

WRITTEN REFLECTIONS: FYSM 1502.B

8. "Quebec's Maple Spring and the Future of Student Activism"

Question: "Do you think that the government had the right to revoke the students and their fellow protesters basic fundamental freedoms in accordance to Bill 78?"

THESIS:

I do not think the Quebec government has the right to revoke students and protesters right to freedom of assembly.

EVIDENCE:

As freedom of assembly is a basic fundamental freedom, it is not right that ANY government take that away. The fact that the police are also allowed to not just arrest protesters but to give them high fines, upward of \$500, on any budget, for protesting is absurd.

ANTITHESIS:

On the other hand, I can see where the government was coming from in the fact that they wanted to put an end to the protests and regulate them in order to make it the most safe it can be for all those involved.

SYNTHESIS:

However, I still believe that it should not even have been discussed as to whether they could enact Loi 78. To me, it is ridiculous. That would be like taking away someone's freedom of religion, freedom of association, or freedom of thought. Every Canadian, as stated in the Constitution Act of 1982 is entitled to the rights listed above and the right to peaceful assembly. Quebec may not always think they are part of Canada, but much to their dismay, they still are. So, they SHOULD follow our laws. As it seems, they like to make up their own.

=====

Thesis: the government had no right to revoke from the students and protestors their basic fundamental freedoms under Bill 78 during the Maple Spring student protests.

Evidence: from a legal standpoint, the lawfulness of Bill 78 was deemed unconstitutional by Louis Masson, the head of the Quebec Bar Association (Global Research, 2012). Bill 78 essentially blotted out the only effective method to protest the financial standoff, the method and right of freedom of speech. In addition to legality of the government's actions, it is also viewed by some as completely unnecessary as a means of generating revenue. The movement was considered to "[have] everything to do with ideology and very little to do with economic conditions." (Rosenfeld, 2012). The government was said to have many other different ways to generate revenue rather than raising tuition, instigating a student strike, and then taking away the student rights.

Antithesis: the movement itself was not entirely peaceful protest, and not considered completely lawful. The movement "has responded to police aggression by trashing government offices and corporate windows, building barricades and ripping up concrete to heave onto police lines" (Rosenfeld, 2012). This lawlessness from the protestors, to a certain extent, justified the revocation of the right for protesting, since there was violent protest. The major justification for revocation of freedoms of the protestors by the government and the police was as a safeguard against violence. The "inability of the police to contain the protests led to unpredictability and the occasional use of violence" (Pavlova, 2013).

Synthesis: Despite the need to safeguard against the potential for protest violence, the repressive measures used by the government and later the police to restrict freedoms of the protestors were unjustified. The lawfulness of the restrictions were in serious question during the Maple Spring, and it was deemed that there were other methods for the government to retrieve revenue to regulate the economy, rather than through the commodification of education through higher tuition prices.

=====

No. We've been reading about protests all year long, and at this point, if a government retaliates by taking away the right to free speech, to expression and assembly, it really just seems like a really lazy way to simply not manage the issue whatsoever. But if a protest gets too dangerous, too violent, and too inconvenient, at what point does a government have the right to properly manage the situation and dissolve the protest all together?

Perhaps the key question is not whether or not it was right to- I think the question lies in whether or not it is even reasonable to enact such a bill. In Quebec, with its left-leaning pro-education stances and its protester spirit, the Bill actually worked against the government by drumming up more support for lower tuition and strengthening numbers within the protest itself. Solty's article highlights the bill backfiring: "Emergency Law 78 boomeranged on the government. Many citizens who originally did not approve of the strikes now supported the protests." In Quebec, it was evidently unreasonable, and to them, not right, to revoke these rights.

However, in any other province or government, without a strong union of student associations and labor unions, a bill such as this one may have flown under the radar. Low tuition movements do exist in Ontario, but they are seemingly less strong. The lack of support shows in the numbers itself- Quebec's low tuition is the result of decades upon decades of negotiation and protest, whereas Ontario's tuition fees continue to rise year by year. Again, as Solty's article states, "...the chances for successful protests are considerably greater if they are not based solely on spontaneity but rather on long-term organization." Quebec's left-leaning protest culture is strong. It was this misjudgment on behalf of the PLQ that costed them the election. But this kind of bill would have been reasonable if it weren't for the very nature of Quebec. If the citizens are politically complacent, they would be more likely to simply not notice if their rights were being revoked.

Ultimately, in specific Western democracies, a government can only go so far to limit fundamental rights. Democratic rights may be limited to avoid protests, but as seen here, the democratic right to a vote works stronger than most grassroots protests will. With other governments, where there is more voter apathy and complacency, and less politically motivated networks, fundamental rights will continue to be easily restricted. The key factor is how politically minded the people are.

=====

Thesis:

The government did not have the right to revoke the students and their fellow protestors their basic fundamental freedoms in accordance to Bill 78.

Evidence:

As people of Canada, we are entitled to certain rights and freedoms. The freedom of expression and the freedom of peaceful assembly are fundamental rights that are within the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which is entrenched in our Constitution. The Constitution is the highest level of law and those fundamental rights cannot be infringed upon unless there is a reasonable justification. Bill 78 is an “emergency law designed to be valid for one year” (Solty 2012). It made a small “...reference to ‘national security,’ [which] enabled the police to forbid events and enacted a complete ban on assemblies at universities. In addition it severely limited university workers’ right to strike...the law aimed to paralyze the main actors and organization taking part in and driving the resistance...” (Solty 2012). The Maple Spring protests was the largest display of civil disobedience in civil history. The protests were peaceful and were aimed at stopping the tuition fees from being raised. The students had a grievance with the government and they have the right to make that grievance known by protesting. The protests were really only violent on the side of the police who employed tactics of “... concussion grenades, pepper spray, batons, kettling and mass arrests...” (Rosenfeld 2012).

Antithesis:

Well, who is to say that the government had no right? All rights and freedoms are allowed to be infringed upon with a reasonable explanation. The protests were with such large numbers and not all of them were peaceful; there was “a minority [who]

responded to police aggression by trashing government offices and corporate windows, building barricades and ripping up concrete to heave onto police lines” (Rosenfeld 2012). It was enacted in order to protect people- for “national security” (Rosenfeld 2012). Since when was it wrong for a government to try and protect its citizens?

Synthesis

Sure, some people on the side of the protests did get violent but this was a small number, a minority. Regardless, this does not and should not have allowed the government to quash something that is a *fundamental* right. There is no reasonable explanation to explain why the Bill would be justified at all. The enactment of the Bill got the correct reaction from the Quebec population, in that many people, even those who did not support the protests originally, suddenly showed their support (Soly 2012). The government, however, did not seem to learn from their mistakes the first time. A municipal by-law called P-6 was passed in May 2012 but only really enacted and used in 2013. This by-law allowed police to shut down demonstration as soon as they started. This once again infringes upon people’s fundamental freedoms- the freedom of expression and the freedom of peaceful assembly (Pavlova 2013). These freedoms are entrenched in the Constitution not only to protect people from one another but also to protect people from the State. However, the people of Quebec are not allowed to even have a peaceful assembly without being shut down. They are being

exploited of their rights by their government. We live in a democracy not a dictatorship and the citizens have a right to make their grievances known.

=====

A protest named the Printemps Érable or the Maple Springs, in reference to the Arab Springs and Canada's national symbol, came to light in Quebec in response to proposed raised tuition fees and is gaining national attention. Groups such as Coalition large de l'Association pour une Solidarité Syndicale Étudiante (CLASSE) and others came together to form the Red-Hand Coalition, which strived to coordinate protests and raise awareness about the issues around rising tuition fees. These strikes attracted immense amounts of people to become one of the largest strikes in Canadian history and lasted for a record-breaking amount of time. Therefore, the government was feeling a lack of control that made them put in place a Bill that revoked these students of their fundamental freedoms, such as the freedom to protest. This Bill was unjust and improper in my opinion, and causes for greater attention about unfairness towards our society.

The Parti Libéral du Québec (PLQ) of Premier Jean Charest announced that tuition fees would increase 75%, from \$2168 per year to \$3793 by 2017. This sparked an immense bout of discussion and a call for action in the province in Canada that already has the lowest tuition, Quebec. As Canadian citizens we are guaranteed a set of rights according to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. "Loi 78" is an emergency law designed to be valid for one year. It ended the current academic year by means of a directive and limited freedom of assembly. Although not illegal, the call to put Bill-78 in place is completely unjust as it strives to take away the rights of the students who are attempting to create a change. In my opinion, the implementation of this Bill is completely unfounded as, according to many resources, this strike was mostly non-violent and therefore was not harmful to the officers or other members of society.

Not everyone sees this struggle from the side of the protestors however. Some people have named this strike the "Spoiled Children Protest" because Quebec has the lowest tuition in North America, therefore since these students want it lowered then they are just being greedy. As well, other members of Quebec especially may view this entire protest as a grievance, of crowding the streets and causing a scene, therefore having this

Bill put in place will put an end to the chaos. However, as the spokesman of CLASSE said, when people learn more about the protest, they realize that it is not just spoiled children on strike, but that they have a reasonable cause to protest. As well, it is important to note that the province with the cheapest tuition fees already is fighting so hard for them to remain low, as this can explain why they were like that in the first place. These students have a passion and drive to keep secondary education affordable like no other province and will not allow for members of the government to put them into crippling debt. This struggle, although annoying for the protestors and other citizens of society, is necessary for creating a change and making sure that our values are upheld.

As Canadian citizens, we have the right to protest and try to change the things in society that we do not like, such as a potential increased tuition. The fight for lower tuition fees does not just help students escape the debt they are now almost guaranteed if attending secondary school but help raise employment availability and wages. It has been shown that 60% of students leave college/university with a debt and this is fundamentally unjust as we are supposed to be a knowledge society but the high costs of education is sabotaging people from reaching their full potential. This strike strives to create a more equal and affordable society for everyone, with a lasting transformation through continuing austerity measures. This movement is very important as it shows

that students do have power to implement a change and start a nation-wide movement to help almost everyone in society to have a better life.

=====

In my opinion, I do not believe that the Quebec Government had the right to deny the student protestors and other protestors that participated in the Maple Spring, their fundamental freedoms.

The first reason I believe that the Government did not have the right to do so is because the student protestors of the Maple Spring uprising had a reason to protest. In my opinion I believe that the students who participated in this movement had the right to do so because in the Royal Commission it clearly states that Quebecer's have the right to free education, so why would the Quebec Government go against it and raise the tuition over one grand more per student over the course of five years? In the article by Rosenfeld it is stated that the Quebec Government could make tuition for University free because it would take only 1% of Quebec's taxes to pay for a free University tuition. Hearing this, if I was a University student at the time, I would be angered because instead of dedicating one percent of taxes to free tuition for University the Quebec

Government believes that it would be more fair to raise the fees over five years so that Quebecer's can receive a "better education". That is nonsense, because as it also states in the Rosenfeld article, Quebec is almost 10% higher in post-secondary participation than any other Province in Canada, which shows that having tuition at a low fee makes it more accessible for people to pursue post-secondary careers. So by the Government enacting Bill 78 because students are protesting student fees is not reasonable at all, because the students are just expressing how much more beneficial it would be if tuition fees stayed the same or was lowered.

Contrary to the ideology that the Government did not have the right to take fundamental freedoms from the protestors of the Maple Spring, some people do believe that it was necessary. The first reason that it was deemed necessary to do so was because when the protestors were protesting outside of Universities campuses they were denying students who weren't participating in this mass protest the ability to attend class. I believe that by enacting Bill 78 due to these purposes was necessary because although the protestors have a right to protest and state their opinions, I do not believe that they should be able to deny other people from doing what they want (or

pursuing their own interests). Furthermore, the protest on May 22nd, 2012 marked the largest civil disobedience in Canadian history when over 400,000 people showed up throughout the day and over 1000 got arrested. In my opinion, this obviously gives the Quebec Government a reason to enact Bill 78 because this event showed that the people who participated in the Maple Spring uprising would stop at no lengths to get what they wanted (to not have an increase in tuition rates). Although this event was unprecedented, it could have sparked an even larger civil disobedience that could have caused chaos throughout Canada, so it was only justifiable with the Quebec Government enacting Bill 78 because it allowed the Police to shut down any mass protest that was taking place due to the Maple Spring immediately and not have another civil disobedience stunt like the one on May 22nd, 2012.

Although, the Quebec Government had some reason to enact Bill 78, especially due to the mass civil disobedience that happened on May 22nd this does not mean that the Quebec Government truly had the right to take away fundamental freedoms of the protestors. These protestors that were participating in the Maple Spring had reason to do so because they were expressing their feelings of disgust towards the Quebec Government's idea in raising tuition fees for University since they are the lowest paying Province in Canada, but also North America. By taking away people's right to freedom of expression that is clearly stated in the Charter, the Quebec Government was technically asking for the largest civil disobedience stunt to happen because by taking

that away obviously people will be mad and want to react by doing the opposite which is what the Maple Spring protestors did. Therefore, this is why I believe the Quebec Government did not have the right to take away fundamental freedoms of the Maple Spring protestors.

=====

Thesis: The government did not have a right to revoke protestors and student's fundamental freedoms in accordance with Bill 78.

Evidence: What is at stake in the Maple Spring is the ability of the protestors' freedom of speech. A theme too common in other mass protests similar to the Maple Spring, freedom of speech is a constitutional right under section 2 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The police's actions were exaggerated and irrational in proportion to the peaceful protests of the students, with a series of concussion grenades, mass arrests and kettling bouts (Rosenfeld, 2012). Furthermore, students have cited the government's inability to address the concerns of free education in Quebec, a fundamental right in the Quebec educational system that was still not met by the provincial government (Tremblay-Pepin as cited by Rosenfeld, 2012), yet the government chose a different path by limiting the students' ability to express the infringement of this right. In this respect,

the government chose to respond to an irrelevant issue that further muffled the fundamental constitutional rights of not only the students, but the people of Quebec, taking a step in the wrong direction.

Perhaps the government's attempts to muffle the rights of the students is existent due to the unwillingness of the government to pursue free education for its citizens. "If education, as neoliberals gladly emphasize, is the key to social mobility in the 'knowledge society,' then it should not be dependent on the pocketbooks of parents" (Socialist Project, 2012). A job that is seemingly supposed to be accomplished years earlier by the government is still a dream for students.

Antithesis: The government was perhaps justified in muffling the rights of students and protestors. Appropriate measures were needed in ensuring a safer society in Quebec and a more tolerant community. As it currently stands, in order for police to apprehend protestors in Quebec streets, they must come up with a good reason to do so (Pavlova, 2013). This meant that police were delayed in stopping any discriminatory protests, which are highly damaging in nature to the views of the overall Quebec community

and must be dissolved as quickly as possible. Police need to do their work more efficiently in order to ensure minimal damage and maximum result.

As for education, the student's perhaps took a massively radical approach to voicing their concerns, which is disproportionate to the actual issue at hand. The provincial government points toward the drastic changes needed to accommodate free education, including increases in taxes and introduction of new taxes to accommodate free education (Rosenfeld, 2012). Therefore, rational changes must be embraced instead of ideological changes, with rational changes having better overall effects on Quebec society.

Synthesis: Regardless, the government and the police have infringed on the fundamental rights of the students and protestors. The very existence of prospects of danger and discrimination in Quebec society is the very reason for the existence of protests, where protestors call out the social inequalities. As established in cases like *R. v. Fearon* and *R. v. Vu*, police already have adequate tools to serve and protect communities. The students were justified in expressing an inequality that has been existent for decades, where other countries including Germany have flourished due to

the existence of free education. Taxes are not the only way to accommodate budget changes in favour of free education; redistribution of the current budget is one of several ways to accommodate free education. As a result, students and protestors are fully justified to call out the inequalities in education and are fully justified to express and propose an idea that is proven to work in other countries.

=====

No, though we see governments taking fundamental freedoms away from their citizens all over the world this doesn't mean the government should have the right to. The government should not be able to take away a humans right to agency because that's what makes us human and what creates social change. I do not believe that access to free post secondary education is an obscure idea. Brazil, Germany, Finland, France, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden all provide free tuition, while some only charge for registration¹. Jesse Rosenfeild reports that Simon Tremblay-Pepin, of the Institute for Socio-Economic Research and Information said "It's written in the most fundamental text of the Quebec educational system that there should be free education."² So why not fight for what students deserve. If this course has taught us anything it's that to create social change sometimes people have to break a few rules in order to make something right. Besides, a lot of the protesters aren't even fighting for free education, the neoliberal protesters say that "social mobility in the "knowledge society," [...] should

¹ Zaid Jilani, "Looking to Escape the High Cost of College? These 7 Countries Will Educate You for Free," *Alternet*, October 31st 2014, accessed March 28th 2015, <http://www.alternet.org/education/looking-escape-high-cost-college-these-7-countries-will-educate-you-free>.

² Jesse Rosenfeild, "Quebec's Maple Spring," *NowToronto*, May 3rd 2012, accessed March 28th 2015, <https://nowtoronto.com/news/quebecs-maple-spring/>.

not be dependent on the pocketbooks of parents”³. The strike itself is only against raising the tuition, and for that they should protest.

I suppose one of the large arguments against my case is that their tuition is already so low, at \$2168 per year⁴ and is only increasing by \$1,625 over five years⁵. Comparatively, my tuition in Ontario is somewhere around \$6000-\$7000 per year and we don’t have any large strikes about our tuition, if we do, none the size of Maple Spring. I think that because Quebec has such low tuition already it is even more important for Quebec to strike while their tuition is so low in order to attempt to move closer to free education. If Ontario had a strike it would be difficult to make such a drastic change to free education from Ontario’s student fees, vs. Quebec.

³ Ingar Solty, “Canada’s “Maple Spring”: From the Quebec Student Strike to the Movement Against Neoliberalism,” *Global Research*, December 31st 2012, accessed March 28th 2015, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/canadas-maple-spring-from-the-quebec-student-strike-to-the-movement-against-neoliberalism/5317452>.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Jesse Rosenfeild, “Quebec’s Maple Spring.”

=====

Thesis: No, I do not believe the government have the right to revoke the fundamental freedoms of the citizens in this protest through the enactment of Bill 78.

Evidence:

1. By enacting this bill, the government is breaching citizens' freedom of expression. According to section 13 of the Charter, freedom of expression allows individuals to participate in peaceful associations. Therefore, in enacting Bill 78, students and protestors are being denied a very fundamental right without significant justification. (cife.org)
2. The movement is well grounded, and well led, thus there is no reason protestors shouldn't be allowed to exercise their fundamental freedom let alone have it taken from them. For example, the protestors are fighting to make their case that the economic crisis is being shifted upon them instead of the government. The students are being forced to do the job of the weakening government commitment, and thus they are driven by a legitimate cause to protest. (global research)
3. The government is abusing its powers.

Antithesis: Yes, the government should indeed have the right to revoke the fundamental freedoms of the Maple Spring protestors as a way of fulfilling their duty

1. Police have a duty to protect public safety. In this protest, the safety of the protestors as well as the public were being compromised. For example, protestors were harmed with tear gas, concussion grenades, and battons; while the protestors trashed government offices, and broke corporate windows. Both the safety of the protestors and the general public, as well as the police, were in danger and thus police took the necessary measures to ensure they fulfilled their duty to protect and promote order.

Synthesis: The people involved in the Maple Spring protests were participating for a very substantial cause, and it is presumable they were aware of the dangers that come with being involved in a mass demonstration like the one in Montreal. Thus, in a democratic society they should be free to protest without government interference in accordance with Bill 78.

=====

Before I begin I feel the over whelming need to compare this to a two year old child throwing a temper tantrum. Why? Because Mommy and Daddy wouldn't pay for the toy they wanted. So they stand there and scream and cry because they aren't getting their way. What one can only pray for is that this child will one day grow up and realize that getting upset is not going to make your parents drop everything and buy you that toy. Quebec. You are the child, the government is you parents and tuition is your toy. Grow. Up.

I think the government of Quebec is right in limiting the freedom of protestors. They have a duty to protect the citizens of Quebec, which I believe should come above the right to protest. Yes, many students were protesting but not all of them were and they were preventing those who wanted to go to school to do so. Everyone is entitled to their opinion but it needs to be carried out in a civilized manor. The situation in Quebec

was getting out of hand so the government was trying to make a change to get it under control. The students who were protesting were unhappy but that's what you would expect. They did what they had to do.

Tuition in Quebec is already lowest in the country and according to Jesse Rosenfeld of Now Toronto when their students leave university they're average debt is a little more than 10,000 dollars lower than Ontario students. No one likes to pay more money for anything but prices go up whether we like it or not. It makes sense that the students were unhappy, who wouldn't be? But it is a simple fact of life and they need to accept it and move on. Instead they spent 14 weeks parading around Montreal protesting. Protesting is great; it forces the world to pay attention. But that's all it does. It gets attention but it's not productive and it's certainly not going to change anything. Ingar Solty of Global Research said the protest in Montreal included around 200,000 students and was the biggest protest movement in Quebec's history. If the students wanted change, they went about it the wrong way. When you scare someone they lash out to protect themselves and that is what the government of Quebec did.

Both sides should have worked on negotiating the amount students would need to pay in tuition. Solty explains that instead it was announced that students tuition would be going up by more than 75% or 1500 dollars, gradually, over a period of 5 years. So the students of course were shocked and dismayed by this. But no one seemed particularly interested in meeting with the government, looking at it from their perspective and working together to make a plan that would be the best for everyone. The government made their crappy proposal to extend the time frame from 5 years to 7. Was it acceptable? Well apparently not. But the government gave, what they felt, was a reasonable offer but it offended the students. So rather than continuing the negotiations they dropped out of them. In the video posted by democracy now Gabriel is asked what he suggests they do to get the funding so tuition does not have to go up. He goes on and on about the numbers of students in debt and the cost of tuition and they think it should be free education in Quebec, which is great. But he never answered the question. They don't know where to get the money to fund their free education they just know they want it and feel entitled to it. The funny thing is and I guess they either don't understand or don't care that they will be paying for it one way or another through taxes. You don't want to pay to go to university? Great. No problem. But don't you dare complain when you are paying higher taxes for the rest of your life.

Despite what anyone's opinion of this event the outcome stands. The students won! The government that was elected promised not to raise tuition because that is what the citizens want and that is what they campaigned on. The protests stopped and everyone went back to school and work. The student's got what they wanted despite

everything the government through in their way. They accepted and used it to fuel their fire. They selected the government that would respect their wishes. They are the clear cut winners... for now. So sure the party that was most recently elected campaigned on and agreed not to raise tuition fees... for now. But it's not like a politician has ever gone back on their word or anything. No, if they said it when they were campaigning they meant it because politicians keep their promises.

Government did what they had to. The protests were getting bigger and more violent. Something had to be done. So yes the government invented a bill to stop the students from protesting at universities in an attempt to quiet the protesting. To be completely fair, yes as Global Research points out, it backfired. It made the protests bigger because they made it an "us vs. them" scenario. So 400,000 people marched in the biggest protest Canada has ever seen, as Solty reminds us, and that there were similar protests across the world. But my understanding is that it's easier to work with the government than against them. If the government gives into such demands they look weak and no government wants that. So students of Quebec, you may have won right now but it won't last and everyone knows it.

=====

No I do not think the government has the right to invoke Bill 78. I believe this bill is out of line with the situation at hand and does not correspond with the problem at all rather just making the relationship between government and university student even worse in Quebec.

The problem at hand was that the government were making proposals to increase the tuition in the province. The students have reacted the way any student would in any country. When the price of something is raised, the result is usually a disgruntled

consumer, as is the case in the Quebec Student Strike. They have every right to be angry. They have slowly seen their tuition raised over the past two decades and are looking for a cement number.

However the government raises excellent points. Economics are a give and go system. We are in debt. And even though it may not be similar to that of the U.S. it is still a problem that must be solved. For example, the teachers salaries were frozen in Ontario last year. Money must be taken away from certain area's in order to compensate for others. In this case Quebec is looking at university funds. Perhaps they are taking their information from other provinces. Tuition for Quebec students is lower then any other province to start with. Ontario's students pay in some cases four times more minimum compared to that of Quebec. Therefore the government is looking in a very plausible direction in order to bring in money.

I have no issue with the Quebec government looking at university to raise funds in order to strengthen the provinces economic issues. As a student in Ontario i feel no sympathy for what the students argue for in terms of tuition. They simply have it better off then most other students in Canada and should deal with it. However the question at hand is whether the government is right in implementing Bill 78. And in this

circumstance I do not believe they were. I think the action they took drastically outweighs the problem at hand.

=====

The student riots across Quebec were the result of nothing more than spoiled children who demand free hand outs while they continue to scorn and criticize the same government. Because of them, the entire province of Quebec became slowed and the protests caused thousands of dollars in damage to the infrastructure of Quebec. It was the duty of the government to revoke the rights of the small group of protesters not only to benefit Quebec but in order to protect the country of Canada as a whole.

Students of Quebec marched around the streets of Montreal spreading anti consumerist propaganda, there was even a small sect that split and caused mayhem to the province. because of the actions of the students the police we're forced to take action in retaliation in order to maintain a sliver of order within the province.

The students had the right to protest. whether what they were protesting around becomes irrelevant when the question is did they have the right to protest. it is well within the rights of the people to oppose the the government when they do not believe the government has the bet interests of the people in mind.

It is also within the right of the government to control the people and look out for their well being. They are democratically elected by the people to represent there best interests. nobody especially students have to right to undermine that authority. They

have no formal training in politics nor do they have any of the knowledge required to understand the reasoning that was behind the tuition wages. The Student protesters abused the power to protest and as such it was the responsibility of the government to limit there power in the beliefs it would bring peace to the province and end all the unrest.

=====

thesis:

Maple spring was a successful anti-Neoliberalist movement that fought and succeeded in a fight for low tuition and a fight against austerity policies.

evidence:

Maple Spring lasted for 12 weeks in a time where the government issued Bill 78 which restricted the protests and allowed the police to arrest those participating even if they were doing nothing illegal

they fought and succeeded in keeping the tuition low when the government wanted to increase it by 75% over a five-year span

how they gained more traction was because although they were fighting for tuition to stay low they also fought against the privatization of public services.

it was successful in about austerity measures

Antithesis:

it became difficult for them to succeed because of the Bill 78

hundreds of innocent non-violent protesters were arrested and fined hundreds of dollars for participating in the march down Sherbrook

there were major misconceptions were made which divided the nation. such as the Quebecois were going to war with the government over \$325 which was false.

Synthesis

Maple Spring was and is still to this day a monumental stepping stone for university students in Quebec and will drive students around the rest of the country to join an increase in tuition.

although they fought the liberal government at a time when a new bill was passed stopping their right to protest they continued anyways.

"The strike has been given a meaning: you can change history. People get hurt, get \$500 fines on a student budget, are tear-gassed and pepper-sprayed, and they're like, 'You thought we'd back down? Well, we're not and we're going to go further.'"