



Rachel Greszler, Senior Research Fellow

APRIL 23, 2026

TOPLINE: The [Faster Labor Contracts Act \(FLCA\)](#) imposes an [arbitrary and artificially short](#) timeline for collective bargaining, beyond which workers and employers can be cut out of the bargaining process, with government-appointed arbitrators having the ability to impose labor terms on workers and employers that are binding for two years.

BACKGROUND: The [National Labor Relations Act \(NLRA\)](#) requires employers to bargain in “good faith” with unions to reach a first contract but does not impose any deadline or mandate that the parties achieve a collective bargaining agreement. Most first contracts take about 12 months to achieve, and more complex and contentious negotiations take longer. The FLCA would allow only 90 days for negotiations and 30 days for mediation before imposing a binding arbitration requirement.

Arbitrary and Unrealistic Deadlines

- The proposed one-size-fits-all deadlines of 90 days for bargaining and 30 for mediation prior to requiring binding arbitration are arbitrary and unrealistically fast.
- Some contracts are highly complex: the [National Union of Healthcare Workers'](#) first contract with Tarzana Medical Center took about 18 months, and included 29 articles and 80 pages, and the first contract between the [United Auto Workers](#) and Volkswagen Chattanooga took 21 months and included 19 articles and 246 pages.
- Rushed timelines or ceding decisions to arbitrators who are unfamiliar with the business dramatically increases the risk that terms will be adopted or imposed that could cost jobs or entire businesses.

Consequences for Workers

- Workers do not get the opportunity to vote on terms drawn up by arbitrators and their ability to strike is restricted by the short timeline.
- It could result in *slower* first contracts because the arbitration timeline is unlimited and bringing an uninformed arbitrator sufficiently up to speed with the realities of unique operations (manufacturing, healthcare, education, etc.) takes time.
- The FLCA would make the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS)—which was [revealed](#) to be among the most corrupt federal agencies and which DOGE all but shuttered—the provider of supposedly “neutral” arbitrators.

Legally Questionable

- The FLCA would likely be challenged in court because mutual assent is a required element of a legally enforceable contract, and the Act could result in labor terms being imposed on either or both parties without their assent.
- The government imposing terms on private parties could constitute state action, opening the door to free speech and freedom of association challenges to any arbitration-ordered resolution.

