

# THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

of the

# NEW JERSEY ELECTION LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION 1975



*To the Legislature  
May 1, 1976*

## **THE COMMISSION**

Frank P. Reiche, Chairman  
Sidney Goldmann, Vice Chairman  
Josephine Margetts, Member  
Archibald S. Alexander, Member

\*Executive Director — Lewis B. Thurston, III  
Counsel — Edward J. Farrell  
Consultant — Dr. Herbert E. Alexander

\*Note: David F. Norcross served as Executive Director until  
January 23, 1976.

## THE MISSION

The New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission was created and organized in 1973 to administer and enforce the N.J. Campaign Contributions and Expenditures Reporting Act as amended and supplemented (C19:44A-1 et seq). That law consists of Chapter 83 of the Laws of 1973, as amended by Chapter 11 of the Laws of 1975, which requires disclosure of certain campaign contributions and expenditures by candidates for State, county and local elected offices, and Chapter 26 of 1974, which provides for partial public financing and limitations on the amount of political contributions for candidates for governor in the general election beginning in 1977.

The Commission consists of 4 members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate to serve for 3-year terms. No more than 2 members shall belong to the same political party. The Commission is authorized to conduct investigations, issue subpoenas, accept and institute complaints, render advisory opinions, find violations of the Act and levy civil penalties. Criminal penalties are provided for certain willful and knowing violations. A full-time staff of 10 persons headed by an executive director, plus a panel of 16 hearing officers, a counsel and expert consultant comprise the administrative arm to carry out the Commission's mission.

**“Publicity is justly commended as a remedy for social and industrial diseases. Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants . . .”**

Justice Louis Brandeis – 1933

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview .....	3
Elections .....	4
Assembly Election .....	4
Content of Filings .....	5
Enforcement .....	6
Education and Public Information .....	7
Data Summaries .....	9
Budget .....	9
Litigation .....	10
Legislation .....	11
Goals and Anticipated Improvements for 1976 .....	14
Commission Membership .....	16

## OVERVIEW

1975 was a year of acceptance, growth and leadership for the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission. Two years after Watergate in Washington and the enactment of the New Jersey Campaign Contributions and Expenditures Reporting Act in Trenton, the concept of public disclosure of contributions to and expenditures by candidates for elective public office has been substantially accepted as a part of the electoral process by the candidates themselves, legislators, the press and the general public. While other measures such as limits on the amounts of contributions and public financing of campaigns remain controversial, the idea of disclosing the source of campaign funding and the manner of campaign spending seems acceptable to most participants and observers as effective, but not unduly disruptive of the traditional electoral process. The U.S. Supreme Court early in 1976, in *Buckley v. Valeo*, a case involving the constitutionality of the Federal Election Campaign Act, removed the last doubts as to the constitutionality of disclosure.

In New Jersey the Election Law Enforcement Commission and the law which it administers are becoming better known. Candidates, legislators and election officials may not hail the law and the Commission with enthusiasm, but after several years' experience with them they have generally learned to accept the Act and the Commission. Compliance, albeit sometimes with complaint, is steadily improving. This public acceptance is vital to the ultimate success of the law.

The Commission has matured significantly in virtually every phase of its operation. A better public information program is in effect, a more sophisticated and effective filing system ensures the prompt availability of filed reports, an improved enforcement effort is well underway, an ability to produce data summaries more rapidly has evolved, and a better understanding of the problems and perspectives of campaign financing has contributed to improved administration. The first phase—of initial organization, development of basic guidelines, regulations and procedures, and building an effective staff, ended in 1975. Phase two, the growth and development phase, began immediately.

New Jersey was one of the very first states, in 1973, to enact legislation requiring effective and comprehensive disclosure of campaign contributions and expenditures and the enforcement thereof by an adequately-funded, independent government agency. The

Federal Election Commission and some State agencies with functions similar to New Jersey's Election Law Enforcement Commission (ELEC) have benefited from this experience of the Commission. Furthermore, the Commission effectively helped to lead successful efforts in organizing national and regional conferences and information sessions on campaign financing and ethics in government in general.

New Jersey continues as a pioneer in this field. The next gubernatorial election in the State, in 1977, will be the first of its kind in the Nation in which the candidates' campaigns in the general election will be publicly funded in large part. The Commission, charged with the responsibility of administering this unique experiment, will endeavor to devise a system therefor which capitalizes on the experience of the Federal Election Commission in the partial public funding of the 1976 Presidential election process and which will stand as a model for other jurisdictions to emulate.

This annual report, required by the law which created the Commission, will set forth the primary activity of the Commission in 1975 and its goals for 1976 and 1977.

## **ELECTIONS**

Five thousand seven hundred eighty five (5785) candidates and 1325 committees (State, county and municipal political party committees, political clubs, etc.) filed 17,978 documents with the Commission in 1975. All of these documents were promptly made available for public inspection by the Commission staff. A listing according to each election follows:

<b>Election</b>	<b>Candidates</b>	<b>Committees</b>
May Municipal	300	40
June Primary	2625	80
Municipal Runoff	48	5
November General	2812	1200

The Commission estimates that at least \*\$4 million was spent by or on behalf of all candidates in the State in the 1975 General Election.

## **ASSEMBLY ELECTION**

The major election held in 1975 was for the General Assembly in which all 80 seats were contested. Two hundred five candidates

vied in the General Election, spending an \*estimated \$1,443,917. A breakdown of this spending by various categories follows:

Republicans	\$704,815
Democrats	732,566
Other	6,536
Winners (80)	\$783,208 (average \$9,790)
Losers (125)	660,709 (average 5,285)
Incumbents (69)	\$691,808 (average \$10,026)
Non-Incumbents (136)	752,109 (average 5,230)

The average amount spent by each of the 23 winning non-incumbent candidates was \$11,195.

### CONTENT OF FILINGS

In cases where a candidate does not anticipate that expenditures on his or her behalf will exceed \$1,000, the Act permits such a candidate to file an affidavit so indicating in lieu of filing pre-election and post-election campaign reports. In fact, in 1975, 78% (4503) of the 5785 candidates who filed with the Commission filed such affidavits. The remaining 1282 candidates (22%) filed 2 pre-election reports 25 and 7 days before the election and at least one post-election report, 15 days after the election.

For each election the figures were as follows:

Election	Affidavits	Reports
May Municipal	148	152
June Primary	2425	200
Municipal Runoff	20	28
November General	1910	902
TOTALS	4503	1282

---

\*These figures are based on what each candidate reported as net campaign contributions. Therefore, they do not include money spent on the candidates' behalf which was not included in his or her individual report. Also, it does not include expenditures for such items as food, beverages, and victory parties which are items that were not included for expenditure limitation purposes, nor does it include the spending of the 38 candidates who filed affidavits.

In view of the large proportion of candidates filing affidavits (especially in the Primary Election where many candidates are unopposed), the Commission is re-examining the questions of which candidates should file with the Commission and what they should be required to file. The Commission may make a recommendation to the Legislature on the subject upon the conclusion of this reexamination.

## **ENFORCEMENT**

With the employment of a second investigator in the Spring of 1975, improvement in the forms and filing system, and the experience gained in the first year and a half of the Commission's operations, its enforcement capabilities increased significantly in 1975.

The enforcement process includes many things: comparing of the list of candidates in an election with the list of those filing with the Commission to screen out non-filers, reviewing of the reports and affidavits filed for accuracy and completeness, assisting candidates in correcting reports, investigating alleged violations, receiving complaints from citizens, initiating complaints by the Commission itself, determining whether there are violations, imposing civil penalties and/or referring matters to prosecuting agencies in appropriate cases.

With the enhanced staff capability, the experience of two years with the law and the greater awareness of it by the public, it is now possible to investigate alleged violations more expeditiously and effectively. A number of investigations of significant magnitude, plus numerous routine inquiries, were undertaken in 1975. A comprehensive enforcement effort against late filers was commenced in earnest. A program to audit the records of all county committees of political parties by the Commission staff was also begun.

Three hundred thirty two (332) complaints were filed in 1975. Of these, 14 were filed by citizens, with the remainder (318) initiated by the Commission. Eleven fines totaling \$4,450 were levied during the calendar year 1975. All revenue from fines is deposited in the General Treasury of the State; it does not remain with the Commission. The great majority of complaints filed in 1975, many during the latter part of the year, have been, are being and will be disposed of in 1976. Three hundred hearings were held before the Commission's hearing officers in 1975.

The most significant cases in 1975 in which the Commission made determinations involved findings of violations and the



imposition of fines of \$1000 on the Republican State Finance Committee and \$2250 on its treasurer for activity in the 1973 gubernatorial election and the dismissal of a complaint filed against the Mayor of Paterson for alleged violations in the 1974 mayoralty race in that city. These cases consumed a significant portion of the time of the Commission and its staff in 1975.

## **EDUCATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION**

An educated citizenry is one of the surest ways to improve compliance. The Election Law Enforcement Commission devotes a major portion of its time and resources to increasing the knowledge of candidates, campaign and party officials, the press and the public with respect to the requirements of the Campaign Contributions and Expenditures Reporting Act.

The Commission's educational function takes many forms. It includes ensuring prompt and orderly availability of public information filed with the Commission. Significant improvement in this area was made in 1975. It is standard procedure for the Commission staff to work overtime to ensure that the numerous reports and affidavits filed with the Commission on the various filing days are made available for public inspection on the next working day. The Commission's files are open for public inspection from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday of each week. Copies of documents are available at a modest cost. Adequate and comfortable facilities are provided in the Commission offices for the public's use in inspecting the public documents.

The Commission, through its legal counsel, is authorized to render advisory opinions as to whether a given set of facts and circumstances would constitute a violation of any of the provisions of the Act, or whether they would render any person subject to any of the reporting requirements of the Act. In 1975, 38 such opinions were rendered. This number is significantly fewer than in the first year and a half of the Commission's existence, probably reflecting greater understanding and awareness of the law's provisions. Additionally, several thousand inquiries were answered by the Commission staff in letters, telephone calls and personal communications.

An important procedural innovation begun in 1975 was the pre-election mailing of certain forms, instructions and general information to all candidates prior to both the Primary and General Elections. Acquiring the names of the candidates immediately after the filing deadline for candidates' nominating petitions (40 days prior

to the Primary Election) for use in such mailing is a more complicated task than it might appear. This is the case in part because of the defusion of election responsibilities in New Jersey. After the filing deadline, the municipal clerks must assemble the data they have received and deliver it to the county clerks. The county clerks must then prepare a list to send to the Commission. To ensure that such lists can be used in the Commission's data processing program, copies of blank computer sheets are forwarded to the county clerks in advance of the filing date and then the candidates' names and addresses and the offices which they are seeking are typed on these sheets in the county clerks' offices. After receiving these computer sheets from the 21 county clerks, the Commission forwards them to the State Division of Data Processing and Telecommunication where address labels are printed. Upon receipt of these labels the Commission forwards the mailing to the candidates. The candidates must then execute and file the proper forms by the 25th day prior to the election.

Thus, this entire process, which includes using the U.S. Postal Service in at least two of its phases and allowing time for the candidates to understand and execute the forms, must be completed in 15 days. This has proved to be a virtually impossible task despite the excellent cooperation and assistance of the Secretary of State, county clerks and municipal clerks, thus forcing the Commission to extend for one week the filing deadline for reports due on the 25th day prior to the election in the past two Primary Elections. Possible remedies to alleviate this problem and assure greater availability of forms will be discussed later in this report.

In 1975, information sessions for candidates and their campaign treasurers became established as a regular function of the Commission. Five such sessions were held, one in late June and four in late September. Two of the sessions were held in Trenton and one each in Saddle Brook, Cranford and Atlantic City. Total attendance was approximately 440 persons. The Commission plans an expanded program of such seminars in 1976. These sessions have proved mutually beneficial to the candidates, who can obtain greater understanding of the law's requirements and answers to their particular questions about it, and to the Commission staff, which profits from the direct contact and experience with the candidates and their practical problems.

During 1975 the Executive Director and other staff members held very productive meetings with the county clerks regarding

administration of the law. Their assistance, thoughtful suggestions and excellent cooperation have proved invaluable to the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities.

The Executive Director in 1975 continued his active role in organizing national and regional conferences on campaign finance law and ethics in government. His extensive contact with the Federal Election Commission and election officials in other States in regard to mutual problems proved to be extremely helpful to the Commission's operation.

Finally, the Commission's policy of making public its actions and the annual report of the agency, itself, provide increased public awareness of the Commission's purpose.

## **DATA SUMMARIES**

The Act under which the Commission operates requires that it prepare and make available for public inspection summaries of all filed reports, grouped according to candidates, parties and public questions, and containing the total receipts and expenditures, and the name and address of each contributor and the amount and date of each contribution required to be reported.

Four such summaries were published by the Commission in calendar year 1975, as follows:

1973 General Election	January 3, 1975
1974 May Municipal Election	May 9, 1975
1974 Primary Election	May 9, 1975
1974 Municipal Runoff Election	May 9, 1975

These summaries have proved to be excellent research documents and are available to the public at modest cost.

It takes a considerable amount of time and effort by the staff to produce these summaries. As the staff has gained experience in the process, the time necessary to produce them has gradually been reduced. The Commission anticipates that it may be possible to produce them within a shorter period of time after each election in 1976 and 1977, and will strive to do so.

## **BUDGET**

The Commission requested \$399,983 for its operation in fiscal year 1975-76 but was authorized only \$298,620. Moneys to establish a political information organization monitoring system and a microfilm unit, among others, were deleted from the budget request.

Four Hundred sixty six thousand eight hundred seventy four dollars (\$466,874) was requested for fiscal year 1976-77. Major items requested and not funded in 1975-76, included funds for administration of public financing of the 1977 gubernatorial election, establishment of a microfilm unit and the addition of a staff attorney's position.

## LITIGATION

During 1975 the suit which had been brought by the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce and a number of other plaintiffs was tried in the Chancery Division of the New Jersey Superior Court in Newark and resulted in a determination by the trial judge on July 1, 1975 that the provisions of the Act requiring reporting by political information organizations and political committees violated the freedom of speech provisions of the Federal and State Constitutions. Upon application of the Commission, the effect of the judgment was stayed pending an appeal insofar as it applied to political committees, thus permitting the Commission to continue to carry out its normal functions of requiring disclosure and investigating possible violations by such committees. The judgment has been appealed and the Commission, the Attorney General of New Jersey and Common Cause, which had been permitted to intervene in the State action as a defendant, each have filed appeal briefs in the case. The matter is presently awaiting the filing of reply briefs by plaintiff and a hearing before the Appellate Division of the New Jersey Superior Court.

The similar action brought by the American Civil Liberties Union in the Federal District Court for the District of New Jersey has been stayed pending the outcome of the State Chamber of Commerce case.

In September 1975 the case of *Buckley v. Valeo*, involving a challenge to the constitutionality of the Federal Election Campaign Act, reached the United States Supreme Court. The Commission, together with similar commissions in California and other States, filed a brief amicus curiae in support of the constitutionality of the Federal Act. The *Buckley* case was decided in January 1976 and generally upheld the disclosure requirements, but concluded that expenditure limitations were not constitutionally valid, except in connection with publicly-financed elections. When this decision was rendered the Commission immediately suspended such portions of its hearings and investigations as involved expenditure limitations and sought an opinion from the New Jersey Attorney General with respect to the applicability of the *Buckley* decision to the New Jersey

disclosure statute. The opinion of the Attorney General, rendered on March 24, 1976, was that disclosure requirements had been held generally to be constitutionally valid, but that the expenditure limit in the New Jersey Act could not properly be enforced, except possibly with respect to publicly-financed elections. Accordingly, the Commission advised candidates, committees and organizations through a series of letters and press releases that the expenditure limits contained in the Act would no longer be enforced.

An action was commenced in the Superior Court of New Jersey in Cape May County for a declaration of the unconstitutionality of the expenditure limits provision of the New Jersey Act. The Commission opposed the relief sought in that action on the ground that the expenditure limit was still valid in the area of public financing. At the request of the Commission a judgment was entered to the effect that the provision of the Act was not applicable to the campaign activities of the plaintiff in that case. There has been no other litigation in New Jersey with respect to the question of expenditure limitations.

An appeal has been taken by the respondent from the determination and imposition of fines by the Commission in the case of the *Commission v. N.J. Republican Finance Committee, Anthony J. Scala and Joseph Intile* and that appeal is currently pending.

## LEGISLATION

With the exception of a 1974 amendment to relieve Board of Education candidates spending \$1000 or less from most of the filing requirements of the Act and the addition in 1974 of the public financing of gubernatorial election provisions, the provisions of the 1973 New Jersey Campaign Contributions and Expenditures Reporting Act have not been changed. The Commission believes strongly that a number of amendments to the Act which would increase the law's effectiveness, provide for improved administration and clarify certain ambiguities are desirable. The Commission's annual report for 1974 includes a number of Commission recommended amendments, most of which were included in Assembly Bill No. 3201 of 1975, sponsored by Assemblyman Albert Burstein. That bill was introduced in the Assembly and referred to the Assembly Committee on State Government and Federal and Interstate Relations on April 7, 1975. The bill died in that Committee when the 1974-1975 legislative session ended. Its successor in the 1976 session of the legislature is A706, also sponsored by Assemblyman Burstein, which was intro-

duced in the Assembly and referred to the Assembly Judiciary, Law, Public Safety and Defense Committee on January 19, 1976.

Some of the highlights of the Commission's recommended changes contained in its annual report for 1974 were:

1. Imposing upon county clerks the obligation to supply the Commission with the number of registered voters in each election district\*, a list of elections to be held in each district, and the names of all candidates seeking election.

2. The enactment of a requirement that committees spending money on behalf of candidates notify candidates of the amount of the moneys expended prior to the filing deadline.

3. The elimination of transactions in currency in excess of \$100.

4. The inclusion of provisions for the lawful distribution of surplus campaign funds.

5. More specific provision for loan transactions and their disclosure.

6. Elimination of the requirement that banks file deposit statements with the Commission.

7. A provision establishing the first or second day prior to the date on which a report is due as the last day to be covered by such report.

8. Elimination of the report 15 days following an election and substituting therefor a report which would be due 20 days following an election.

9. The elimination of the 60-day report and substituting therefor quarterly reports.

10. The imposition of a requirement that all nominating petitions lawfully used in the State of New Jersey bear notice that candidates are required by law to comply with the provisions of the Act.

The Commission, after another year of experience administering the Act, believes that the following *additional* desirable statutory changes should be considered:

1. Exempt from the requirements of the Act any political information organization whose total expenditures for the purpose of

---

\*Now needed only for any expenditure limit provision in connection with publicly-financed elections.

influencing the content, introduction, passage or defeat of legislation in a calendar year do not exceed \$500 or where the political activity of such committee consists solely of communications by a corporation to its stockholders and their families, or by a labor organization to its members and their families, or by an association to its members and their families on any subject.

2. Exempt from the requirements of the Act as to an election any political committee whose total expenditures for political activity in an election do not exceed \$100 or where the political activity of such committee consists solely of communications by a corporation to its stockholders and their families, or by a labor organization to its members and their families, or by an association to its members and their families on any subject.

3. Extend the time by which the Commission must render an advisory opinion from 10 to 21 days after the receipt of the request.

4. Delete Section 7 except to the extent that it may apply expenditure limits to elections which are financed in whole or part with public funds.

5. Require the reporting in writing to the Commission, within 48 hours of receipt, of any contribution of \$1000 or more during the last 9 days preceding an election.

6. Amend the penalty provisions of the Act to:

A. Delete the requirement of Section 21a that persons willfully and knowingly violating the Act must do so "with intent to conceal or misrepresent . . ." to constitute a misdemeanor.

B. Provide that any person who willfully and knowingly violates *any* of the provisions of the Act is guilty of a misdemeanor.

C. Delete the *requirement* that the election of a candidate be declared void if he is found guilty of a willful and knowing violation; instead, permit the Commission to void an election "where it shall appear that the actions of such candidate in fact significantly affected or reasonably may be deemed to have significantly affected the outcome or where it shall otherwise appear that the actions of the candidate represent a threat to the integrity of the electoral process."

D. Add a provision to Section 22 that any person who violates any of the provisions of this Act shall, in addition to any other penalty provided by law, be liable to a penalty of not more than \$1000 for the first offense and not more than \$2000 for the second and each subsequent offense.

7. Eliminate the 25-day pre-election report for the Primary

Election. The other reports (7 days before and 15 days after the Primary Election) would continue to be required. The inherent statutory conflict between the deadline of 40 days prior to the election for filing nominating petitions and the 25-day report required by the Act, makes proper compliance and enforcement of the 25-day report extremely difficult. The Commission has found it necessary to extend the filing deadline for this report by one week in each of the past two Primaries. Additionally, the great majority of candidates in the Primary Election spend little money and generally file affidavits in lieu of reports. For instance, only 200 of the 2625 candidates in the 1975 Primary Election filed campaign reports; the remainder filed affidavits, indicating they would not spend over \$1000. If the suggested change is made, the affidavit would continue to be used, but would be due 7 days prior to the election.

8. Another area of legislation relating to the Commission is worthy of note. A3334 of 1975, sponsored by Assemblyman Burstein and which would revise the entire New Jersey election code, was introduced on April 21, 1975, but never was reported out of the Assembly State Government and Federal and Interstate Relations Committee. Among its provisions was a recommendation that much of the responsibility for general administration of elections be transferred from those officials now charged with such responsibility to the Election Law Enforcement Commission. The bill was the product of the Election Law Revision Commission.

## **GOALS AND ANTICIPATED IMPROVEMENTS FOR 1976**

### **A. Public Information, Content of Forms and Availability**

1. A revision of forms is anticipated for use in the 1976 General Election. Elimination of expenditure limitation references, a form for reporting contributions in excess of \$100 for those candidates filing affidavits, and substitution of a personal oath in lieu of having forms and affidavits notarized are some of the expected improvements. Of course, the information elicited by the forms is governed by the requirements of the Act.

2. Forms and instructions should be given to candidates when they take out their nominating petitions. The Commission is exploring the feasibility of this with the county and municipal clerks and Secretary of State, to begin in 1977.

3. The Commission staff has prepared a draft of an operating



manual for candidates and the Commission anticipates publication in 1976.

4. The Commission expects that its written instructions and general information bulletins will be rewritten and simplified.

#### **B. General Administration**

1. The Commission staff is preparing an index to the advisory opinions the Commission has rendered since its inception.

2. Greater standardization and uniformity in the form of hearing officers' reports and procedures are needed. The Commission recently doubled the number of hearing officers it employs. Promulgation of a hearing officers' manual would be desirable.

3. The Commission may soon face a serious shortage of space for its voluminous and ever-growing files. Requests for a microfilm unit to begin the task of coping with this problem over the long run have been denied in the last two budgets. Hopefully, eased budgetary pressures will permit a start on this problem in 1977.

#### **C. Regulations**

1. The regulations of the Commission relating to expenditure limitations must be revised to reflect the United States Supreme Court decision in *Buckley v. Valeo* and the opinion of the New Jersey Attorney General with respect to that decision.

2. It may be necessary to promulgate regulations to monitor individuals' campaign expenditures made independently of the candidate and his or her organization consistent with *Buckley v. Valeo*.

3. It is anticipated that extensive regulations will be required in late 1976 or early 1977 to implement the new gubernatorial public financing law and to provide for the administration thereof.

#### **D. Public Financing**

1. A major task for the Commission and its staff will be to devise a system to administer the new gubernatorial election public financing law for 1977 and thereafter. No other State has had significant experience in this area, but the Commission hopes to benefit from the extensive experience of the Federal Election Commission in administering the Federal public financing law for the 1976 Presidential election. The system devised must ensure against fraud and provide for expeditious payments of public matching funds to the

candidates. Data processing may be employed to a considerable extent.

2. The Commission must hire additional staff to administer the public financing program and obtain additional office space for them. The Executive Director and other present staff members have begun the process of hiring the necessary additional personnel and acquiring the additional office facilities to house them.

3. As noted above, extensive regulations are anticipated to implement the public financing statute.

## **COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP**

The Commission membership is the same as that noted in the annual report for 1974. The situation has not been static, however. The terms of both the Chairman and Vice Chairman expired on June 30, 1975. Frank P. Reiche and Sidney Goldmann were reappointed by Governor Brendan T. Byrne. Mr. Reiche was confirmed by the Senate on August 4, 1975 and Judge Goldmann on June 23, 1975. Mr. Reiche continued to serve on the Commission during the relatively short period of time after his term had expired because the law provides that members serve until their successors have been appointed and qualified. Both Mr. Reiche and Judge Goldmann have served on the Commission since its inception, in 1973.

Two other developments, which occurred early in 1976, should be noted. On January 23, 1976, David F. Norcross resigned as executive director to return to private law practice. The Commission is indebted to Mr. Norcross, as the first executive director, for his faithful, diligent and competent service in helping to establish the Commission as a viable entity. Lewis B. Thurston, III, who has served in New Jersey State Government since 1963, primarily with the Legislature, was appointed to succeed Mr. Norcross. His service began on February 20, 1976.

The Commission, which now meets approximately twice a month, met 19 times in 1975. Commission members serve without compensation, but are reimbursed for their expenses.