



RETAIL INDUSTRY LEADERS ASSOCIATION

99 M Street, SE
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20003

www.rila.org

April 22, 2026

U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Member of Congress:

I write on behalf of the Retail Industry Leaders Association (RILA), which represents more than 200 leading retailers, manufacturers, and service providers operating across the United States, to express our strong opposition to using the discharge petition process to advance the Faster Labor Contracts Act (FLCA) to the House floor. The FLCA would amend the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to accelerate the bargaining process by mandating strict timelines to secure first contracts.

RILA recognizes—and shares—Congress’s concern that prolonged delays in securing first collective bargaining agreements can frustrate employees who have voted to unionize and undermine confidence in the bargaining process. Workers deserve timely, meaningful negotiations that lead to durable agreements. However, while the FLCA intends to address these concerns by quickening the path to the first contract, RILA is concerned that the one-size-fits-all statutory timelines and mandatory backstops risk prioritizing speed over quality and durability of the bargaining process. In industries like retail, where bargaining units can be large and operations are complex, rigid timelines may inadvertently increase conflict, reduce transparency for workers, and lead to outcomes that are less stable and less reflective of employees’ long-term interests.

RILA also shares Congress’s interest in ensuring that neither party can delay negotiations indefinitely or bargain in bad faith. Accountability is essential. However, the FLCA’s compressed timelines, combined with the near-automatic transition to binding arbitration, may unintentionally alter bargaining dynamics in ways that disadvantage workers. When parties know that unresolved issues will be imposed by a third party rather than through mutual agreement, there is a real risk that employees will have less opportunity to understand tradeoffs, weigh long-term implications, and meaningfully influence the outcome of their first contract. In practice, this could result in agreements that are faster, but not stronger, and more likely to generate future disputes rather than sustainable labor-management relationships.

If Congress is concerned about delays caused by bad-faith bargaining, a more constructive approach would be to legislatively strengthen the National Labor Relations Board’s authority to enforce existing good-faith bargaining obligations under the NLRA. For example, bolstering penalties for unions, or employers that intentionally delay or undermine the bargaining process. Targeted remedies for parties that intentionally stall negotiations or engage in bad-faith bargaining would address genuine problems without penalizing employers and unions that

are bargaining lawfully but need adequate time to reach an agreement that is sustainable over the long term.

For these reasons, RILA urges you to oppose the Faster Labor Contracts Act and instead pursue policies that promote genuine, good-faith collective bargaining without imposing impractical mandates that harm workers, employers, and the stability of labor relations.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you would like to discuss these concerns further.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E. Armstrong", written in a cursive style.

Evan Armstrong
Senior Vice President, Government Affairs
Retail Industry Leaders Association

