§ 452.39 Participation in insurance plan.

In certain circumstances, in which the duties of a particular office require supervision of an insurance plan in more than the formal sense, a union may require candidates for such office to belong to the plan.

§ 452.40 Prior office holding.

A requirement that candidates for office have some prior service in a lower office is not considered reasonable.\(^{36}\)

§ 452.41 Working at the trade.

(a) It would ordinarily be reasonable for a union to require candidates to be employed at the trade even if they have been so employed for a reasonable period. In applying such a rule an unemployed member is considered to be working at the trade if he is actively seeking such employment. Such a requirement should not be so inflexible as to disqualify those members who are familiar with the trade but who because of illness, economic conditions, or other good reasons are temporarily not working.

(b) It would be unreasonable for a union to prevent a person from continuing his membership rights on the basis of failure to meet a qualification which the union itself arbitrarily prevents the member from satisfying. If a member is willing and able to pay his union dues to maintain his good standing and his right to run for office, it would be unreasonable for the union to refuse to accept such dues merely because the person is temporarily unemployed. Where a union constitution requires applicants for membership to be actively employed in the industry served by the union, a person who becomes a member would not be considered to forfeit his membership in the union or any of the attendant rights of membership merely because he is discharged or laid off.

(c) Ordinarily members working part-time at the trade may not for that reason alone be denied the right to run for office.

(d) A labor organization may postpone the right to run for office of members enrolled in a bona fide apprenticeship program until such members complete their apprenticeship.

\(^{36}\) Wirtz v. Hotel, Motel and Club Employees Union, Local 6, 391 U.S. 492 at 504. The Court stated that the union, in applying such a rule, ‘‘* * * assumes that rank and file union members are unable to distinguish qualified from unqualified candidates for particular offices without a demonstration of a candidate’s performance in other offices. But Congress’ model of democratic elections was political elections in this Country, and they are not based on any such assumption. Rather, in those elections the assumption is that voters will exercise common sense and judgment in casting their ballots. Local 6 made no showing that citizens assumed to make discriminating judgments in public elections cannot be relied on to make such judgments when, voting as union members * * *. ’’