

It's Not Just for Refugees; We Need Extreme Vetting in the Judicial System

The federal court judge who blocked President Trump's temporary travel ban is the poster child for everything that's wrong with America's legal system.

U.S. District Judge James Robart is the man who blocked President Trump's temporary immigration ban. The president's decision to stop refugees from seven countries that are known breeding grounds for jihadists was prudent.

In my estimation, we do not have a moral or constitutional obligation to let people into the country who want to blow us up or chop off our heads.

Judge Robart's restraining order puts Americans in harm's way and, as the Associated Press reports, contained erroneous information.

The judge said not a single person from any of the seven banned countries has been arrested for extremism. It turns out that was not true.

The Associated Press reports that an Iraqi refugee living in Texas pleaded guilty to attempting to provide support to the Islamic State. And in November, a Somali refugee used a car and knife to wage an attack at The Ohio State University.

So President Trump was absolutely within his rights to call out Judge Robart's actions.

Folks, our federal court houses are infested with judicial activists. And the only way to root out the infestation is for President Trump to name conservative judges to the appellate courts.

But Republican presidents have had a bad habit of putting closet liberals on the bench. Democrats nominate liberals who stay liberal. But once GOP nominees get confirmed, their gavels go wobbly.

Judge Robart, for example, was appointed by President George W. Bush.

So not only do we need extreme vetting at the border, we also need extreme vetting in the courthouse. {eoa}