the abuses of entrenched leadership that the LMRDA was expressly enacted to curb. The check of democratic elections as a preventive measure is seriously impaired by candidacy qualifications which substantially deplete the ranks of those who might run in opposition to incumbents.

Union qualifications for office should not be based on assumptions that certain experience or qualifications are necessary. Rather it must be assumed that the labor organization members will exercise common sense and judgment in casting their ballots. ''Congress' model of democratic elections was political elections in this country'' (*Wirtz* v. *Local 6*, 391 U.S. at 502) and a qualification may not be required without a showing that citizens assumed to make discriminating judgments in public elections cannot be relied on to make such judgments when voting as union members.

(b) Some factors to be considered, therefore, in assessing the reasonableness of a qualification for union office are:

(1) The relationship of the qualification to the legitimate needs and interests of the union;

(2) The relationship of the qualification to the demands of union office;

(3) The impact of the qualification, in the light of the Congressional purpose of fostering the broadest possible participation in union affairs;

(4) A comparison of the particular qualification with the requirements for holding office generally prescribed by other labor organizations; and

(5) The degree of difficulty in meeting a qualification by union members.

§ 452.37 Types of qualifications.

Ordinarily the following types of requirements may be considered reasonable, depending on the circumstances in which they are applied and the effect of their application:

(a) *Period of prior membership.* It would ordinarily be reasonable for a local union to require a candidate to have been a member of the organization for a reasonable period of time, not exceeding two years, before the election. However, if a member is involuntarily compelled to transfer from one local to another, such a requirement would not be reasonable if he is not given credit for his prior period of membership.

(b) *Continuity of good standing.* A requirement of continuous good standing based on punctual payment of dues will be considered a reasonable qualification only if (1) it provides a reasonable grace period during which members may make up missed payments without loss of eligibility for office,[24] and (2) the period of time involved is reasonable. What are reasonable periods of time for these purposes will depend upon the circumstances. Section 401(e) of the Act provides that a member whose dues have been withheld by the employer for payment to the labor organization pursuant to his voluntary authorization provided for in a collective bargaining agreement may not be declared ineligible to vote or be a candidate for office by reason of alleged delay or default in the payment of dues. If during the period allowed for payment of dues in order to remain in good standing, a member on a dues checkoff system has no earnings from which dues can be withheld, section 401(e) does not relieve the member of the responsibility of paying his dues in order to remain in good standing.

§ 452.38 Meeting attendance requirements.

(a) It may be reasonable for a labor organization to establish a requirement of attendance at a specified number of its regular meetings during the period immediately preceding an election, in order to insure that candidates have a demonstrated interest in and familiarity with the affairs of the organization. In the past, it was ordinarily considered reasonable to require attendance at no more than 50 percent of

[24] In *Goldberg* v. *Amarillo General Drivers, Teamsters Local 577*, 214 F. Supp. 74 (N.D. Tex. 1963), the disqualification of five nominees for union office for failure to satisfy a constitutional provision requiring candidates for office to have maintained continuous good standing for two years by paying their dues on or before the first business day of the current month, in advance, was held to be unreasonable. See also *Wirtz* v. *Local Unions No. 9, 9–A and 9–B, International Union of Operating Engineers,* 254 F. Supp. 980 (D. Colo. 1965), aff'd. 366 F. 2d 911 (CA 10 1966), vacated as moot 387 U.S. 96 (1967).