Say good bye to ‘stress at work’ and welcome ‘freedom of expression.' Most public workers are denied their right of expression even after being exposed to worse working conditions and right violation, which denies them the morale of giving the best in their duties. Enforcing strike to workers motivates them to work since it encourages them to speak out whenever they feel their rights, safety and regulations are compromised. Thus, countries across the globe should allow public workers to strike.

The main reason supporting the motion that workers should be allowed to strike is in order to voice out for poor safety conditions that most workers are exposed to. For example, radioactive material could affect residents of the surrounding area like in the case of the Chernobyl disaster. In the light of poor safety conditions, workers striking can be justified by the fact that the government and public could be informed (Samuelsen, 2012). Worker’s strike can also help increase the production and confidence after the industrial action. This is because when workers strike for better pay or good working conditions and their demands are met, the employees return to their places of work with motivated and higher morale than before the walk-out. This would result in a higher productivity, which will be a beneficial to the employers. In other instances workers are forced to take a line of a strike against unfair hours or wages so as to fit (Samuelsen, 2012). Also, other workers are forced to work beyond the normal or agreed working hours and through striking it can always pave a way for their demand to be met. The strike is the only way for public workers to protest against poor working conditions and pay democratically. For instance, citing the incidence in 1913-1914 when the miner’s federation received official notice of wage cuts for a miner, the trade unions called on bus drivers, railway laborers, and other workers to strike in support of the miners.
(Larkin and McGuire, 2009, p. 35). On the forth of May, two million laborers walked out to strengthen the cause of the pit workers.

Freedom to strike is very healthy as it encourages unity among workers and prevents conflicts which may cause fight and loss of lives and jobs. For example, in the essential writing of ‘King Martin Luther Jr.’ the Memphis sanitation workers cost loss of lives and most workers losing their jobs (Honey, 5). It helps workers to be paid the salaries equivalent to the kind of services they are offering and this prompt worker to air their grievances basing on for example salary increment and provisions regarding health benefits. The editorial board of the Harvard Law failed to compromise with the workers they began to strike.

It is difficult to imagine how many people stand to deny that all workers should have the rights to strike this is because they think striking gives workers freedom to speech. Many people also argue that if workers are given freedom to strike they will be reluctant to their duties and use the opportunity to demand for more favors and grievances without considering the laws (Slater, 23). Some people also think that public strike may cause disruption to the general public because of the amenities of that are interrupted like train and bus services and also hospitals (Samuelsen, 2012). This is according to trade unions congress whose result also caused disorganization to media spotlight on the employer, forcing them to give in to public pressure and accede to their employee's demands.

On the contrary, legalizing strike according to many workers does not make sense at all. For example, in a nuclear power industry, any breaches of safety can have consequences like if employees are exposed to the nuclear material it could lead to serious illness such as leukemia, cancer, and radiation sickness (Slater, 50). By making public workers strike legal, countries can have the best employees in public sectors like hospitals, schools, and road as well as public officers.
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The world would be a better place to enjoy working as a public employer and also delivering best services to its citizens. The lives of many workers who work in risky obligations like firefighters will have their health protected as they have a right to a better healthy treatment and they can always strike should their grievances be rejected (Samuelsen, 2012). The public workers would like the government support them in strike should they feel not comfortable in their works. This helps them to invest fully on their duties and do their jobs with passion. Failure to this there is a loss of expertise in public offices because if an employee feels that the service he or she is offering is not worthy a certain pay or working condition it might lead to quitting hence going away with the skills which are of great importance in the field. If the government support workers strike it should set some restrictions so that the employees do not take advantage of the freedom to demand more than required (Hameed, 210). It should set the restriction that allows workers to give a notice maybe one week or a month before going on a strike. According to ‘Act no. 7783, June 1989 enacted in Brazil’

Clause 1 of the act provides that ‘the right to strike shall be guaranteed. Workers have the right to determine when the right to strike shall be exercised and to define the range of interest to be defended by strike action’. The Act goes on to impose restrictions on the right to strike including a requirement of 48 hour notice of a strike, a requirement that demonstrations and act of persuasion by strikers shall not impede access to work, impose threats or cause harm to persons or property, a provision that strikes will merely ‘have the effect of suspending the contract of employment’ and that strike in essential services require 72 hours notice.

According to most workers, freedom to strike must be tailored so as to be compatible with a county’s relation system and must protect the rights of employers and the community at large (Hameed, 210). People might think that freedom to strike cannot be compatible with industrial relation system, but this can be proved wrong and cannot justify the argument that freedom to strike legislation is unnecessary by positive right to strike which has been included in New Zealand recent Employment Example By essaypro.com
Contract Act. This same freedom to strike is also supported by the works of the late Mr. Justice Higgins, the second leader of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court and also in the debates in the federal house.

However, people feel that public workers should not be allowed to strike since there will be a major impact to the society. People are also afraid of a strike because it causes many unnecessary occurrences for example if public teachers strike children will have to stay in homes then the teacher will have to stay home hence will have to send away the caretaker as he or she can take care of the family. This will lead to loss of job for this caretaker. On the other hand, children will have to force parents to find someone to take care of them at homes. This will add cost to parent and also a loss since the children will not be getting education as required (Samuelsen, 2012). The same case happens to doctors and nurses whereby patients will not get access to medical care which may lead to loss of lives and spread of diseases. The same case will apply to security officers. Despite having this side effect of the strike, people should view it in the perspective of the safety of the workers. If workers like teachers, doctors, nurses and security officers are not comfortable and happy with their daily chores, then most likely they will not deliver well in their duties, for instance, children will not get the quality education from teachers, patients will not get good medical services and the same thing to national security (Samuelsen, 2012).

Public workers are outlawed from strike by the government not because of public safety, but because it is the only employ with the capacity to prohibit such strikes (Slater, 2004). However, public workers should strike for a variety of reasons. Public sector strike will enable the employees to defend their pensions. In addition, the strike protects both conditions and pay. The strike will also enable public workers to defend public services since when pay and conditions are affected, the quality of service will also be poor. Public workers should be allowed to strike since safeguarding employee pension will not damage the economy, but it would improve the economy. Moreover, the argument regarding cuts and pension cannot be won by argument alone, but by constant pressure, which is by striking. Thus, strike is a sign
of democratic strength in workplace. The strike will not cause the harm to the economy, but instead it will improve the economy as well as people’s welfare.

In conclusion, public workers should be allowed to strike since it will give them a chance to air their grievances. Public workers are should be allowed to strike when their rights, safety, and regulations are compromised. The workers will get motivated when they strike, and their demands are met. Public workers should be allowed to strike because it will unite them hence reduce unnecessary conflict at the job place. In some cases workers are forced to work for long working hours for a low pay. In addition, strike among workers can increase confidence and production after the industrial action. Thus, public workers should be allowed to strike, but there should be regulations if public workers are to be allowed to strike. This will enable the workers to air their grievances in an appropriate manner.
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