Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Kean
Mace
McDonald Rivet
Norman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1723

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5408, FASTER LABOR CONTRACTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1140) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5408) to accelerate workplace time-to-contract under the National Labor Relations Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 201, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—221

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Bacon
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
LaLota
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lawler
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Min
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Van Drew
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—201

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
Langworthy
Latta
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Barr
Haridopolos
Kean
Mace
Mast
McDonald Rivet
Moulton
Norman

□ 1730

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of North Carolina). Pursuant to House Resolution 1140, the House will proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5408, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1140, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5408

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Faster Labor Contracts Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Employees in the United States have a right to organize collectively in order to secure higher wages and other benefits, and regularly exercise that right by voting to be represented by a labor organization in their workplaces.

(2) A successful vote in favor of representation by a labor organization does not immediately lead to an agreement between the parties. Often the negotiation process is difficult and protracted, taking a year or longer.

(3) Research indicates that these contracting delays are increasing over time. A Bloomberg Law study from 2021 found that the average number of days between a vote in favor of representation by a labor organization and a contract entered into between the parties was 465 days.

(4) Delays in the processing of collective bargaining contracts primarily benefit employers opposed to representation by the labor organization. The employers can use those delays to sap labor organization resolve and secure more favorable terms for the employer.

(5) In order for employees in the United States to fully enjoy the benefits guaranteed to them by Federal labor law, those employees must be able to promptly secure a first contract following the legal recognition or certification of a labor organization, and Federal labor law ought to facilitate this expediency.

SEC. 3. FACILITATING INITIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.

Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively;

(B) by striking ''For the purposes of this section'' and inserting ''(1) For the purposes of this section'';

(C) by inserting ''(and to maintain current wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment pending an agreement)'' after ''arising thereunder'';

(D) by inserting '': *Provided*, That an employer's duty to collectively bargain shall continue absent decertification of the representative following an election conducted pursuant to section 9'' after ''making of a concession'';

(E) by inserting ''*further*'' before '', That where there is in effect'';

(F) by striking ''The duties imposed'' and inserting ''(2) The duties imposed'';

(G) by striking ''by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)'' and inserting ''by subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (1)'';

(H) by striking ''section 8(d)(1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A)'';

(I) by striking ''section 8(d)(3)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraph (1)(C)'';

(J) by striking ''section 8(d)(4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(D)''; and

(K) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) Whenever collective bargaining is for the purpose of establishing an initial collective bargaining agreement following certification or recognition of an individual or labor organization as a representative as provided under section 9(a), the following shall apply:

''(A) Not later than 10 days after receiving a written request for collective bargaining from an individual or labor organization that has been newly recognized or certified as a representative as provided under section 9(a), or within such further period as the parties agree upon, the parties shall meet and begin bargaining collectively, and shall make every reasonable effort to conclude and sign a collective bargaining agreement.

''(B) If after the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which bargaining is commenced, or such additional period as the parties may agree upon, the parties have failed to reach an agreement, either party may notify the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service that a dispute exists, and may request mediation. Whenever such a request is received, the Service shall promptly communicate with the parties and use its best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to secure an agreement.

''(C) If after the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the request for mediation is made under subparagraph (B), or such additional period as the parties may agree upon, the Service is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation, the Service shall refer the dispute to a 3-person arbitration panel established in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Service, with one member selected by the individual or labor organization, one member selected by the employer, and one neutral member mutually agreed to by the parties. The individual or labor organization and the employer must each select the members of the 3-person arbitration panel within 14 days of the Service's referral; if the individual or labor organization or the employer fail to do so, the Service shall designate any members not selected by the individual or labor organization or by the employer. A majority of the 3-person arbitration panel shall render a decision settling the dispute and such decision shall be binding upon the parties for a period of 2 years, unless amended during such period by written consent of the parties. Such decision shall be based on—

''(i) the employer's financial status and prospects;

''(ii) the size and type of the employer's operations and business;

''(iii) the employees' cost of living;

''(iv) the employees' ability to sustain themselves, their families, and their dependents on the wages and benefits they earn from the employer; and

''(v) the wages and benefits other employers in the same business provide their employees.''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''clause (B) of the last sentence of section 8(d) of this Act'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(2)(B)''.

SEC. 4. GAO REPORT EXAMINING AVERAGE WORKPLACE TIME-TO-CONTRACT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report examining the average number of days between—

(1) the date on which an individual or labor organization is certified or recognized as the representative of employees under section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159(a)), following the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) the date on which the parties enter into an initial collective bargaining agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5408.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5408, the so-called Faster Labor Contracts Act. I will give credit to whoever named this bill because it certainly accomplishes two things faster: It fast-tracks government intrusion into private workplaces, and it erodes workers' rights faster than we have ever seen before.

Under the FLCA, if the private parties involved do not reach a first contract on an accelerated timeline, a government-appointed arbitration panel steps in and imposes one.

The panel does not merely recommend contract provisions or serve as a neutral entity while parties work to reach an agreement. Instead, it imposes a contract on employers and employees for at least 2 years without their consent.

Let's call this bill what it really is: a massive expansion of Washington's power over American workers and job creators.

It is the latest attempt to put workers under the thumb of Federal bureaucrats. Under the bill, government bureaucrats can parachute into workplaces they have never set foot in, override the voice of the workers and industries they know little about, and leave them with contracts that may not serve their interests.

Mr. Speaker, supporters of this bill assure businesses and workers that it is about worker empowerment and efficiency. I may be misremembering the definition of empowerment, but I can guarantee it does not mean taking away a worker's right to vote on his or her own contract and giving that power to a Washington bureaucrat with no stake in the outcome.

As for efficiency, this bill inserts the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, FMCS, an agency that President Trump rightly sought to eliminate for its corruption into the bargaining process.

Reports came out last year about the agency's alleged mismanagement of funds and other fraudulent activities. Now we are expected to give this agency a role in deciding workers' wages, benefits, scheduling rules, disciplinary procedures, and working conditions whenever contract negotiations extend beyond an arbitrary time frame.

I really doubt this agency will be able to do much, if anything, efficiently. If the bill supporters truly care about efficiency—and I believe they do—this is a strange way to show it.

For more than 90 years, Federal labor law has required employers and unions to bargain in good faith. Despite what supporters of this bill seem to suggest, that system is still working today. Whether it is the Teamsters, UPS, or United Auto Workers and the Big Three automakers, countless agreements across the country have been reached because both sides negotiated compromise and arrived at terms that made sense for their unique workplaces.

Under this bill, small businesses, in particular, could be forced into long-term, expensive, one-size-fits-all contracts written by bureaucrats. Those contracts could mandate spending that small employers cannot sustain, threaten jobs, kill growth, and in some cases, shut businesses down entirely.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, the FLCA is not proworker. It is an ideological Trojan horse that harms the very people it claims to help, empowers bureaucrats over workers, and undermines the collaborative process that has long-defined American labor relations.

Ultimately, workers value having a voice in workplace decisions.

The Trump administration has prioritized putting America's workers first and strengthening the Nation's workforce. This bill goes directly against the President's vision for America: to have the most capable and competitive workforce in the world.

It takes decisions out of the hands of workers and job creators and places them in the hands of unelected bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need government-imposed contracts. We do not need bureaucrats writing workplace rules. We certainly do not need a bill that claims to champion workers while stripping them of their ability to approve contracts that govern their livelihoods, whether they understand that or not.

If Congress truly wants to support American workers, we should strengthen workplace democracy, protect workers' rights, and encourage honest bargaining—not replace negotiation with government mandates.

The FLCA is wrong for workers, wrong for businesses, wrong for the economy, and wrong for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1740

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5408, the Faster Labor Contracts Act, which ensures that workers can quickly and efficiently reach a first contract between a union and their employer.

It is also one of the many important provisions of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, or the PRO Act, which critically bolsters working people's ability to organize and form a union while holding union-busting employers accountable.

This bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act to require employers to begin negotiations with a newly certified union within 10 days. This bill further provides that if no agreement is reached after 90 days, either party may request mediation from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. If mediation fails after 30 days, the dispute will be referred to an arbitration panel selected by the union and employer to secure an initial contract.

For too many workers, the hard work doesn't end when they vote to form a union. It just begins. Reaching a first contract to form a union can take months, even years. In some cases, it never happens at all. It is not unusual for workers to sit through endless delays and other dilatory tactics by employers, including shifting proposals and stalled negotiations. Workers endure all of this while trying to balance their jobs, their families, and their livelihoods.

When workers choose to organize, they are choosing a unified voice to negotiate for their rights with management. Without a first contract, that voice can be effectively silenced. Dragging out negotiations gives corporations a long chance to break up a union.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act brings accountability to this process. It sets up reasonable timelines and ensures that both sides engage in serious, good-faith negotiations. It helps prevent delay tactics and keeps the focus where it belongs—on reaching an agreement that works for everyone.

This bill is about making the right to organize real, not theoretical.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman NORCROSS for his leadership on this issue, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Faster Labor Contracts Act.

Republicans should always be proworker, and we are always proworker; but being proworker does not mean handing more power to Washington, and it certainly does not mean taking decisions away from the workers themselves.

Yet, that is exactly what this bill does.

For nearly 90 years, Federal labor policy has been guided by a simple principle: workers and employers should determine the terms of employment through voluntary, good-faith bargaining.

That framework, established under the National Labor Relations Act, has governed labor relations for generations.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act turns that principle on its head. If negotiations fail to conclude within a federally prescribed timeline, government-appointed arbitrators are empowered to impose wages, benefits, schedules, and workplace rules for years to come. In other words, this bill replaces negotiation with compulsion and substitutes private agreements with Federal mandates. Most concerning, workers themselves may be bound by contracts they never approved.

Under the FLCA, employees would lose one of the most fundamental rights they have today: the ability to vote on the terms and conditions governing their own employment.

This is not proworker. It is progovernment, and Congress should not be in the business of silencing workers or stripping them of their voice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), a member of the Committee on Education and Workforce and the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when a union wins more fair pay and better working conditions for its members, it sets the bar higher for everyone. Even if you are not part of the union yourself, you can still thank organized labor for negotiating some of what is in your contract.

For millions of workers, the first contract can take years to negotiate if an employer decides to play the waiting game. Some negotiations collapse before the contract ever becomes law. In fact, that is exactly what many corporations are banking on.

If we can't count on billionaires negotiating ethically, and we can't count on existing rules to stop employers from running out the clock, what can we count on?

We can count on ourselves to fight back. My Faster Labor Contracts Act is what an unprecedented coalition of lawmakers, labor leaders, and workers across this great Nation are now fighting back with.

We are proposing that workers get a choice. If an employer won't meaningfully come to the table, my legislation would give workers and employers the option to invoke hard deadlines. It is an option. It is not mandatory. If the bill offers a clear path to a first contract, and it doesn't pass, this has an end to it.

It is a really simple change. Yet, by leveling the playing field, the Faster Labor Contracts Act would be the most significant new protection for workers since before World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BOBBY SCOTT and my friends on both sides of the aisle for helping get this Faster Labor Contracts Act to this point. Let's pass it out of the House, get it over to the Senate, and send it to the White House to be signed.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect my good friend and colleague from New Jersey, the sponsor of this bill, and his desire to move processes forward. I just have a significant concern that it is short-sighted to think that government intrusion into this process will ever work in the end and what would be considered optional wouldn't eventually become mandatory in the fact that the workers themselves aren't making these decisions, that the best interests of the union leadership may be carried on, but not the workers'. That is my concern.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a man who knows what it means to be involved in negotiations from both sides.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5408, the Faster Labor Contracts Act.

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of this House majority and the Trump administration, we are working to deliver

a 21st century economy that benefits the working class. We are putting workers first and giving them the freedom to champion their own future and achieve the American Dream.

This legislation before us today, to put it simply, is a significant step backward. There is a reason this bill is opposed by hundreds of organizations and stakeholder groups, including H.R. professionals, franchise businesses, retailers, and more.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act would allow government-appointed arbitrators to impose a union contract on workers and employers if the two sides cannot reach an agreement on their own.

At its core, H.R. 5408 rips power away from workers and job creators and lays it in the lap of the Federal Government. I can tell you firsthand that the hardworking Georgians I represent want no part of this.

Georgia has been named the number one State to do business for 12 consecutive years. We are a right-to-work State. One reason for that is that we have great State-level leadership that rejects destructive policies like this.

Current law already requires employers and unions to bargain in good faith and provides remedies for parties that refuse to do so.

The goal of this body should be to fuel growth for Main Street, not force employees and employers into union contracts without their consent.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act is bad for our economy, bad for American workers, and I strongly urge a vote in opposition.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a son of the labor movement and co-chair of the Congressional Labor Caucus in strong support of the Faster Labor Contracts Act.

When workers come together to form a union, they are not asking for a handout. They are asking and fighting for what they have already earned: better wages, safer working conditions, stronger benefits, and the dignity of having a voice on the job.

Collective bargaining is a fundamental right, guaranteed under Federal law, and it is one of the most powerful tools working people have.

□ 1750

Mr. Speaker, winning the union election is supposed to be the end of the fight. Instead, for far too many workers, it is just the beginning. It is just the beginning because current law provides no meaningful timeline for reaching a first contract.

Employers who want to stall can stall for months, even years, all while workers wait. Here is the number that should outrage every Member of this body: 458 days. On average, it takes 458 days to reach a first contract after workers have already voted.

Think about that. More than 1 year after workers have spoken clearly with their vote, they are still waiting. They are still waiting for the wages that they organized to win. They are still waiting for the benefits that their families need. They are still waiting for basic dignity on the job.

Too often, that delay is not an accident. It is a strategy to wear workers down and to preserve the status quo.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act, introduced by my friend and fellow co-chair of the Labor Caucus, Representative NORCROSS, closes that loophole. It does not guarantee any particular outcome at the bargaining table. It simply ensures that both parties show up and negotiate in good faith on a reasonable timeline.

A right delayed is a right denied. Workers cannot wait. Families cannot wait.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Faster Labor Contracts Act and to bring this PRO Act to the floor for its full approval.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we talked about efficiency and moving the issue forward 400-some days, but this bill is being rushed. It is being rushed in other ways. It requires a report from the Government Accountability Office, examining the length of time between recognition of a union in the workplace and the initial collective bargaining agreement. However, that report will not be issued until 1 year after enactment of the bill.

We are passing a bill that could impact millions of employers and employees, only then to request a report to understand the alleged issue that this bill aims to address.

I think back to the 2010 ObamaCare vote, when Members of this body were told to pass the bill so we could find out what was in it. We face a similar question today.

Why must we vote on a proposed solution before we even know the problem? Instead, let us do the reasonable thing before this bill goes to a vote.

That is just something we ought to consider, especially when we have the opportunity to do that, as opposed to pushing this directly to the floor without even having a GAO study beforehand.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), a great member of our Education and Workforce Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join the majority of my Republican colleagues in voicing strong opposition to H.R. 5408, the Faster Labor Contracts Act.

This bill puts the selfish needs of the union bosses above the welfare of American workers. It would force employers to begin bargaining with new unions within 10 days of certification. It would force Federal mediation to intervene if no contract is signed. It would force the arbitrated contracts to last 2 years, and they cannot be appealed.

Let me be clear. Employers and unions already meet at the negotiating table. There is no need to use government overreach to force labor negotiations.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act is bad for employers, bad for employees, and bad for the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and vote ''no.''

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI).

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5408, the Faster Labor Contracts Act, and I salute Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. SCOTT for their outstanding leadership on this bill.

Across America, workers exercise one of the most fundamental rights protected under our labor laws—namely, the right to organize and bargain collectively. Yet, far too often, after workers vote to form a union, they are forced to wait months and even years before seeing the benefits of that decision.

In fact, the average time to secure a first contract exceeds 450 days. During that time, workers can face uncertainty, delays, and frustration while negotiations drag on with no clear path to resolution.

There are countless examples. A few years ago, in my home State of Illinois, Teamsters drivers at XPO Logistics in Aurora voted to form a union. Yet, more than 1 year after they voted, they were still fighting simply to get the company to come to the bargaining table.

Those workers had exercised their legal right to organize, but they remained without a first contract and without the certainty that they voted for.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act addresses this problem with a straightforward and commonsense framework. It requires newly certified unions and employers to begin bargaining promptly. If negotiations stall, the bill provides mediation and, if necessary, a neutral arbitration process to help both sides reach an initial agreement.

This bill ensures that when workers make their voices heard through a lawful election, that decision is respected. Workers deserve to know that their vote to organize will not be rendered meaningless by endless delays.

That is what this bill provides. It is practical, bipartisan, and strengthens confidence in our labor system, supporting working families and helping to create more stable workplaces.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Faster Labor Contracts Act.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ONDER), another great member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. ONDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Members from both sides of the aisle will head to the field for the annual Congressional Baseball Game. It is a great tradition in Washington, reminding us that no matter how intensely we disagree, we believe in the basic American principle of fair play.

I rise today to talk about a piece of legislation that completely upends the rules of fair play for Americans, the Faster Labor Contracts Act.

To understand why this bill is so dangerous for our workforce, let's stick with the baseball analogy for a second.

Imagine a tie game, the bottom of the ninth, a close play at the plate, and the call is challenged. In Major League Baseball, we know how the replay review works. It goes to a centralized room in New York filled with veteran umpires who have spent decades in the field. Both teams accept the final decision because they trust the expertise of the people making the call.

Now, imagine if the MLB suddenly changed that rule. Imagine replay reviews were handed over to a rushed, three-person panel, with one reviewer picked by the home team and one picked by the away team. A third tie-breaking member is chosen at random from the stadium's front-office staff. They are then given a 2-minute clock to issue a final, unappealable ruling.

None of us would accept it. The fans would protest, and the integrity of the game would be destroyed.

Yet, remarkably, that is exactly the framework this legislation wants to force upon collective bargaining in the American workplace. The Faster Labor Contracts Act invites Federal bureaucrats directly into private negotiations and empowers them to dictate contracts between employers and employees.

Under the text of this bill, once the union is certified, negotiations must begin within 10 days. The parties are then given a rigid window of just 90 days to reach a first contract.

If they cannot reach a deal in that brief window, the bill forces them into mediation, but it only gives the process 30 days. If the mediation doesn't resolve every single issue in those few weeks, a government-imposed, binding arbitration automatically kicks in.

Just like that hypothetical baseball panel, a three-person arbitration board takes over. The employer picks one, the union picks one, and a third so-called neutral arbitrator is selected. If the parties cannot agree on those selections within 14 days, the Federal mediation conciliation panel steps in and chooses all three arbitrators for them.

This panel is given sweeping, unprecedented power to dictate wages, benefits, safety procedures, leave policies, and virtually every term of employment.

☐ 1800

Then comes the worst part of all. These three-person panel votes, and that contract becomes legally binding for a full 2 years.

What about the rank-and-file workers, the men and women on the factory floor and on the construction sites? They are completely shut out of the process. Under this bill, the workers are denied the right to vote on the very contract that governs their work lives. There is no ratification vote, and there is no right of appeal.

Think about that. The moral argument for labor unions is to give workers a collective voice, but this bill strips them of that voice and hands it over to a panel of outside lawyers and bureaucrats.

Last spring at a Senate hearing, an International Association of Machinists shop steward testified on this point. He warned that removing the right of workers to ratify their own contract removes democracy from the workplace. He said: Giving the worker a say is the whole point of a union.

If we value the voices of working people, we should not support a bill that silences them.

Our government already furnishes help and protection through the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, which employers, employees, and unions can voluntarily utilize to resolve disputes. We do not need a heavy-handed law that prioritizes speed over fairness, centralization over consent, and government control over workplace democracy.

Let's keep the Federal Government out of the dugout, and let's let American workers and businesses call the balls and strikes themselves.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Federation of Teachers.

AFT,
Washington DC, June 9, 2026.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFT's more than 1.8 million members working in education, healthcare and public services, I write to strongly encourage you to vote yes on the Faster Labor Contracts Act (H.R. 5408).

We believe that workers, no matter where they work, whether in the private sector or the public sector, deserve labor laws that meaningfully protect them and preserve their ability to join a union and collectively bargain. While the majority of AFT members work in the public sector, the AFT is the second-largest nurses' union in the country and represents more than 75,000 educators in charter schools who are considered private sector employees.

For many years, we have strongly supported the robust and comprehensive labor law reforms in both the Protecting the Right to Organize Act and the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act, and we have urged Congress to pass both bills. The National Labor Relations Act, originally enacted in 1935, has never significantly been reformed; the need to do so is undeniable. As unionization rates across the U.S. economy have declined, from over 30 percent in 1954 to 11 percent in 2024, our country has seen income inequality skyrocket. A recent report by the Economic Policy Institute shows that more than 60 million Americans would join a union if given the choice. Yet, despite the popularity of unions, too many workers face insurmountable barriers when trying to organize a union, a direct result of the failure to reform American labor laws. Workers trying to form a union are faced with firings, harassment and captive audience meetings. And if workers prevail and the majority vote to form a union, many employers simply refuse to bargain a first contract. The Faster Labor Contracts Act would require employers to bargain a first collective bargaining agreement in good faith. If no agreement is reached after three months, the employer and the union would enter mediation, and if mediation fails within 30 days, they move to binding arbitration.

Absent congressional action on the PRO Act or PSFNA in the short term, we believe that individual provisions of either bill that have bipartisan support, such as the Faster Labor Contracts Act, should move forward.

For this reason, we call on all members of the House to vote for the bipartisan Faster Labor Contracts Act (H.R. 5408). It is far from being a complete set of labor reforms, but it is an incredibly important step in the right direction.

Unions enable working people to have a voice on the job and the power to act collectively. Whether it is a decent wage or safety on the job, workers have a better shot at better working conditions when they can form a union and collectively bargain. By standing together, union members earn higher wages and are more likely to have employer-provided healthcare, pensions and benefits such as paid sick and family leave. Data shows that the average median union worker is paid approximately 20 percent more than the median nonunion worker.

Under current law, for far too many workers, including many who seek to join the AFT, organizing a union is marked by employer anti-union campaigns that include pressure tactics and a refusal to negotiate a first contract after workers have voted to unionize.

Over the last few years, healthcare professionals organizing the AFT in Oregon have encountered yearslong delays from their employer when they tried to bargain a first contract in good faith. In K–12 charter schools, we have repeatedly experienced employers who, in the face of resounding pro-union elections, turn their energies toward wearing down a new union by refusing to negotiate a first contract. We have seen an unwillingness to come to the bargaining table in Arizona, Illinois, Louisiana, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Yearslong delays or outright refusals to bargain are meant to send a message to workers that their voice and their vote do not matter and that there is no point in forming a union.

We believe that ultimately the package of reforms contained in both the PRO Act and the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act are critical for working families in this country and their communities, and we will continue to fight for these reforms. However, we recognize that progress is often achieved in incremental steps; making progress in one area while continuing to organize and work for additional gains in other areas is often how meaningful change is achieved.

All workers, no matter where they are employed, deserve a voice on the job and should have the freedom to join together and bargain with their employer. We look forward to working with lawmakers, no matter their political party, to advance labor law reforms for all workers.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President, AFT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The letter says, in part: "For this reason, we call

on all Members of the House to vote for the bipartisan Faster Labor Contracts Act. It is far from being a complete set of labor reforms, but it is an incredibly important step in the right direction.''

The letter goes on to say: ''Under current law, for far too many workers, including many who seek to join the AFT, organizing a union is marked by employer anti-union campaigns that include pressure tactics and a refusal to negotiate a first contract after workers have voted to unionize.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE).

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is hard enough to form a union, and in this building and in States across the country, we see efforts every day to make it even more difficult.

We are seeing yet another strategy to delay and deny union representation from workers who have overcome every hurdle to vote to belong to a union.

The average time between forming a union and a contract being signed is 458 days, and it is 548 days for nonprofits. Workers should not have to wait years after forming a union to get a contract, and employers should not be able to move the goalposts after the decision has been made to form a union.

My friend Representative NORCROSS brought forward the Faster Labor Contracts Act to address this issue, and I am proud to speak in favor of this bill.

Being proworker does not mean being antibusiness. Being probusiness shouldn't mean being antiworker. When workers do well and have a clear path to the middle class, have access to family-wage jobs, and safe working conditions, our economy thrives and our businesses do better.

I am a Member of Congress as a third-generation union member. Because my father and grandfather fought for or won better wages, hours, and working conditions with their unions, I am able to be here today.

This bill corrects a loophole and gives a timeline to negotiate a contract. That is what it does.

This is a proworker bill, and should not be a partisan issue, and it is not. We have Republicans who have stood up for workers as well. Either you stand with workers or you don't. Today, I am proud to stand with the workers of this country and support this very good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FINE), one who stands up for workers and is a great participant in the Education and Workforce Committee as well.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the so-called Faster Labor Contracts Act.

I used to run businesses. That is what I was good at, and I understand the importance of collective bargaining, but I also know that the process shouldn't be rushed.

Labor contracts are not minor administrative details. These are life-changing agreements. But this legislation imposes rigid timelines and artificial deadlines that could actually hurt both parties.

Negotiations take time because real compromise takes time. Workers deserve the opportunity to organize, consult with representatives, and review proposals carefully.

The current law provides the right incentives for good-faith bargaining, but the Faster Labor Contracts Act does not do that. It does not even promise a quicker turnaround for labor contracts. It just promises that a third party will step in sooner.

The bill gives union workers and employees 90 days to reach an agreement before being referred to mediation and then 30 additional days before going to arbitration. But there is no time limit on the arbitration, which could last for months or even years.

Think about that. The only participants who do not face a deadline under the bill are the arbitrators the government is forcing employers and employees to submit to.

Despite the name of the bill, there is no guarantee the process will actually become faster. There is only a guarantee that workers and businesses may have no say in the final product.

This bill doesn't promise higher wages. It doesn't improve workplace safety. It doesn't strengthen retirement security. It does not protect healthcare benefits. What it does do is place private negotiations on an accelerated timetable that increases pressure on workers to settle before they have fully fought for what they deserve.

This is a bad idea, and I hope that we vote it down today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MENEFEE).

Mr. MENEFEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Faster Labor Contracts Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am just astonished to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that this bill was rushed when they failed to take it up in committee, when we all know that under their leadership, the committee has focused on attacking unions and attacking trans kids.

Maybe if they focused more on education and workforce, we would see more bills like this come to the floor through a proper process that actually helps unions.

I represent Houston and the longshoremen on the Ship Channel, like my grandfather; freight drivers; steelworkers; and electricians. These are folks that without them, this country would come to a screeching halt.

Right now, when those workers vote to form a union, what the law requires is that the employer bargain in good faith. That is exactly what the law requires, but we all know that is not what happens in real life.

In reality, employers stall. They run out the clock. That is why the average time between a union vote and the first contract is over a year, a year when the bosses hold all of the cards. That is a loophole that lets employers act in bad faith. All this bill does is close it.

It sets clear deadlines; a fair process; mediation, if needed; arbitration as a backstop; and it only applies to first contracts. It is focused, and it is reasonable.

When workers follow the rules, the rules have to work for them. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues across the aisle to spend better time when they are managing their committees.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a former union steelworker, I certainly understand the value that unions play in the workplace. I also understand the value that employers play in the workplace. I sometimes have my concerns about union officials and where they put their greatest agenda items at and the greatest concerns.

Unions can only force workers to pay dues or fees if there is a signed contract in effect. This means that between the time a union is certified and when a first contract is signed, the union is not getting paid to represent workers.

Once the dues spigot is open, nearly all unions funnel that money to opposing President Trump and the Republican Party goals to lower taxes and make the American Dream affordable.

For decades, unions have increasingly spent more of their money on political campaigns—it is part of the record—and fringe social issues with a paltry sum spent on actually representing their members at the bargaining table and fighting for their rights.

□ 1810

From 1990 to 2010, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFSCME, was the second largest political donor on record, but spent 98 percent of its dollars on the other party, Democrats.

President Trump is a strong supporter of Israel, but millions of dollars of union dues from unions like the SEIU, United Electrical Workers Union, and United Auto Workers are going to a pro-Hamas, anti-Israel agenda.

President Trump has fought to get DEI initiatives out of our schools, workplaces, and government agencies. Union money has been propping up that agenda for more than a decade. These are hard truths.

President Trump supports a pro-life policy, but union money flows into Planned Parenthood and other pro-abortion organizations.

Union-funded House Democrats have not spent their time fighting for workers like they promise. Instead, they have spent their time undermining President Trump's agenda and trying to get him removed from office. These are hard truths.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act is just the latest attempt to undermine the President and his proworker agenda. It will go to union leadership. They will still be pulling it in while the bureaucrats make decisions for the employees.

I urge colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 5408, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR), the vice ranking member of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for us to pass the Faster Labor Contracts Act tonight in the U.S. House to uphold the fundamental right for all American workers, the right to bargain collectively for a fair contract.

American workers marched, bled, and died for the right to form a union. They marched, bled, and died for the right to join together and bargain for fair wages and working conditions.

However, for far too many Americans, that right exists in name only because far too often employers drag out contract negotiations for weeks, months, and then years. On average, it takes more than 465 days to secure a first union contract. That is 465 days that workers go without fair wages, benefits, and the protections that they have earned. That is unacceptable.

Today, we say: When you exercise your fundamental rights to organize a union, you deserve a contract without needless delay. After we do our job in the House, the Senate should pass this bill without delay.

I am very grateful to the ranking member and to Mr. NORCROSS for this effort. I also want to say a word about how the bill came to the floor. The bill itself is critically important, but today's vote is about more than any one bill.

After the Speaker refused to bring the bill to the floor, working people got to work and organized 218 signatures needed to force this vote. This vote sends a clear message that when working people stand together, we can win under the most difficult of circumstances.

It is happening more and more. Just this Congress, we have stood together to demand a vote on collective bargaining for Federal workers, the right to form a union, affordable healthcare, defense for the people of Ukraine, and the rights of those with temporary protected status.

The vote sends a message that the Speaker may hold the gavel, but in the United States of America, working people are still in charge.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), a great member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for fighting this onerous bill. I will add in addition to all the other things he pointed out, the candidates that the unions back usually are in favor of big welfare. I think part of that is because people, I am sure, on welfare are more likely to vote Democratic, so they like a lot of people taking advantage of that system.

When I look at this bill, I wonder which planet the drafters were from. I love to get around my district and talk to my employers, the factories, and the warehouses. Again and again, I find happy and well-paid people.

This bill was drafted by somebody who wants as many businesses, I think, to be in a confrontational mode of using the government to negotiate an arbitration on this contract or that contract or how we are going to be able to run the factory, which is a primary way that you can make American business less competitive.

You also see, as other speakers have pointed out, that we have a situation here in which government officials are going to impose a contract. In other words, government officials are going to determine how a factory is run. I can't think of a way to make American business less competitive.

I encourage my colleagues to tour a nonunion factory sometime over the weekend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, sir. The minority side has 15½ minutes remaining. I believe the majority side has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you say that again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Your side has 15½ minutes remaining, sir.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN).

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCOTT and Representative NORCROSS for bringing this to our attention.

The men and women who pour our steel and power our grid built the middle class with a union card in their pocket. This bill makes sure the next generation of workers can earn one without waiting to be heard for months, years, or decades.

I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 5408, the Faster Labor Contracts Act.

My good friend, the chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, mentioned this administration and how much they like the working public, working men and women. It was in March and on Labor Day that they stripped collective bargaining in the greatest historical moment in stripping collective bargaining from the workforce of Federal employees to the tune of 445,000 Federal workers. Therefore, when we talk about union workers and working men and women, this administration made history by stripping collective bargaining from almost half a million people.

Throughout my career as a public servant, I have been proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with all members of organized labor because working families are worth fighting for. They are the foundation of the strength of our communities, our workforce, and our economy.

It is because of decades of their efforts and their advocacy that they have built not just our infrastructure—our roads and bridges and waterways—but they have built our middle class through promoting safe working conditions, affordable healthcare options, and a sound retirement.

When workers vote in the affirmative to form a union, the government should ensure that businesses immediately acknowledge and respect their voice. I applaud the leadership of Representative NORCROSS in this bipartisan process. There are Republicans who crossed over to vote for this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MRVAN. There were Republicans who crossed over to allow this bill to come to the floor—again, in a bipartisan process to bring this matter to a vote because working men and women matter. In northwest Indiana, they are worth fighting for.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this important measure. Again, this administration made history by cutting collective bargaining to over half a million Federal employees and did that on Labor Day.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, through you to my friend from the region where we both grew up, Hammond, South Side of Chicago, Calumet City, steel area and all the rest, I just make one point: Our President is clearly for private sector workers, very much so.

When he dealt with the Federal Government, it follows the pattern of trying to reduce the cost, the size, the scope of the Federal Government. In fact, that is what we are talking about here, of expanding the scope of the Federal Government to come in and force on employees and employers contracts that in many cases they will not have voted on. I just remind my good friend of that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1820

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very dear friend from Virginia for allowing me the time. I shall return some of it to the gentleman.

First, an acknowledgment: I am a dues check-off member of AFSCME. I am proud to have been a member of this union for more than 20 years, and I rise to say that I support the legislation.

More importantly, I rise to say that we should not engage in insidious prevarications to solicit the support of

legislation. It is not true, and I defend all the unions, especially SEIU and AFSCME. It is not true that any of those unions support Hamas. That is below the belt. There is no empirical evidence to indicate that any of the unions support Hamas. When I heard that, it really touched a nerve.

We can debate these issues without the prevarications that can become incitive.

This is about whether we should have collective bargaining, that it should be fair, and that the industry and labor should compromise and work together. I can support compromise, but I cannot support language indicating that labor unions are supporting Hamas. It is not true.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, just to bring clarity, my exact words were: President Trump is a strong supporter of Israel, but millions of dollars of union dues from unions like SEIU, the United Electrical Workers, and the United Auto Workers are going to support a pro-Hamas, anti-Israel agenda. I stand by that.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, when workers vote to form a union, they don't want their first contract to come in years after endless stalling by an employer negotiating in bad faith. They want a voice in the workplace.

The Faster Labor Contracts Act helps prevent these delay tactics and smooths the transition to an organized workplace. As the saying goes, forming a union should be a right, not a fight.

This legislation is an important first step toward ensuring that workers can more easily form a union and negotiate for higher wages, better benefits, and safer workplaces. Unions are critical to leveling the playing field and addressing rising economic inequality. This bill will help achieve these goals, but we cannot stop here. We must also pass the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, the PRO Act, to comprehensively advance workers' rights.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill asks us to believe that workers are empowered when their right to vote on a contract is taken away and handed to a government-appointed arbitrator. That is not empowerment. That is Washington deciding it knows better in the end than people actually doing the job.

For decades, employers and unions have negotiated contracts through good faith bargaining. Certainly, it is not always easy, but it works because the people closest to the workplace are the ones making the decisions. This bill replaces that process with Federal intervention and a one-size-fits-all mandate.

Congress is being asked to make these sweeping changes without the scrutiny they deserve—no committee process, no serious examination of the costs, and no opportunity to fully consider the consequences.

Workers deserve a voice. Businesses deserve certainty. The American people deserve better than rushed legislation that puts bureaucrats in charge and leaves everyone else with the bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I will include a letter at a later time raising concerns about H.R. 5408 from G. Roger King, senior labor and employment counsel at CHRO Association, and Alex McDonald, co-chair of the Workplace Policy Institute at Littler Mendelson.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRANK). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1140, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

YEAS—230

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Bacon
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carey
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
LaLota
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lawler
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Min
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Rulli
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (OH)
Underwood
Van Drew
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—193

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Gill (TX)
Goldman (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
Latta
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mackenzie
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Valadao
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Carter (GA)
Dunn (FL)
Kean
Khanna
Mace
McDonald Rivet
Norman

☐ 1905

Messrs. SMUCKER, WITTMAN, FITZGERALD, COMER, and RUTHERFORD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. MEEKS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: I hereby resign my position on the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Sincerely,

SUMMER L. LEE,
Congresswoman,
Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1352

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Bell.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Ms. Lee of Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Menefee, to rank immediately after Mr. Walkinshaw.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Ms. Mejia.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Ms. Goodlander.

Mr. LIEU (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR PULSE NIGHTCLUB VICTIMS

(Mr. SOTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this Friday, our happy little town of Orlando was the subject of the deadliest mass shooting in history at that time. It happened at the Pulse nightclub, an LGBTQ+ nightclub, during Latin night. We lost 49 of our brothers and sisters, and 53 others were wounded.

Tonight, we rise to remember them, the first responders, their families, and our community as we continue to heal after this terrible tragedy, and I ask for a moment of silence.

NO AID FOR GHOST STUDENTS ACT OF 2026

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1333, I call up the bill (H.R. 7892) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require to the Secretary of Education to use an identity fraud detection system to review each FAFSA to determine whether the FAFSA presents a reasonable suspicion of identity fraud, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Utah). Pursuant to House Resolution 1333, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–31 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 7892

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''No Aid for Ghost Students Act of 2026''.

SEC. 2. IDENTITY FRAUD DETECTION SYSTEM.

(a) IDENTITY FRAUD DETECTION SYSTEM.—Section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) IDENTITY FRAUD DETECTION SYSTEM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to, or in conjunction with, other verification processes carried out under this title, the Secretary shall—

''(A) use an identity fraud detection system to screen and assess each application submitted under this section on or after October 1, 2026, to determine whether the application presents a reasonable suspicion of identity fraud based on one or more indicators associated with suspected fraud risk; and

''(B) carry out notifications in accordance with paragraph (2).

''(2) NOTIFICATION OF REASONABLE SUSPICION OF IDENTITY FRAUD.—If the Secretary determines that an application submitted under this section presents a reasonable suspicion of identity fraud, the Secretary shall—

''(A) provide the applicant with notice—

''(i) of such determination;

''(ii) that the information described in subparagraph (B) will be transmitted to each institution of higher education designated by the applicant in the application; and

''(iii) that the applicant is subject to additional identity verification requirements in accordance with section 487(a)(15)(B); and

''(B) transmit to each institution designated by the applicant in the application, a notice—

''(i) that such application presents a reasonable suspicion of identity fraud; and

''(ii) that the applicant is subject to additional identity verification requirements to be carried out by the institution in accordance with section 487(a)(15)(B), before the institution may disburse Federal financial aid under this title to such applicant.

''(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICES AND REPORT.—

''(A) NOTICES.—The Secretary shall submit to the authorizing committees—

''(i) not later than November 1, 2026, a written description of the identity fraud detection system required under this subsection; and

''(ii) not later than 30 days after implementing any substantial change to such system, a written description and rationale for such change.

''(B) ANNUAL EVALUATION AND REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2027, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of the identity fraud detection system carried out under this subsection, and submit to the authorizing committees a report on the use and effectiveness of such system.

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from meeting the requirements of paragraph (1), in whole or in part, through a capability or system used by the Secretary on or before the date of enactment of the No Aid for Ghost Students Act of 2026.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 487(a)(15) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(15)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(15) The institution acknowledges'' and inserting ''(15)(A) The institution acknowledges''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) Beginning on October 1, 2026, the institution will not disburse Federal financial aid under this title to an applicant with an application under section 483 that presents a reasonable suspicion of identity fraud under section 483(e), unless the institution, directly or through a contracted third-party service provider and in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary—

''(i) before the disbursement of such aid—

''(I) determines that a reasonable suspicion of identity fraud is not present by confirming the identity of such applicant using—

''(aa) in-person identity verification;

''(bb) live, synchronous audiovisual identity verification;

''(cc) identity verification compliant with National Institute of Standards and Technology Identity Assurance Level 2 (NIST IAL2), or an equivalent successor;

''(dd) any additional identity verification method approved by the Secretary that provides a level of identity assurance that is equal to or greater than the level of assurance provided by an identify verification method described in items (aa) through (cc); or

''(ee) a combination of two or more of the verification methods described in items (aa) through (dd); and

''(II) notifies the Secretary that the identity of the applicant has been verified; and

''(ii) maintains a record of such identity verification.''.

(2) GUIDELINES ON INSTITUTIONAL VERIFICATION PROCEDURES.—Not later than October 1, 2026, the Secretary of Education shall establish guidelines with respect to identity verification procedures to be carried out by institutions of higher education under subparagraph (B) of section 487(a)(15) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(15)), as amended by paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. PROGRAM REVIEW PRIORITY CATEGORY.

Section 498A(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1099c–1(a)(2)) is amended—