

## Endorsements

### Constitutional Amendments

There are five constitutional amendments voters have the opportunity to decide Nov. 6. These come up, as do the general obligation bonds, every two years. This year three amendments focus on cleaning up the Public Regulation Commission.

Amendment 2 asks voters to require the legislature to increase the qualifications for Public Regulation Commissioners. This is a desperately needed change to the way we choose Commissioners. Currently to be a Commissioner you must be 18 years old, a resident of New Mexico for one year and not be a convicted felon. Pretty slim requirements.

This does not set requirements but requires the legislature to increase the requirements.

The Commission is one of the most complicated jobs in state government. It would take pages to explain all of the things the Commission regulates, reviews and hears testimony on. These are complicated issues being dissected by teams of very knowledgeable and experienced lawyers. Picture someone with little (or no) education listening to these arguments and making a decision.

The impetus is to move toward college-degreed candidates or those with extensive experience in utilities and their regulation.

The arguments against this amendment are that it precludes average citizens from serving and that the vague request of increasing requirements leaves the legislature without proper guidance.

This is a no-brainer. We must, as in most other states, have educated, experienced people on the Commission deciding these complex and vitally important issues.

**Vote yes on Amendment 2.**

Amendment 3 takes the authority to charter and regulate corporations from the Public Regulation Commission and places it under the secretary of state. That office already regulates limited liability corporations, trademarks, service marks, notary certificates and other document filings.

The argument for passage is that it would create a simple one-stop shop and that 41 states already have corporation regulation under the secretary of state.

The argument against passage is that it's an expensive move that doesn't really fix anything. It's more cosmetic than anything else. Also regulating corporations is not assigned to a specific state agency.

Ironically, we have to take care of our biennial filing this week and don't look forward to it. The last two times we ventured into that forest it was trying to say the least. Customer service in that department is spotty at best. We look forward to a well-supervised, regulated department staffed by mature adults.

This move will be good for the public as long as we have a qualified secretary of state. We've had problems there too but Dianna Duran seems to be getting the job done.

**Vote yes on Amendment 3.**

Amendment 4 also affects the Commission's structure. If passed it would create the office of the superintendent of insurance and remove it from the purview of the PRC. This is long past due. So much so that in 2009 a change in the law regarding title insurance was passed and by 2012 the PRC's insurance division had failed to make those changes.

The insurance division must be placed out on its own. Those serving on the PRC now either cannot or will not deal with the division and the biggest reason is political. There are a lot of jobs and votes in that division.

The passage of amendment 4 would also create an insurance nominating committee to select the new superintendent. This too, would take a lot (not all) of the politics out of choosing a superintendent. Most of the problems over the past two decades have been because the superintendent lacked intestinal fortitude and had a wavering moral compass.

**Vote yes on Amendment 4.**