it.⁵³

By focusing on violations of the quasi-criminal laws that are the purview of the province and deputizing the community to act as the front line of this crime-control strategy, the Manitoba NDP is able to demonstrate to the public an assertive approach toward perceived inner-city disorders.

Schools have also been targeted for regulation through the Safe Schools Charter, which allows for the introduction of police into schools and requires schools to establish codes of ethics. Likewise, the Manitoba NDP have established the Turnabout program:

Canada's first province-wide initiative to provide help and consequences for youth under age 12 who would otherwise have been charged under the laws of the land is becoming a full-time piece of the Manitoba justice system, following the pilot project over the last 18 months ... that pilot project actually dealt with 361 children under age 12, connecting them to existing youth resources. What I am very pleased about is that this program can be instituted full time now with an investment of \$94,000. That is because this

⁵² Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 3d Sess, Vol 52 No 38 (May 28, 2002), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/3rd-37th/vol_038/h038.html#ms (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

⁵³ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 39th Leg, 2d Sess, Vol 61 No 31 (April 28, 2008), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/2nd-39th/vol_31/h31.html#ms (Rob Altemeyer).

program is the hub in the wheel of many services serving children that already exist and provide excellent services in Manitoba.⁵⁴

These children previously beyond the reach of the criminal justice system are now brought under an expanded crime-control umbrella through a program that bridges family services with crime prevention. Through such programs, the Manitoba NDP presents itself as using its limited jurisdiction to counteract the perceived insufficient criminal justice policies provided by the federal government, particularly with its promise of “consequences” for youth under the age of 12.

With respect to surveillance, early in the Manitoba NDP’s government the minister for urban affairs suggested that this was not the route they would take to deal with inner-city crime; she presented the NDP’s deputized approach as an alternative to surveillance:

I can assure you that guard dogs and video cameras on every street corner in the inner city are not the way that this government is going to go. We are going to build on the strengths of the people of the inner city. We are going to rebuild the housing, and we are going to make that commitment that that government never made.⁵⁵

In fact, however, techniques of surveillance have also been mobilized under the Manitoba NDP to advance crime-control objectives. Indeed, under the Manitoba NDP, programs of restorative and community justice are deployed as components of a local surveillant assemblage. For example, as minister of justice Gord Mackintosh redefined community policing and community justice in a manner that foregrounds its role in public surveillance:

Often the calls for police assistance come from very few residences in a community. Where an officer can be attuned to that, know where people, for example, on probation may live, know people who are at greater risk of criminal behaviour, they can then take a role in trying to stop crime before it happens. As well, I know that partnerships can develop between elements in the community, whether they are schools or community centres, whether it is a justice committee . . .⁵⁶

Completing this picture of community-based surveillance are citizen patrols:

Citizen patrols are a very important part of the changing justice system of Manitoba. I strongly believe and I know that, for example, Chief Ewatski of the City of Winnipeg Police Services strongly agrees that the citizen patrol program of Manitoba continues to offer tremendous opportunities, but we have to look to see how we can provide greater

⁵⁴ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 38th Leg, 2d Sess, Volume 54 No 28 (27 April 2004), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/2nd-38th/vol_028/h028.html#oq (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

⁵⁵ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 1st Sess, Vol 50 No 14 (December 14, 1999), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/1st-37th/vol_014/h014.html (Hon Jean Friesen).

⁵⁶ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 1st Sess, Volume 50, No 42B (June 8, 2000), http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/1st-37th/vol_042b/h042b.html#oq (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

supports and recognition for our citizen patrols who are eyes and ears for police.⁵⁷

In sum, despite its limited jurisdiction over criminal matters, the Manitoba NDP has deployed techniques of counter law and increased surveillance as exceptional means to advance regulatory goals and to represent itself as being well prepared to fight crime. This strategy involves delegating crime responsibilities to deputized sectors of the public sphere and offloading these responsibilities to communities that operate as both the enforcers and the eyes and ears of a seemingly boundless crime-control strategy.

Conclusion

In this article we have provided a glimpse at the particular ways in which neo-liberal rationalities have become entwined with Third Way and social-democratic politics in Manitoba. By employing an open definition of neo-liberalism, and through the notion of exception, we have sought to paint a picture of the influence of neo-liberalism as a mutating economic and political rationality, while also portraying it as comprising potentially contradictory notions. The Manitoba NDP, as Canadian political parties go, has certainly not been vicious in its embrace of elements of neo-liberal doctrine; the massive cuts and rollbacks experienced under neo-liberal Tory governments have not been witnessed under "Today's NDP." But the logic of neo-liberalism has had an impact on policy making in Manitoba, and this is clearly evident in the way the Manitoba NDP's crime-control policy is simultaneously broadened and individualized, thereby deputizing multiple sectors of the public and community realms to the task of responsabilization.

The objective of crime control has stretched across multiple provincial ministries and informed government-community relations. Like New Labour, then, the Manitoba NDP has embraced crime control as a fundamental government concern and has worked diligently to make safety and responsibility pillars of the Manitoba NDP approach to governance. But unlike those who wonder if this trend signals a lessening of the priority of crime in contemporary government, we see it as reflecting crime's increasing relevance, especially at the provincial level of politics. It is in this sense that we speak of the deputization of public and even community service, as ministries such as Education, Family Services, Healthy Living, and Housing and Community Development are enlisted to the task of promoting a responsabilized safety. While on one level this partnered approach to crime control can be viewed as a holistic response that recognizes the broad structural conditions that produce crime and public insecurity, on another, this view is confounded by the fact that these efforts are only superficially directed at contending with the causes of crime, as demonstrated by the rarity of traditional social-democratic statements addressing structural causes of crime in our discourse analysis. Rather than identifying social

⁵⁷ Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, *Debates and Proceedings (Hansard)*, 37th Leg, 2nd Sess, Vol 50, No 19 (April 25, 2001), http://www.gov.mb.ca/hansard/hansard/2nd-37th/vol_019/h019.html (Hon Gord Mackintosh).

conditions that give rise to criminal behaviour, the deputization of the public service directs government ministries toward the broader management and responsabilization of targeted or risky populations.

This deputization is currently felt by community-based non-profit agencies through a government funding structure that offloads programming once provided by government onto community agencies, then imposes accountability mechanisms such as outcomes measures that require any funded agency to demonstrate how its interventions are affecting a predetermined at-risk population. Under these circumstances, agencies providing services ranging from youth centres through homeless shelters to employment-assistance programs must demonstrate that potentially unsafe individuals are indeed passing through their doors to receive pro-social programming. In interviews conducted subsequent to the drafting of this article,⁵⁸ one respondent informed us of the funding hierarchy whereby health, education, and safety are known to be the province's funding priorities, and agencies therefore strive to have their services associated with one or all of these policy areas. Another respondent likened the combination of offloaded programming and the demand for accountability measures to outsourcing to India: non-profit agencies are asked to offer services previously provided by government and then to be fully accountable for delivering these services in a manner that satisfies government goals, yet without having the full resources of government at their disposal. Finally, we have also come across several instances of agencies' taking on deputized tasks, such as a "drunk tank" housed on the premises of a homeless shelter and building "weekend jail" and remand housing on agency premises to attract government contracts. In these and many other cases, we see agencies both attempting to take advantage of the funding opportunities made available through deputization by emphasizing how their programming holds the potential to foster safety and striving to meet government accountability demands to demonstrate that they are refashioning the thoughts and actions of at-risk individuals.

The minimal persistence of social-democratic discourses of crime and social welfare within Manitoba NDP rhetoric, as well as the imperfect blend of neo-liberal and Third Way rationalities that is more apparent in their thinking, is not, in our view, evidence of an exploitable weakness for those who would like to see a transformed approach to crime and justice in Manitoba. While minor resistances may be mobilized in the fissures created by the contradictions and contrasts in Manitoba NDP crime-control policy, the fluid and adaptable nature of such rationalities of government allow neo-liberal governments to rapidly address oppositional challenges, presenting the prospect of an ever-growing responsabilization of the social universe through the continued

⁵⁸ This article is part of a three-stage project examining the effects of neo-liberal social regulation in inner-city Winnipeg. The first stage, to which this article belongs, examined federal, provincial, and municipal policy with respect to safety and crime control. The second stage included interviews with community agencies providing services to inner-city residents. The third stage, recently completed, involved interviews with inner-city service users to gauge their experiences of responsabilization.

deputization of other realms of community life. If such a movement is to be undone, it will require an equally broad-based strategy of refusal and resistance to the deputization of government and community services, one that forcefully rejects the colonization of the social by crime-control thinking.

Abstract

This article examines the discourses of crime and safety mobilized by Gary Doer's provincial NDP government in Manitoba between 1999 and 2009. Through a Foucaultian discourse analysis of statements made by Manitoba NDP members in the Legislative Assembly—in particular, the language and preconceptions drawn on by government members when speaking about matters of crime and safety—the authors assess the role of Third Way and neo-liberal rationalities of crime governance in a provincial crime-control assemblage that seeks to foster “security” beyond the limits of federally defined criminal law. Based on this analysis, the authors discuss how the Manitoba NDP is engaged in a process of “deputizing” public service and communities for purposes of crime control.

Keywords: neo-liberalism, crime control, the Third Way, exception, Manitoba

Résumé

Cet article examine les discours du gouvernement néo-démocrate provincial de Gary Doer relatifs au crime et à la sécurité publique au Manitoba durant les années 1999 à 2009. À partir d'une analyse foucauldienne des déclarations des membres du NPD à l'Assemblée législative du Manitoba—particulièrement, du langage et des idées préconçues des membres du gouvernement lorsque ceux-ci abordent des questions relatives au crime et à la sécurité—nous examinons le rôle de la troisième voie ainsi que les arguments néo-libéraux de ce gouvernement, à savoir un parti provincial cherchant à contrôler le crime et à ériger la sécurité au-delà des limites du droit pénal fédéral. Suivant cette analyse, nous démontrons comment le NPD du Manitoba tente de contrôler le crime par l'entremise d'un processus d'inféodation du service public ainsi que des communautés.

Mots clés: néolibéralisme, contrôle du crime, la troisième voie, exception, Manitoba

Andrew Woolford
Department of Sociology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2
Canada
E-mail: andrew_woolford@umanitoba.ca

Jasmine Thomas
Department of Sociology
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB
Canada
E-mail: jthomas@ualberta.ca