

Did Dianne Feinstein Even Think Before She Spoke?

Whenever Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), a ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, gives her opening statements before committee hearings, her statements are, effectively, the spoken on behalf of her party.

For Democrats, that's unfortunate, because it's hard to imagine her comments Monday to President Trump's Supreme Court nominee, 10th Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Neil Gorsuch, won't come back to haunt them. While House Democrats try to spin the repeal of Obamacare as a Republican effort to "Make America Sick Again," Feinstein demonstrated why many believe Democrats are the "Party of Death."

She came out of her corner swinging hard:

"President Trump repeatedly promised to appoint someone in the mold of Justice (Antonin) Scalia and said that the nomination of Judge Gorsuch illustrates he's a man of his word. The Supreme Court has the final say on whether a woman will continue to have control over her own body or whether decisions about her healthcare will be determined by politicians and the government."

Typical, recycled liberal talking points, but what she said next needs to be framed under the context of Gorsuch's statement, written in a book he authored about the legal and moral ramifications of euthanasia. The judge wrote, "the intentional taking of a human life by private persons is always wrong."

That triggered Feinstein's opening statement:

"President Trump repeatedly promised that his judicial nominees would be pro-life, and automatically overturn *Roe v.*

Wade. Judge Gorsuch has not had occasion to rule directly on a case involving *Roe*. However, his writings do raise questions.

“Specifically, he wrote that he believes there are no exceptions to the principle that ‘the intentional taking of a human life by private persons is always wrong.’ This language has been interpreted by both pro-life and pro-choice organizations to mean he would overturn *Roe*.”

That’s right: because Gorsuch thinks it’s always wrong to intentionally take a life, he’s unfit—in the eyes of Democrats—to sit on the high court. She then concluded that Gorsuch’s “originalist” judicial philosophy was “really troubling,” and could lead to government sanctioned discrimination of racial and religious minorities and homosexuals.

You can watch the entire speech in the video clip above.