



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on May 22, 2016

Hillary Clinton Spokesman Says Candidate Supports Background Checks on Ammo Purchases

Hillary Clinton wants to force background checks on civilians prior to purchasing ammunition, a spokesman said.

Speaking on behalf of the presumptive Democratic candidate during a May 16 roundtable discussion on gun violence sponsored by Clinton's presidential campaign, former Los Angeles mayor Antonio Villaraigosa said that Clinton supports California Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom's effort to enforce background checks on ammunition purchasers.



In its coverage of the Clinton campaign event — which featured an appearance by former congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords — CBS Los Angeles reported that Villaraigosa told the supporters gathered at Homeboy Industries in Chinatown that Clinton supports the state's proposal to require background checks before buying ammunition.

Clinton also wants to impose, according to spokesman Villaraigosa, the "implementation of universal background checks on the national level and a ban on 'assault weapons.'"

Described by some as the "Gunpocalypse," the anti-gun goals of the Golden State's politicians would result in effectively disarming the civilian population. As ABC News reports: "Lawmakers also voted to require that people turn in magazines capable of holding more than 10 rounds as they backed nearly a dozen measures that would significantly reshape California's gun laws, already among the strictest in the U.S."

The so-called "assault weapons" ban is nothing more than a usurpation, as it has been repeatedly proven to be ineffective at reducing gun violence.

Despite the fact that President Obama's adopted hometown of Chicago is home to such a ban, it had nearly 500 gun-related homicides in 2015.

According to the *Chicago Tribune*, over 1,000 people have been shot in Chicago since the beginning of 2016. This total is more than the number of gunshot victims in both New York and Los Angeles combined over the same period.

The consolidation of control of all weapons and ammunition in the hands of government (the instrument of millions of gun-related deaths in the 20th century) has been a Hillary Clinton priority for years.



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on May 22, 2016

During the deliberations on the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton pushed through a proposal to allow approval of the globalist gun grab by a majority vote of the UN General Assembly rather than than by consensus as originally required.

This reporter attended the final conference at the UN when the Arms Trade Treaty was approved — the U.S. State Department being the primary promoter of the plan — and the right to keep and bear arms was a hiss and a byword to those committed to confiscating weapons from civilians.

At a side event on the topic of confiscation of ammunition held at the conference co-sponsored by the government of Mexico and the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), several speakers presented their best cases for granting the UN control over bullets as well as guns.

The hour-long meeting featured testimony from PRIO, the permanent mission of Mexico to the UN, the Spanish foreign affairs ministry, and Norwegian Church Aid. Each of them echoed the claim made by PRIO in a paper given to each of those in attendance that “controls over transfers of ammunition offer a greater opportunity to prevent atrocities compared to control over weapons.”

“Without bullets, a gun is not much more than a baseball bat,” said [Hilde Wallacher of Norwegian Church Aid](#).

And that is the ultimate aim. The UN will have you left defenseless against itself and its “state party” enforcers. If eradicating private ownership of firearms proves too difficult, then they will prevent purchase of ammunition, rendering your weapons useless to defend yourself, your family, or your home from whatever atrocity is imposed upon you by your global overlords.

Near the end of the meeting, the ambassador at large for international affairs from Spain suggested that in order to accomplish the aim of the anti-ammo agenda, someone would need to develop a technology that would prevent reloading, the reuse of spent cartridges.

When asked during an interview with *The New American* after the conclusion of the presentation how reloading could be controlled, Ambassador Carlos Sanchez de Boado suggested implanting some sort of device in the cartridge that would cause it to self-destruct after being fired the first time.

Although this scheme of Sanchez sounds far-fetched, other suggestions for accelerating the internationalists’ control over guns and ammo are closer to becoming reality. The first significant step is the mandate that state parties begin compiling a list of all people inside their respective borders who own, sell, trade, or manufacture weapons and ammunition.

All of this sounds good to Clinton and always has. Her support for the proposed imposition of background checks prior to the purchase of ammunition is part and parcel of her plan to take guns from the people and put them in the hands of the government.

For example, less than a year after the inauguration of Barack Obama, Clinton spoke out in favor of the Arms Trade Treaty. “The United States is committed to actively pursuing a strong and robust treaty that contains the highest possible, legally binding standards,” Clinton said in a statement issued by the State Department.

Article 3 of the agreement places the “ammunition/munitions fired, launched or delivered by the conventional arms covered under Article 2” within the scope of the treaty’s prohibitions, as well.

When asked at a campaign stop in October 2015 if she approved of adopting the British and Australian model of gun control, Clinton praised the policies of those Anglophone countries:



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on May 22, 2016

Australia is a good example, Canada is a good example, the U.K. is a good example. Why? Each of them have had mass killings. Australia had a huge mass killing about 20-25 years ago, Canada did as well, so did the U.K. In reaction, they passed much stricter gun laws.

History isn't on the side of those who think banning guns and ammo will lead to a decrease in violent crimes committed with those weapons.

Consider this evidence on the effect that outlawing handguns had on homicide rates in England presented by the Crime Prevention Research Center:

Every place that has banned guns has seen murder rates go up. You cannot point to one place where murder rates have fallen, whether it's Chicago or D.C. or even island nations such as England, Jamaica, or Ireland.

For an example of homicide rates before and after a ban, take the case of the handgun ban in England and Wales in January 1997. After the ban, clearly homicide rates bounce around over time, but there is only one year (2010) where the homicide rate is lower than it was in 1996. The immediate effect was about a 50-percent increase in homicide rates. The homicide rate began falling only when there was a large increase in the number of police officers during 2003 and 2004. Despite the [huge increase](#) in the number of police, the murder rate still remained slightly higher than the immediate pre-ban rate.

Statistics from Australia also shed light on the illogic of disarmament.

In 1996, an Australian man named Martin Bryant killed 35 people and wounded 21 others during an armed rampage at a tourist site in Tasmania. Bryant used two semiautomatic weapons in the attack.

Australian gun laws were already very strict when Bryant committed the Port Arthur massacre. The laws in effect at the time required applicants asking for permission to buy a gun to provide a "genuine reason and need for owning, possessing or using a firearm."

The list of government-approved "genuine reasons" included police and security work, hunting, controlling feral animals, collecting, and target shooting.

Noticeably missing from the Australian statute: *personal protection*. This omission brings up the question of whether the number of victims of the Bryant shooting spree might have been a bit lower had one of those who were caught in the crosshairs had a means to end the slaughter.

After the election of Prime Minister John Howard in March 1996, the Australian Parliament passed the National Firearms Agreement (NFA), which banned all semiautomatic rifles, semiautomatic shotguns, and pump-action shotguns, and imposed severe limits on the possession of all other weapons.

In 2003, the Brookings Institution [published a study](#) of homicides in Australia after the passage of the National Firearms Agreement and the enforcement of its remarkably strict prohibitions on civilian gun ownership.

The Brookings study found that the "total homicide rate has been slowly declining throughout the 1990s." And what about after the enforcement of the gun grab? "In the five years post-NFA there has been no pronounced acceleration of that decline," the report concluded.

Speaking specifically of armed homicide, the study found that there was "a 3.2 percent decline in the daily rate of firearm homicide." That reduction "continued a long-term trend rather than the effect of the Port Arthur incident."



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on May 22, 2016

Also noteworthy, the Brookings study found that the number of homicides involving the “assault rifles” targeted by the NFA dropped, while the number of homicides involving handguns “did increase sharply after the NFA.”

Her statements at the gun violence event in Los Angeles prove that under a President Hillary Clinton, the right to own and purchase guns and ammunition will be regulated out of existence following the British and Australia models she praises so highly.

Unfortunately, history reveals that armed violence in the United States would follow the paths taken by these countries, too — a path that leads to an increase in gun-related crimes and an inversely proportional decrease in the right to keep and bear arms protected by the Second Amendment.

Photo of Hillary Clinton: AP Images



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

[Subscribe](#)