



## HB 1676

**Sponsor: Brian Seitz**

**Path to full text:**

<https://documents.house.mo.gov/billtracking/bills261/hlrbillspdf/4015H.01I.pdf>

### **PART 1 – QUICK SNAPSHOT**

#### **1.1 One-Paragraph Overview**

HB 1676 creates a broad statutory ban on state-mandated **digital identification** and repeals the Department of Revenue’s authority to implement a **mobile / digital driver’s license** program. It prohibits Missouri from developing or maintaining a state-sponsored digital ID system, from requiring people to use a digital ID to access public or private services, from requiring biometric data for identification or verification within state agencies or government contracts, and from sharing digital identity data without explicit, informed consent.

It also strikes existing law that authorized a secure digital driver’s license in addition to the physical card. Overall, the bill aims to put a hard brake on the kind of digital ID infrastructure that could feed a future surveillance or social-credit system.

#### **1.2 Triage Table**

- **Single-subject (Mo. Const. Art. III §23):**
  - **Yes.** The bill’s provisions (new §1.3055 and amended §302.181) all relate to **digital identification and driver licensing**; the title (“...relating to digital identification”) accurately reflects the content.
- **Does it grow government?**
  - **No.** It **removes** authority to implement a digital driver’s license and **restricts** the state’s ability to create or mandate digital ID systems and biometric ID requirements.
- **Overall impact on Missouri families:**
  - **Helps.** It protects families from being forced into digital ID systems or biometric identification and reduces the risk that access to services will be conditioned on digital credentials.

- **Alignment with Act for Missouri core beliefs:**
    - **Supports.** The bill pushes back against centralized, tech-driven control over citizens’ identities and protects privacy and bodily integrity, consistent with limited government, state sovereignty, and civil-liberties concerns.
  - **Recommended stance:**
    - **Support** – The core direction is very positive.
- 

## PART 2 – PURPOSE & PROVISION MAP

### 2.1 Stated Purpose

- **Apparent purpose in plain language:**  
HB 1676 is meant to **stop Missouri from moving into a state-managed digital ID regime**, including mobile driver’s licenses and biometric-ID-based systems, and to protect citizens from being forced to use digital identity or have their digital ID data shared without consent.
- **Title accuracy:**
  - Title: “To repeal section 302.181, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof two new sections relating to digital identification.”
  - This is **accurate and not misleading**: the bill creates a general digital ID prohibition (§1.3055) and amends the driver’s license statute (§302.181) specifically in the digital-ID context.

### 2.2 Provision-by-Provision Map

#### Provision 1 – Broad prohibition on state-mandated digital identification

- **Location:** New §1.3055.1.
- **What it does (plain language):**  
Says the state **shall not implement or enforce any laws requiring digital identification**, including:
  1. Developing, deploying, or maintaining any state-sponsored digital ID system;
  2. Mandating that individuals obtain or use digital ID to access public or private services, benefits, or facilities;
  3. Using biometric data as a requirement for identification or verification within state agencies or government contracts;
  4. Sharing an individual’s digital identity data with federal agencies, international organizations, or private entities without explicit, informed consent.

- **Tag:** [Good, with one Concern]
  - **Explanation:** Strongly protects against digital ID mandates and unauthorized data-sharing. The only concern is that the biometric clause is broad enough that it could inadvertently ban legitimate, narrowly tailored uses (e.g., certain security or background-check processes) if interpreted expansively. That said, it seems to err on the side of the citizens' rights, which is preferred.
- 

#### **Provision 2 – Definition of “digital identification”**

- **Location:** §1.3055.2.
  - **What it does:**  
Defines “digital identification” as **information stored on a digital network** that can be accessed by a government or commercial entity and serves as proof of an individual’s identity.
  - **Tag:** [Good / Concern]
  - **Explanation:** The definition is broad enough to clearly cover mobile driver’s licenses and app-based IDs, which is good. However, it might also be read to cover **any** digital record used to verify identity (e.g., internal state databases used to check identity during law enforcement or employment screening), which could create legal ambiguity. Clarifying that the term refers to **general-purpose, citizen-facing identification credentials** would reduce unintended side effects.
- 

#### **Provision 3 – Driver’s license form and digital images (existing law maintained)**

- **Location:** §302.181.1–9 (mostly existing law).
  - **What it does:**  
Keeps the basic structure of Missouri driver’s licenses as **plastic cards with digitized image and data**, sets rules for carrying/displaying the license, allows non-driver ID cards, and preserves existing exemptions (e.g., religious photo exemptions).
  - **Tag:** [Neutral]
  - **Explanation:** No new power added here; this is existing statutory framework for physical licenses and photo requirements.
- 

#### **Provision 4 – Removal of secure digital driver’s license authority**

- **Location:** §302.181.10–11 (subsection 10 deleted; renumbering of rulemaking authority).

- **What it does:**  
Strikes the prior subsection that **explicitly authorized** the Department of Revenue to design and implement a **secure digital driver's license program**, including mobile app access, and to treat a digital driver's license as legally equivalent to the physical card. The remaining subsection simply preserves the director's general rulemaking authority.
- **Tag: [Good]**
- **Explanation:** Removing the digital driver's license authority is consistent with §1.3055's ban on state-sponsored digital identification and helps prevent the rollout of a statewide mobile ID that could later be linked to broader digital control systems.

## 2.3 Changes to Existing Law

- **New §1.3055 (created):**
  - **Current law:** No general statute prohibiting digital ID or biometric ID mandates; digital/mobile ID programs and data-sharing could be created via future statutes or rules.
  - **Change:** Establishes a **default ban** on state-mandated digital ID systems, biometric ID requirements, and non-consensual sharing of digital identity data. This shifts the presumption **against** digital identity infrastructure and protects citizens' privacy and bodily autonomy.
- **§302.181 (amended):**
  - **Current law:** Authorizes the Department of Revenue to design and implement a **secure digital driver's license** in addition to the physical card, including via a mobile app.
  - **Change:** Removes that authority so that **only physical card-based licenses** remain supported by statute. This prevents the Department from unilaterally rolling out a mobile driver's license system.

---

## PART 3 – CONSTITUTIONAL & PROCESS CHECKS

### 3.1 Single-Subject & Original-Purpose

- **Main subject (in one sentence):**  
Regulation and limitation of **digital identification** and **digital driver's licenses** in Missouri.
- **Additional subjects or policy areas:**
  - Driver's licenses and non-driver ID cards (existing framework).
  - Biometric data and digital identity data-sharing.

All of these are **directly related** to digital identification.

- **Relationship of provisions to main subject:**

- New §1.3055 sets broad limits on digital identification mandates and data-sharing.
- Amended §302.181 removes the Department's digital driver's license authority. Both provisions address **how identity is digitally represented, stored, and used by the state.**

- **Title clarity:**

- Title clearly describes the subject: "relating to digital identification." It does not hide any major effect; the removal of the digital driver's license subsection is clearly within that theme.

- **Original-purpose concerns:**

- Based on the introduced text provided, there is no visible "gut and replace" or shift in the bill's core purpose; both sections are aligned from the start.

**Conclusion:** HB 1676 **likely complies** with the **single-subject and clear-title requirements** of Article III §23.

### **3.2 U.S. & Missouri Constitutional Rights**

Overall, the bill **enhances** civil liberties rather than threatening them:

- **Privacy & security in persons, papers, and effects** (Mo. Const. Art. I §15; Fourth Amendment):

- By prohibiting compulsory digital ID systems and restricting biometric requirements and data-sharing, HB 1676 **strengthens** protections against unreasonable government tracking and centralized identity databases.

- **Due process & equal protection (U.S. 14th Amendment; Mo. Const. Art. I §§2,10):**

- No obvious new due-process or equal-protection burdens; the law applies uniformly to citizens and agencies.

- **Free exercise / religious liberty:**

- The bill does not burden religious exercise; it sits alongside existing religious-photo exemptions in §302.181.7. If anything, limiting digital and biometric mandates indirectly protects religious and conscience-based objections to invasive ID technologies.

**Net constitutional effect:** The bill is **protective** of rights and **unlikely to be unconstitutional**;

### **3.3 Delegation & Unelected Power**

- HB 1676 **does not create new boards, commissions, or task forces**, nor does it expand rulemaking beyond what already exists in §302.181.11.
- Instead, it **removes** the Department of Revenue’s delegated authority to craft a digital driver’s license system by rule.

**Conclusion:** This bill **reduces** the scope for unelected bureaucrats to build major new digital ID infrastructure and keeps more control over identity policy in the hands of elected legislators.

---

## PART 4 – IMPACT ON MISSOURI FAMILIES

### 4.1 Economic, Tax, and Utility Impacts

- **Short term (1–2 years):**
  - Some potential **cost avoidance**: the state will not spend money building and maintaining a digital driver’s license system or statewide digital ID infrastructure.
  - Any minor convenience that might come from digital IDs (e.g., using a phone instead of a wallet) is outweighed by reduced risk of costly data breaches or misuse of identity data.
- **Long term (5+ years):**
  - By blocking digital ID mandates, the bill **reduces the likelihood** that access to benefits, licenses, or services will be tied to a single, integrated digital ID that could later be turned into a **control point** (e.g., for travel, employment, or financial access). This is a long-term **economic and freedom safeguard** for families.

### 4.2 Freedom, Parental Rights, and Education

- HB 1676 does **not** regulate schools directly, but:
  - By restricting digital ID and biometric requirements within state agencies and contracts, it makes it harder for a future regime to require students, parents, or teachers to use a **state digital ID** or biometric credential to access school services, tests, or activities.
  - It also makes it harder for state-driven digital ID schemes to become prerequisites for homeschooling oversight, online curriculum access, or education benefits in the future.

**Net effect on parental rights and family freedom: Positive.** The bill indirectly protects families from being forced into digital ID systems tied to children’s education and activities.

### 4.3 Moral & Cultural Climate

- While HB 1676 does not directly address life, marriage, or sexuality, it pushes back against the **technocratic, globalist trend** toward centralized digital identity as a gatekeeper for participation in society.
- A government that can easily track and control citizens through a single digital ID is far more likely to **pressure Christian families**, churches, and ministries in the future (for example, by tying benefits or access to compliance with progressive social norms). Limiting that infrastructure now makes such pressure harder to apply.

**Net impact on Missouri families: Helps.** The bill moves Missouri away from surveillance-style control and toward a freer environment where families can live, work, worship, and educate their children without being forced into a digital ID system.

---

## **PART 5 – ACT FOR MISSOURI CORE PRINCIPLES CHECK**

- **100% Pro-Life:**
  - **Not directly implicated.** The bill doesn't touch abortion law or equal protection for the unborn. Indirectly, by resisting digital ID frameworks, it could help avoid future systems that might be weaponized against pro-life activism.
  - **Rating: Not Implicated / Mildly Supports.**
- **Christian & Biblical Values:**
  - Respecting human dignity includes protecting the **body and identity** from invasive, compulsory biometric tracking. HB 1676 limits that intrusion and reduces the risk that Christians will face digital profiling or pressure tied to their beliefs.
  - **Rating: Supports.**
- **Property Taxes & Economic Freedom:**
  - The bill doesn't change taxes, but it does limit a type of infrastructure that could later be tied to **ownership, licensing, and property controls** (e.g., digital credentials linked to property access).
  - **Rating: Not directly implicated / Slightly Supports.**
- **Literal / Original-Intent Constitutionalism:**
  - By reinforcing privacy and limiting centralized ID systems, HB 1676 supports a more **originalist** understanding of limited government and the right to be secure in one's person and data.
  - **Rating: Supports.**
- **Right to Bear Arms:**

- No direct impact on firearms. However, preventing a universal digital ID system makes it harder to implement **de facto registries or tracking** of gun owners through ID-based access systems.
  - **Rating: Supports (indirectly).**
- **State Sovereignty & Tenth Amendment:**
  - The bill makes it harder for **federal or international bodies** to demand Missouri participation in a shared digital ID or identity-data network, especially through the consent requirement for data-sharing.
  - **Rating: Supports.**
- **Nuclear Family & Parental Rights:**
  - Limiting digital ID and biometric mandates protects families from being forced to enroll children into such systems as a condition for school, healthcare, or benefits.
  - **Rating: Supports.**
- **Homeschool Protection:**
  - No direct language about homeschooling, but blocking digital ID mandates reduces opportunities for future regulations that could say “no digital ID, no access to...” for homeschool services or testing.
  - **Rating: Supports (indirectly).**
- **Currency & Financial Control (CBDC / FedNow):**
  - Digital identity is a **building block** for CBDC-based social-credit control. By stopping state digital ID mandates, HB 1676 helps prevent a core piece of that infrastructure from taking root in Missouri.
  - **Rating: Supports.**
- **Election Integrity:**
  - No direct changes to elections, but preventing universal digital ID systems makes it harder to centralize voter identity and build nationalized “ID + vote” tracking structures.
  - **Rating: Supports (indirectly).**
- **Government Transparency:**
  - HB 1676 does not change Sunshine laws, but limiting digital ID infrastructure **reduces hidden complexity** and potential secret data-sharing.
  - **Rating: Supports / Not strongly implicated.**



---

## PART 6 – SPECIAL TOPIC TESTS (2025 PRIORITIES)

### 6.1 Amendment 3 / Personhood & Equal-Protection Test

- HB 1676 does **not** address abortion, reproductive freedom, or personhood language.
- **Result: Not implicated for this bill.**

### 6.2 Surveillance, Digital-ID, and Data-Hub Test

HB 1676 directly hits this category:

- **Digital IDs & identity databases:**
  - Explicitly bans the **development, deployment, or maintenance** of any **state-sponsored digital identification system** and mandates requiring individuals to use digital ID for access to services or facilities.
  - This is a **major protection** against exactly the kind of digital ID frameworks being promoted globally.
- **Biometrics:**
  - Prohibits “the use of biometric data... as a requirement for identification or verification within state agencies or government contracts.”
  - Positive from a privacy standpoint (no forced fingerprints, facial recognition, etc. as general ID).
- **Data-sharing / future mission creep:**
  - Prohibits sharing an individual’s digital identity data with **federal agencies, international organizations, or private entities** without explicit, informed consent.
  - This is a strong guardrail against mission creep, cross-border data hubs, and integration into global ID schemes.

**Conclusion:** HB 1676 is **strongly positive** on surveillance and digital ID concerns.

### 6.3 Utilities, Energy Policy, and Data-Center / Big-User Test

- **Not implicated for this bill.**

### 6.4 Federal Money & Strings

- HB 1676 may put Missouri at odds with **future federal programs** that try to tie funding to digital ID or biometric verification—but that is actually a **feature** from a sovereignty standpoint, not a bug.
- The bill does not itself accept or depend on federal funding.

**Conclusion:** It likely **reduces the risk** of Missouri being drawn into federal digital-ID schemes via funding strings.

## 6.5 Model-Legislation / Agenda 21 & 2030 / Globalism Indicators

- The bill’s language is straightforward and **does not use** Agenda 21/2030 buzzwords like “sustainable development” or “equity.”
- Substantively, it **pushes against** the global trend toward integrated digital IDs promoted by various international bodies.

**Conclusion:** The bill is **anti-globalist in effect**, not a vehicle for globalist agendas.

---

## PART 7 – RED FLAGS, AMENDMENT IDEAS, & FINAL RECOMMENDATION

### 7.1 Red-Flag List

Most “flags” here are not reasons to oppose, but areas to refine:

1. **[Red Flag #1 – No explicit enforcement / remedy]** – §1.3055 –
  - The bill states the state “shall not” do certain things but provides **no clear enforcement mechanism**, penalties, or citizen remedies, which may weaken its practical effect.

### 7.2 Possible Fixes / Amendments

Act for Missouri **supports the bill while recommending the following possible improvement:**

1. **Add an enforcement clause:**
  - Provide either:
    - A **private right of action** for citizens whose digital identity data is shared without consent, and/or
    - Explicit penalties or disciplinary measures for agencies that create or attempt to enforce prohibited digital ID systems.

### 7.3 Final Recommendation

- **Recommended stance: Support.**

HB 1676 is a **strong, pro-freedom, anti-surveillance** bill that fits very well with Act for Missouri’s Christian, constitutional, limited-government perspective. It **does not violate** single-subject or clear-title rules, does **not grow government**, and instead **blocks** the infrastructure needed for a future digital ID regime that could be tied to travel, finances, healthcare, education, or speech.