

Liberal Activist Judges Have No Decency With Regard to Constitution

US District Judge Derrick Watson should be impeached

By Donald A. Loucks
Submitted 16 July, 2017

It comes with little surprise that one of the liberal, activist federal judges who had a hand in gutting President Trump's temporary travel restrictions from six dangerous countries took the stage for a repeat performance. Last week, US District Judge Derrick Watson (in Hawaii) of the infamous 9th Circuit, blew away the family relations restrictions in the ban.

This judge meddled with the definition used by Trump to clearly state what relations could tag along into the US and which could not. Under Watson's interpretation, just about anybody can claim a familial relationship with anyone else: operant word is "cousin." Also, Watson says that "close family members" can be grandparents, grandchildren, brothers and sisters-in-law, aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, and of course cousins.

While it is more than dangerous to loosen the restrictions in this way, it is also something that we seldom hear defined as indecent anymore.

Watson's recent ruling in the immigration matter is a gross overreach, and in my opinion, an impeachable offense. I would describe this as using a seat on a federal court to render a decision which is clearly unconstitutional and also contradicts federal statute which further defines executive power with regard to immigration (which also includes visitors) just so there would be no question about what a president can or cannot do.

Watson knew exactly what the Constitution says and the Federal laws that reinforce that executive power, but he chose to defy that in a way that is breathtaking from any legal perspective.

This is indecent. This is shameless. It is also a sign of the political times. These times are falling into lawlessness and disrespect. Whole states (California for one) and many cities are thumbing their noses with regard to enforcement of Federal Immigration Law. This is extremely dangerous, not just to the Constitution, but also to our safety. Example: have you had a driving accident with an illegal lately? If so, how did the insurance process work out for you?

If one considers the attitude shown to our president by Democrat members of Congress, and the rebellion of Deep State bureaucrats, it is no wonder that some observers are discussing the possibility of anarchy and civil war.

But what disturbs me most about Judge Watson's reinforcement of the 9th Circuit's disregard of the law, is the absolute, middle-finger shown to the executive branch of government: You can't make me follow the law, ha ha, take this!

It was noted in a previous column the Congress has the ability to eliminate a court by defunding it, thus firing the errant judge. In the case of the 9th Circuit which Judge Watson is a part, it is probably time to eliminate three quarters of it and create several new districts in order to dilute the extreme liberal bend that has accumulated over the decades.

And now, let's go to a different kind of government tyranny. Last week, I wrote about Charlie Gard, the 11 month-old British baby who the nationalized healthcare system there would not allow out of the country to seek treatment for a rare mitochondrial condition. Even the European Union courts sided with the government death panels in the sentence of death. Finally, even after external funds were raised to bring Charlie to America, the courts would still not let him go.

However, with mounting outrage having its effect, a British court generously allowed an American physician to examine the baby in the British hospital. How generous indeed.

Here, the government is forbidding someone to leave their country to prove the sick point that the government health system is more important than saving a baby's life. Things work both ways, don't they?