



## HB 2107

Sponsor: Richard West

Path to full text:

<https://documents.house.mo.gov/billtracking/bills261/hlrbillspdf/5010H.01I.pdf>

## Act for Missouri Bill Analysis (103rd GA)

---

### PART 1 – QUICK SNAPSHOT

#### 1.1 One-Paragraph Overview (Plain Language)

HB 2107 authorizes the Missouri General Assembly (and either chamber) to employ “legislative security officers” for the House and/or Senate. These officers may carry firearms when necessary for their duties and must be licensed peace officers under Missouri’s POST program. The bill further grants these officers the law-enforcement powers they deem “necessary” to secure and keep the General Assembly functioning, including the power to apprehend and arrest people. The bill includes an emergency clause, meaning it would take effect immediately upon passage and approval rather than waiting the normal effective-date timeline.

HB2107

#### 1.2 Triage Table (Fast Flags)

Check	Quick Finding
Single-Subject / Clear Title	<b>Likely compliant</b> (one main topic: legislative security officers).
Title Specificity (0–3)	<b>3</b> — “relating to legislative security officers” is narrow and direct.
Department Scope	<b>Single</b> — primarily the General Assembly (though it relies on POST licensing administered under DPS).

Check	Quick Finding
Does it grow government?	<b>Yes</b> — authorizes a potentially new, chamber-controlled armed peace-officer force with arrest authority.
Impact on Missouri families (overall)	<b>Mixed</b> — could improve safety at the Capitol, but expands government enforcement power in a politically sensitive public space.
Alignment with core beliefs (high-level)	<b>Mixed/Unclear</b> — legitimate safety goal, but broad police powers + emergency clause raise process/accountability concerns.
Initial stance	<b>Oppose</b>

## PART 2 – PURPOSE & PROVISION MAP

### 2.1 Stated Purpose & Title

- **Bill title (summary):** “Relating to legislative security officers, with an emergency clause.”
- **What it appears designed to accomplish:** Give the House/Senate the explicit statutory authority to hire POST-licensed peace officers (armed) under legislative control to secure the Capitol/legislative operations—rather than relying solely on existing Capitol Police or other executive-branch law enforcement.

### 2.2 Provision-by-Provision Map

#### 1. §21.158 (new) — Legislative security officers

- **Plain-language summary:** Allows the General Assembly/House/Senate to employ security officers who can carry firearms; requires POST peace-officer licensing; grants them law-enforcement powers “necessary” for legislative security and functioning, including arrest authority.
- **Tag: [Concern]**
- **Why:** The security objective is legitimate, and POST licensing is a meaningful baseline; however, the grant of “all powers...necessary” is broad and undefined (jurisdiction, command, coordination, and limits are not spelled out), increasing risk of mission creep or politicized enforcement in a public forum.

#### 2. Section B — Emergency clause

- **Plain-language summary:** Declares an emergency for Capitol safety during the current session and thereafter, making the act effective immediately upon passage/approval.
- **Tag: [Concern]**
- **Why:** Emergency clauses are frequently used as process leverage. Under Missouri’s constitutional framework, emergencies accelerate effective date and are also tied to

referendum exceptions for laws necessary for immediate preservation of public peace/health/safety—raising “fair process” concerns unless clearly justified.

## 2.3 Changes to Existing Law (High-Level)

- Creates explicit authority for the legislature (or either chamber) to employ its own **POST-licensed** armed security officers.
  - Grants those officers **arrest/apprehension powers** and other law-enforcement powers deemed “necessary” to secure and maintain legislative functioning.
  - Makes the change **effective immediately** via emergency clause (if passed with required vote thresholds).
- 

# PART 3 – CONSTITUTIONAL & PROCESS CHECKS

## 3.1 Missouri Single-Subject & Original-Purpose Tests (Art. III §23)

- **Main subject:** Authorizing legislative security officers (armed, POST-licensed) with enforcement powers for legislative security.
- **Additional subjects/riders:** None apparent in the introduced form.
- **Title clarity vs. real effects:** The title is fairly candid (security officers) and not a catch-all. **Title Specificity = 3.**
- **Department scope: Single** (General Assembly), but it intersects with DPS/POST licensing as a dependency.
- **Conclusion: Likely complies** with single-subject and clear-title requirements.

## 3.2 U.S. & Missouri Constitutional Rights

- **Free speech/assembly/petition (Capitol as a public civic forum):** The bill does not explicitly restrict speech, but granting a chamber-controlled police power in a public setting can affect how citizens experience access and dissent. This is a **risk-of-abuse** issue, not a direct textual violation—best handled by guardrails (clear jurisdiction, conduct standards, reporting, and complaint process).
- **Due process:** Arrest powers are implied to be the same as those of other Missouri law enforcement; however, the bill does not define jurisdiction or limits, which can create practical due-process and accountability concerns if policies are not clearly set.
- **Right to bear arms:** No direct infringement on citizens; it expands authority for officers to carry firearms.

## 3.3 Delegation, Separation of Powers, and Accountable Government

This bill is notable because it strengthens **legislative-branch control over an armed enforcement capacity**. While the officers must be POST-licensed (external baseline), the operational discretion is broad (“all powers...necessary”), and the bill does not clarify:

- geographic jurisdiction (Capitol complex only vs. beyond),
- chain of command/oversight,
- coordination with the existing Capitol Police,
- reporting requirements,
- misconduct/complaint handling (beyond whatever POST decertification might cover).

Also, Missouri already has a **Capitol Police Division** described in state regulations as the **primary law enforcement agency for the Capitol Complex**, and Missouri statutes provide Capitol Police arrest authority in the county containing the seat of government under specified conditions.

HB 2107 does not explain why a second, legislature-controlled force is needed or how conflicts would be prevented.

---

## PART 4 – IMPACT ON MISSOURI FAMILIES

### 4.1 Economic, Tax, and Utility Impacts

- **Potential cost increase (Burden):** Hiring POST-licensed peace officers (salary, benefits, training, equipment) likely increases government operating costs, even though HB 2107 does not contain a fiscal mechanism or appropriation language in the introduced text.
- **Potential benefit (Relief):** If it prevents violence or disruption at the Capitol, that is a public-safety benefit—though the bill does not provide metrics or standards to evaluate results. However, this is not currently a problem. The Capitol police have been able to maintain order without any outside assistance.

### 4.2 Family, Parental Rights, and Education

Not implicated.

### 4.3 Moral & Cultural Climate

Neutral on life/family issues, but it does touch the broader civic culture question: will the Capitol be more secure **without becoming less accessible** to ordinary citizens?

---

## PART 5 – ACT FOR MISSOURI CORE PRINCIPLES CHECK

1. **Sanctity of life:** Not implicated.

2. **Christian/biblical view of government: Mixed** — government has a legitimate duty to punish evil and protect public order, but this expands coercive power and should be narrowly constrained and accountable.
  3. **Property rights & economic liberty:** Indirect (cost growth).
  4. **Constitutionalism & rule of law: Mixed** — single-subject/title look clean; **emergency clause** triggers process concerns unless clearly justified.
  5. **Right to bear arms:** No restriction on citizens.
  6. **State sovereignty / Tenth Amendment:** Not implicated.
  7. **Nuclear family / parental rights:** Not implicated.
  8. **Homeschool freedom / private Christian education:** Not implicated.
  9. **Surveillance/data / financial control:** Not implicated.
- 

## PART 6 – SPECIAL TOPIC TESTS (2025–2026 PRIORITIES)

- **Amendment 3 / personhood:** Not implicated.
  - **Surveillance State & digital control:** Not implicated.
  - **Utilities/data centers:** Not implicated.
  - **Federal money & strings:** Not implicated.
  - **Globalism/Agenda signals:** Not implicated.
  - **Doula/perinatal:** Not implicated.
- 

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

### 7.1 Red-Flag List (Prioritized)

1. **Emergency Clause Used to Accelerate / Bypass Normal Process**
  - **Location:** Section B (emergency clause).
  - **Why it matters:** Missouri’s emergency framework changes effective timing and relates to referendum exceptions for “immediate preservation” laws—so it should be used sparingly and only when the emergency is concrete and immediate.
  - **Severity: Serious**
2. **Overbroad Grant of “All Powers...Necessary” Without Defined Jurisdiction or Limits**
  - **Location:** §21.158 (new).

- **Why it matters:** Creates wide discretionary enforcement power in a politically sensitive public environment without guardrails (jurisdiction, oversight, coordination, transparency).
- **Severity: Serious**

### 3. **Potential Duplication / Turf Conflict With Existing Capitol Police**

- **Location:** Structural (bill creates a legislature-controlled force).
- **Why it matters:** Capitol Police are already described in state regs as the primary law enforcement agency for the Capitol Complex, and Missouri statutes address Capitol Police arrest authority—so creating a parallel force risks confusion, inconsistent standards, and accountability gaps.
- **Severity: Serious**

## 7.2 **Possible Fixes / Amendments (Concrete)**

We see no way to amend this legislation in a way we could support. This is not needed at best, and is an attempt to limit or intimidate the citizens from their right to petition their government.

## 7.3 **Final Recommendation – STRONGLY OPPOSE**

**Act for Missouri rates HB 2107 as STRONGLY OPPOSE.** The goal of protecting public safety at the Capitol is legitimate. However, the bill’s emergency clause and its broad, undefined grant of “all powers...necessary” (including arrest authority) under legislative control raise serious concerns about accountability, mission creep, and potential chilling effects on citizen access and civic participation at the Capitol.