

ABORTION CONFOUNDS HILLARY

When Hillary Clinton was recently a guest on NBC's "Meet the Press," she said the following about abortion:

"Under Roe v. Wade, as you know," "there is room for reasonable kinds of restrictions after a certain point in time." She did not say why she has never found a restriction she could support, including the reasonable restriction on stabbing the skull of a baby who is 80 percent born (otherwise known as partial-birth abortion).

"The unborn person doesn't have constitutional rights," she said. Having conceded that pregnant mothers are carrying the life of another person, she did not feel obligated to protect that life. Moreover, she did not say why constitutional rights can be denied to one class of persons without greasing the slide to denying other classes of persons.

Hillary's position is eerily reminiscent of what U.S. Supreme Court Justice Roger Taney said in his infamous 1857 Dred Scott ruling on slavery: He declared that blacks had "no rights which the white man was bound to respect."

Hillary also told "Meet the Press" host Chuck Todd that "in the third trimester of pregnancy there is room for looking at the life and the health of the mother." This shows how abortion totally confounds her—it is not just Donald Trump who needs to develop a coherent position.

Third trimester discussions do not focus exclusively on "the life and the health of the mother"; rather, they focus on "the life and the health" of the baby, as well. She knows that but can't admit to it.

Last year, Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker signed legislation banning abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy. "At five months," he said, "that's the time when that unborn child can

feel pain.” Hillary labeled his decision “dangerous.” Dangerous to whom? According to her reasoning, expounded recently, it couldn’t be the child. After all, unborn persons have no constitutional rights.