

Overview:

Jill Schupp has a disturbing pattern of siding against our law enforcement and public safety.

Example 1: Schupp voted to prevent sex offenders who are also illegal immigrants from getting deported.

Background: In 2011, Schupp voted against bipartisan legislation requiring the state to report sex offenders to the federal government. Her vote would have made it more difficult to deport illegal immigrant sex offenders once they were released from prison.

- Schupp was 1 of ONLY 23 legislators (163 legislators in the house) who voted against a bipartisan bill (HB 731) to require the state to report illegal immigrants on the state's sex offender registry to the federal government. The bill also included language to add citizenship information to the state's sex offender registration form. "Adds citizenship information to the sexual offender registration form and requires the State Highway Patrol to report to the federal government any non-U.S. citizen on the sexual offender registry."
- Schupp voted No on HB 731. (HB 731, March 17, 2011, Overall vote: 130-23, Schupp vote: No, [Missouri House Journal](#), p. 688)
- Former Missouri Rep. Steven Tilley championed the bill, saying the bill "adds the requirement that those convicted of sex crimes which require registration also provide information about their immigration status." "The bill we passed through this week adds the requirement that those convicted of sex crimes which require registration also provide information about their immigration status. Also, the Highway Patrol would be required to cross-check this registration, and if the offender was not a citizen, report them for deportation. Strangely, the Highway patrol does not currently have the authority to look directly into sex offenders' citizenship or immigration status. Our bill would give them that authority. Fortunately, this bill would cost no extra money, and would provide for an easy solution to a tough problem. It's hard enough to deal with sex offenders in communities who are United States citizens." (Rep. Steven Tilley, "Growing jobs, protecting families," *Farmington Press*, 3/24/11)

Example 2: Schupp voted against a bipartisan constitutional amendment that was introduced to bring child sex offenders to justice and give victims a voice.

Background: In 2013, Schupp voted against a constitutional amendment (HJR 16) that made it easier to prosecute child sex offenders:

- In 2013, Schupp voted against a constitutional amendment (HJR 16) "allowing relevant evidence of prior criminal acts to be admissible in prosecutions for crimes of a sexual nature" involving minors. "This proposes a constitutional amendment allowing relevant evidence of prior criminal acts to be admissible in prosecutions for crimes of a sexual nature involving a victim under 18 years of age." ("The Final Week: Hourly update of the Missouri House," [Press Release](#), 5/17/13)

- The amendment would “allow use of relevant evidence of past criminal acts to corroborate a victim’s testimony” in cases involving minors. “Prosecutors in Missouri could use evidence of past criminal behavior in child sex abuse prosecutions under a proposed state constitutional amendment approved Friday by the state Legislature. The measure would allow use of relevant evidence of past criminal acts to corroborate a victim's testimony or to demonstrate the defendant has a propensity to commit the crime with which he or she now is charged. That type of evidence would be limited to prosecutions of crimes of a sexual nature in which the victim was younger than 18. ‘It would help stop sex abuse of children,’ said Sen. Rob Schaaf, R-St. Joseph, who sponsored the measure in the Senate.” (“Mo. lawmakers OK measure aimed at child sex abuse,” The Associated Press, 5/17/13)
- Schupp voted against HJR 16. (SCS HJR 16, Passed 135-21, Schupp Voted No, 5/17/13, [Missouri House of Representatives](#), p. 3261)

The constitutional amendment that Schupp opposed ultimately went before the voters in 2014.¹

- *Official Ballot Title:* “Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended so that it will be permissible to allow relevant **evidence of prior criminal acts to be admissible in prosecutions for crimes of a sexual nature involving a victim under eighteen years of age?**”
- The constitutional amendment was endorsed by the Post-Dispatch, Kansas City Star, Daily-Star Journal and more.
 - Post-Dispatch: “Those who commit crimes in secret against society’s most vulnerable victims should not be able to keep their past a secret. This amendment seeks to level the playing field for prosecutors. Vote Yes on Amendment 2”
 - KC Star: “a reasonable and necessary measure to help sexually abused children and put dangerous offenders behind bars. The Star recommends voting YES.”

The constitutional amendment passed with 72% of the vote. Jill was once again on the wrong side of Missourians.

Example 3: Schupp is backed by radical groups that want to defund our police.

Background: Schupp has received support from the Indivisible St. Louis organization which has made vile comments denigrating police officers and the national organization has called for police departments to be defunded:

- The day Jill announced her candidacy for Congress, she received [praise](#) from the Invisible STL via Twitter. Schupp happily shared their support with her [twitter followers](#). Indivisible STL followed up with a [formal endorsement](#) earlier this year.

¹ [https://ballotpedia.org/Missouri Evidence in Sexual Crimes Against Minors, Amendment 2 \(2014\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Missouri_Evidence_in_Sexual_Crimes_Against_Minors,_Amendment_2_(2014))

- As protests and riots sprang up across the country earlier this year the [national Indivisible organization](#) became hostile toward local police departments and has called for them to be defunded.
- Invisible STL also began using terms like [#ACAB \(All Cops Are Bastards\)](#) and calling officers “[ANIMALS](#).” Jill has yet to condemn any of these disparaging terms about our police officers from her supporters in the Indivisible STL organization.
- Schupp is also [supported](#) by Planned Parenthood Action Fund which has stated their support of the defund the police movement.

Defunding the Police: What it Means and Why Planned Parenthood Supports It

By [Planned Parenthood Action Fund](#) | July 9, 2020, 5:17 p.m.

- Schupp is also [supported](#) by NARAL which has stated it [supports the defund the police movement](#).

NARAL Pro-Choice America supports the demands of the Movement for Black Lives, including [defunding the police](#) and investing in Black communities, which are a response to hundreds of years of systemic oppression and the failure of reforms to address urgent needs and injustices. Budgets reflect our priorities. As such, the call to [defund the police](#) is also a call for investment in Black communities—in urgent needs that are currently underfunded, like access to healthcare, education, social services, and more. Through this investment, we can work to make sure every person, every parent, and every family is able to thrive.

- Schupp has never spoken out against her supporter’s defund positions or disavowed their support.