STATE OF NEW JERSEY
ELECTION LAW ENFORCEMENT
COMMISSION

NATIONAL STATE BANK BLDG.
SUITE 1114

TRENTON, N. J. 08605

LEWIS B. THURSTON, III

EDWARD J. FARRELL

Josephine S. Margetts
Andrew Axtell

Sidney Goldmann

Chairman

April 1, 1980

H. Neil Broder, Esquire
Messrs. Brach, Eichler, Rosenberg,
Silver, Bernstein & Hamner, P.A.
33 Evergreen Place
East Orange, New Jersey 07018

Re: The New Jersey Campaign Contributions and Expenditures Reporting Act, Chapter 83, Laws of 1973 as Amended and Supplemented ("the Act") Your letters dated January 11, 1980 and March 4, 1980 Opinlon \$0-03-80

Dear Mr. Broder:

Your letter dated January 11, 1980 and your subsequent letter dated March 4, 1980, to the New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission ("the Commission"), including a request for advisory opinion, have been forwarded to me for reply.

The obligation for political information organizations, other than political party committees and political clubs, continues to be stayed. The New Jersey Supreme Court decided the case of New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, et als v. New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission, et als on February 6, 1980. That decision upheld the constitutionality of the lobbying provisions of the Act as construed by the Court, and directed that the Commission supplement the opinion by regulations including a monetary threshold within 90 days after the date of the opinion.

Since the activities of the group which you describe do not appear to be intended to influence legislation at the state level, there would be no obligation on the part of the West Orange Apartment Owners Association to comply with the obligations for a political information organization under the facts set forth in your letter.

In addition to the regulation of the activities to the requirement of disclosure on the part of lobbyists, the Act also calls for filing of pre-election and post-election reports by

April 1, 1980

political committees acting with respect to a public question. The term "public question" has been interpreted by the Commission to mean a ballot question. Accordingly, efforts to have a matter placed on the ballot prior to the time of its becoming a ballot question are not subject to the disclosure requirements of the Act. In this connection I am enclosing a copy of an earlier opinion of the Commission relating to this question, which you may find to be of assistance.

The Commission has from the outset been of the view that the Act provides protection to the rights of persons seeking advisory opinions, in cases in which the Commission is unable to provide a response within 10 days. Accordingly, I must reject the suggestion in your letter of March 4, that the Commission is in violation of the Act.

Yours very truly,

Edward J. Farrell Legal Counsel

EJF:no

Enclosure - #0-42-76