



Minnesota House Health Finance and Policy Committee
Minnesota House of Representatives

March 2, 2026

Re: Opposition to HF 3668 – Office of Gun Violence Prevention

Chair Backer, Chair Bierman, and Members,

On behalf of the Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus, the trusted voice of Minnesota’s gun owners working to defend and restore the right to keep and bear arms, **we respectfully urge you to vote NO on HF 3668.**

HF 3668 proposes creating a new “Office of Gun Violence Prevention” within the Minnesota Department of Health.

While presented as a public health initiative, the bill would establish a permanent, taxpayer-funded office with broad authority to shape firearm policy, influence legislation, coordinate with outside organizations, and promote regulatory strategies under the banner of research and data collection.

Minnesota does not need another layer of government bureaucracy focused on reframing and restricting a constitutional right.

The proposal mirrors a federal experiment that was recently dismantled after becoming a centralized advocacy hub inside the Executive Branch. The former White House Office of Gun Violence Prevention was created to coordinate firearm policy and regulatory initiatives, but it ultimately functioned as a political policy engine. Minnesota should not replicate that model at the state level.

Instead of focusing on violent offenders, repeat criminals, and systemic prosecution failures, HF 3668 institutionalizes a public-health framing that treats lawful firearm ownership as a societal pathology.

The Second Amendment protects a fundamental civil right. It should not be recast as a public health disorder.

HF 3668 grants the proposed office sweeping authority to conduct and promote research on gun violence, collect and report firearm-related data, create public messaging campaigns, build partnerships with national stakeholders, and serve as a legislative resource on gun violence prevention policy. The bill contains no meaningful guardrails limiting how this authority may be



used. There is no clear statutory limitation on coordination with private advocacy organizations, nor is there a prohibition on engaging in activities that functionally support policy advocacy.

In practice, “national stakeholders” often means national gun control advocacy organizations.

Minnesota taxpayers should not be compelled to fund coordination with outside political groups whose stated mission is to restrict lawful firearm ownership. This office would not simply operate as a neutral data clearinghouse; it would operate as a policy engine embedded within state government.

Minnesota already funds and operates substantial public safety infrastructure.

The Department of Public Safety, the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, the Office of Justice Programs, county attorneys, local law enforcement agencies, and victim support services all play direct roles in addressing violent crime. If violence is the concern, the solution lies in enforcement, prosecution, and accountability. Creating another administrative office does not put repeat offenders behind bars, strengthen prosecution, address gang activity, or reform plea-bargaining practices. It creates additional bureaucracy.

Minnesota taxpayers are also already funding a politicized firearms litigation clinic within the University of Minnesota Law School, commonly referred to as the “Gun Violence Prevention Clinic.”

In practice, that clinic has participated in litigation defending Minnesota’s gun control laws, supported legal strategies targeting firearm manufacturers and retailers, and advanced policy positions aligned with national gun control advocacy organizations. This is not merely neutral academic inquiry; it is taxpayer-subsidized advocacy. Law-abiding gun owners in Minnesota are already compelled to fund a public university program that works to uphold and expand firearm restrictions.

Supporters argue that HF 3668 is needed to improve data collection and address firearm-related violence as a public health issue.

However, Minnesota and the federal government already collect extensive data on violent crime and suicide involving firearms. At the state level, the Department of Public Safety, the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, the Office of Justice Programs, the Department of Health, and local law enforcement agencies compile and publish firearm-related crime and mortality statistics. At the federal level, the FBI, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics collect and publish comprehensive data annually. Information about homicide, assault, domestic violence, and suicide involving firearms is already tracked, analyzed, and reported.



Creating a new Office of Gun Violence Prevention does not fill a data gap; it duplicates existing functions.

If the legislature believes reporting or coordination can be improved, it can direct current agencies to refine their data collection and collaboration efforts. It does not need to establish a permanent, standalone office with its own staff, budget, and policy mandate to accomplish that goal. Minnesota should strengthen the institutions it already funds rather than layering on redundant bureaucracy.

HF 3668 would establish a new director, full-time staff, retirement system obligations, grant-seeking authority, annual reporting requirements, and ongoing general fund appropriations. All of this would be created without demonstrated evidence that such an office reduces violent crime.

At a time when Minnesotans face rising taxes, inflation, and ongoing public safety concerns, expanding government overhead should not be the first response.

If this body is serious about reducing violence, the path forward is clear: enforce existing laws against violent felons, address repeat offender release, support law enforcement, ensure meaningful prosecution, and expand direct services for victims. The Constitution does not prevent Minnesota from punishing violent criminals. It does prevent the state from targeting peaceful citizens for exercising a fundamental right.

HF 3668 would create a permanent, taxpayer-funded policy office dedicated to reframing and regulating a constitutional right. Minnesota already funds a publicly supported clinic advancing firearm restriction strategies. Establishing an additional executive branch office to pursue similar objectives is unnecessary, duplicative, and fiscally irresponsible. This bill expands bureaucracy instead of strengthening accountability.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to vote NO on HF 3668.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bryan Strawser
Chair

Anna Leamy
Director, Government Relations & Advocacy