

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS
WINNIE BEATRICE RICHARDSON
WEST

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 2026

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Private First Class Winnie Beatrice Richardson West, a proud Texan, World War II veteran, and member of the historic 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight." Born on February 5, 1920, in Hankamer, Texas, Winnie Richardson enlisted in the Women's Army Corps on November 28, 1943, and honorably served her country until November 16, 1945. During her military service, she attained the rank of Private First Class. She was assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, the only predominantly African American Women's Army Corps unit deployed overseas during World War II.

In early 1945, the Six Triple Eight was sent to Europe to address an enormous backlog of millions of undelivered letters and packages intended for American servicemembers and their families. The task before them was daunting. Mountains of mail had accumulated in warehouses across England and France, leaving troops disconnected from loved ones during one of the most challenging periods in American history.

The women worked tirelessly under extreme conditions to restore morale to the men fighting for freedom, so far from their loved ones. The women of the 6888th achieved what many believed was impossible. Through resilience and sheer determination, they restored a vital connection between servicemembers and home. Their work strengthened morale among American troops and provided comfort and reassurance to countless families awaiting news from loved ones serving abroad.

PFC West carried out her duties with distinction despite serving in a segregated military at a time when African American women faced significant racial and gender barriers. Her service relected courage, resilience, professionalism, and a steadfast dedication to mission and country. Her example helped pave the way for future generations of women who dare to exceed the boundaries of what they thought possible.

For her honorable service, PFC West received the American Theater Campaign Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Women's Army Corps Service Ribbon, and the Overseas Service Bar.

Today, the story of the Six Triple Eight stands as a testament to perseverance, patriotism, and excellence. Their long-overdue recognition serves as a reminder that victory in war depends not only on those who fight on the front lines but also on those whose dedication behind the scenes sustains the strength and spirit of our armed forces.

By remembering the life and legacy of Winnie Beatrice Richardson West, we honor a member of the Greatest Generation whose service contributed to the Allied victory in World War II and whose example continues to inspire Americans today.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Private First Class Winnie Beatrice Richardson West for her faithful service and for the lasting legacy she leaves to her family, her community, the state of Texas, and the United States of America. May her life and service never be forgotten.

FASTER LABOR CONTRACTS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letters from Alex McDonald and Roger King, in opposition to H.R. 5408.

Re Opposition to the Faster Labor Contracts Act—H.R. 5408

JUNE 9, 2026.

Hon. TIM WALBERG,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WALBERG: We are writing regarding H.R. 5408, the Faster Labor Contracts Act ("FLCA"). The FLCA is a deeply flawed piece of legislation that should not be considered by this Congress—or any other. It aims to speed up negotiations for first collective-bargaining agreements between employers and workers. The bill's authors evidently believe that those negotiations take too long. But while negotiations are long, they are long for a reason: negotiating a first contract is hard. It involves detailed financial and operational tradeoffs, which the parties must negotiate from ground zero. So it is no surprise that contracts often take weeks, months, or years to finalize. That "delay" is not a sign that the process is broken; it is a sign that the process is working.

Worse, the bill proposes to solve that problem with a deeply flawed approach. It would funnel the parties through a compressed bargaining schedule, terminating in compulsory and binding arbitration. Parties would have only 90 days to negotiate their own agreements, after which the bill's processes would kick in. Those processes would be exceptionally burdensome and expensive, requiring complex and cost-heavy hearings to "prove" what a "fair" contract would be. America's businesses cannot afford that burden, and Congress should not force them to swallow it.

If that weren't enough, the bill is likely unconstitutional. It would raise serious questions under the Due Process Clause, the Vesting Clauses, and the Appointments Clause. It would also threaten to convert every collective-bargaining agreement imposed under its procedures into "state action," dragging constitutional doctrines into the American workplace. These problems

have not been considered, much less vetted. The bill needs serious rework, and members should not vote for it if they take seriously their oath to uphold the Constitution.

Yet despite these problems, some members are pushing the legislation through with an unusual procedure—the discharge petition. That procedure is inappropriate in most cases and especially inappropriate here. This bill is deeply problematic and needs the scrutiny of ordinary legislative processes. It should not be rammed through with extraordinary procedural maneuvers.

We urge you and the other members of Congress to reject the discharge petition and reject this bill.

As you are aware, the House will be considering H.R. 5408 as a result of a discharge petition signed by certain Members that requires the House to consider and schedule a vote on this legislation without the benefit of Committee deliberation. This discharge protocol and procedure is not the preferred method to consider legislation. It precludes meaningful input from all stakeholders who are potentially impacted by the legislation in question. H.R. 5408 has not had the benefit of any meaningful Member or staff analysis. No hearings have been held on this legislation. No opportunity has been provided for stakeholders to file comments and submit questions regarding the legislation.

More troubling, no technical analysis has been undertaken regarding the legislation. And that analysis is badly needed, as this legislation is technically defective in several respects and is not in proper form to be considered by the House of Representatives. No financial or cost analysis has been undertaken. No Committee markup has occurred regarding this legislation.

This legislation should be referred back to the House Education and Workforce Committee ("Committee") to permit Members and all stakeholders to consider counter-proposals, amendments, appropriate background research information, and academic studies regarding the impact of this legislation. We urge you and your colleagues to have H.R. 5408 returned to the Committee.

Proponents of H.R. 5408 assert that there is a significant problem with the time period it takes parties to reach an agreement on an initial collective bargaining agreement. They allege that employers are largely responsible for delays, and such delays in the negotiation process are designed to undermine union representation. They further allege that such delay strategies are often part of employers' plans to decertify or remove a union. There is no reliable data to support these arguments and allegations.

First, it is very difficult to ascertain the start date of collective bargaining in negotiations, especially for first contracts, where the parties may not have any prior relationship. Does the start date of negotiations begin when one party sends another party a request for information and documents—a procedure often used by unions to prepare for negotiations. Does the negotiation start date begin when the parties start general discussions about the issues to be discussed in negotiations? Does a preliminary discussion regarding whether the parties should conclude non-economic issues before moving to economic issues start the negotiation process? Do mutually agreed upon delay periods in

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.