



Lisa Mei Crowley
@LisaMei62

Thread Reader App
4 tweets - 13 Jan 2019

[LisaMei62/status/108456453066049542](#)

New Q. Dems doing all they can to prolong Mueller investigation to protect themselves. Grand Jury testimony underway against many of them in their respective states for crimes abv/beyond corruption/sedition. Many Congressmen/women & Senators will be removed once charged w/crimes.

Q !!mG7VJxZNCI ID: 9c745a No. [4739743](#) 2672
Jan 13 2019 14:08:58 (EST) NEW

https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2018/02/11/former_cia_director_john_brennan_investigated_for_perjury.html

D House focus on POTUS = 'insurance' extension from MUELLER to House.

GJ testimony underway in several states.

Attempts to BLOCK/PROTECT themselves will FAIL.

Far beyond political corruption/sedition.

Law governing removal of a sitting

Congress(m/w)/Senator?

Lights on.

Q

<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/Dw0IsBXUcAACvoo.jpg>

2. Here's the link from last drop (see prev tweet this thread) re: role Brennan, Clapper, Panetta, Rice, Power, Morrell, played in pushing the Russia hoax, promoting the fake Steele dossier on POTUS, & if Brennan perjured himself.

He clearly did.



Exclusive: CIA Ex-Director Brennan's Perjury Peril | RealClearInvestigations

House Intelligence Committee Chairman Devin Nunes next plans to investigate the role former CIA Director John Brennan and other Obama intelligence officials played in promoting the salacious and...

https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2018/02/11/former_cia_director_john_brennan_investigated_f...

https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2018/02/11/former_cia_director_john_brennan_investigated_for_perjury.html

3. Rules for expulsion fm Congress:

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expulsion_from_the_United_States_Congress

"In the entire history of the United States Congress, 20 Members have been expelled: 15 from the Senate and 5 from the House of Representatives."

https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/briefing/Expulsion_Censure.htm

More info:

<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30016.pdf>



Recall of Legislators and the Removal of Members of Congress from Office

Jack Maskell
Legislative Attorney

January 5, 2012

Congressional Research Service
7-5700
www.crs.gov
RL30016

CRS Report for Congress
Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress

<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/Dw0psQUVsAARuHk.jpg>

Summary

Under the United States Constitution and congressional practice, Members of Congress may have their services ended prior to the normal expiration of their constitutionally established terms of office by their resignation or death, or by action of the house of Congress in which they are a Member by way of an "expulsion," or by a finding that in accepting a subsequent "incompatible" public office, the Member would be deemed to have vacated his congressional seat.

Under Article I, Section 5, clause 2, of the Constitution, a Member of Congress may be removed from office before the normal expiration of his or her constitutional term by an "expulsion" from the Senate (if a Senator) or from the House of Representatives (if a Representative) upon a formal vote on a resolution agreed to by two-thirds of the Members of that body present and voting. While there are no specific grounds for an expulsion expressed in the Constitution, expulsion actions in both the House and the Senate have generally concerned cases of perceived disloyalty to the United States, or the conviction of a criminal statutory offense which involved abuse of one's official position. Each house has broad authority as to the grounds, nature, timing, and procedure for an expulsion of a Member. However, *policy* considerations, as opposed to questions of authority, have appeared to restrain the Senate and House in the exercise of expulsion when it might be considered as infringing on the electoral process, such as when the electorate knew of the past misconduct under consideration and still elected or re-elected the Member.

As to removal by recall, the United States Constitution does *not* provide for nor authorize the recall of United States officers such as Senators, Representatives, or the President or Vice President, and thus no Member of Congress has ever been recalled in the history of the United States. The recall of Members was considered during the time of the drafting of the federal Constitution in 1787, but no such provisions were included in the final version sent to the states for ratification, and the specific drafting and ratifying debates indicate an express understanding of the framers and ratifiers that no right or power to recall a Senator or Representative in Congress exists under the Constitution. Although the Supreme Court has not needed to directly address the subject of recall of Members of Congress, other Supreme Court decisions, as well as the weight of other judicial and administrative decisions, rulings, and opinions, indicate that (1) the right to remove a Member of Congress before the expiration of his or her constitutionally established term of office is one which resides exclusively in each house of Congress as expressly delegated in the expulsion clause of the United States Constitution, and (2) the length and number of the terms of office for *federal* officials, established and agreed upon by the states in the Constitution creating that federal government, may not be unilaterally changed by an individual state, such as through the enactment of a recall provision or a term limitation for a United States Senator or Representative. Under Supreme Court constitutional interpretation, since individual states never had the original sovereign authority to unilaterally change the terms and conditions of service of *federal* officials agreed to and established in the Constitution, such a power could not be "reserved" under the Tenth Amendment. Even the *dissenters* in the Supreme Court decision on the Tenth Amendment and term limits, who would have found a "reserved" authority in the states regarding "qualifications" of Members of Congress, conceded that the exclusive authority to remove a sitting Member is delegated to each house in the expulsion clause of the Constitution, and that with respect to "a power of recall ... the Framers denied to the States [such power] when they specified the terms of Members of Congress."

This report has been and will be revised and updated as new decisional material or administrative opinions warrant.

https://pbs.twimg.com/media/Dw0psm-UYAA_vRN.jpg

4. We taxpayers have been subsidizing the Globalists (both parties) for many decades via wars, charities, foreign aid, organizations like PP, etc. PP donates millions of the tax dollars they receive to Dems which means WE are helping to elect Dems. 🇺🇸



Charlie Kirk
@charliekirk11



Planned Parenthood spent \$30 million to help the Democrats win back the house

Yet we still give them \$500 million in taxpayer funding each year

If they have that kind of cash and engage in that blatant partisan activity, why am I forced to fund them with my money?



58.1K 4:31 PM - Jan 13, 2019



28.9K people are talking about this



Q !mG7VJxZNCI ID: 46eaf0 No.4740419 Jan 13 2019 14:52:02 (EST) NEW 2673

[D] Party Con.jpg

Q !mG7VJxZNCI 11/03/18 (Sat) 15:09:12 No.387

[D] Party Con:
When you can't raise money 'organically' through party (individual) donations (voter base) YOU STEAL IT from the American taxpayer and give it back to yourself in the form of campaign contributions.
[Example 1]
Planned Parenthood
<https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-18-204R>
\$1.5 billion provided in taxpayer funding over 3-year period.
[Case 1]
PP spent \$30 million [disclosed - real estimates close to \$65 million] in taxpayer subsidies to influence the outcome of the 2018 midterm elections.
[Conclusion]
Should it be legal for a taxpayer [D+R+I] funded organization to donate massive amounts of money to the D party in an effort to sway an election?
D_insider_term: T_WASH
Re_read drops re: Soros & taxpayer funding
YOUR HARD EARNED TAX DOLLARS AT WORK.
VOTE! VOTE! VOTE!
Q

<https://twitter.com/charliekirk11/status/1084488036598075393>

FAKE NEWS control over those who do not think for themselves limits exposure of TRUTH.

[D] Party Con.

Q

<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/Dw0tAdlUwAA90kD.jpg>

Q !mG7VJxZNCI 11/03/18 (Sat) 15:09:12 No.387

[D] Party Con:

When you can't raise money 'organically' through party (individual) donations (voter base) YOU STEAL IT from the American taxpayer and give it back to yourself in the form of campaign contributions.

[Example 1]

Planned Parenthood

<https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-18-204R>

\$1.5 billion provided in taxpayer funding over 3-year period.

[Case 1]

PP spent \$30 million [disclosed - real estimates close to \$65 million] in taxpayer subsidies to influence the outcome of the 2018 midterm elections.

[Conclusion]

Should it be legal for a taxpayer [D+R+I] funded organization to donate massive amounts of money to the D party in an effort to sway an election?

D_insider_term: T_WASH

Re_read drops re: Soros & taxpayer funding
YOUR HARD EARNED TAX DOLLARS AT WORK.

VOTE! VOTE! VOTE!

Q

<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/Dw0tBEeUYAAFPu.jpg>



Charlie Kirk ✓
@charliekirk11

Planned Parenthood spent \$30 million to help the Democrats win back the house

Yet we still give them \$500 million in taxpayer funding each year

If they have that kind of cash and engage in that blatant partisan activity, why am I forced to fund them with my money?



11:31 · 13 Jan 19 · Twitter for iPhone

<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/Dw0tBjYUYAASbD7.jpg>

Q !UW.yye1fxo ID: 05b846 No.13359 Jan 7 2018 03:10:11 (EST) 489

US taxpayers are paying for it all.

Paris accord = scam (trillions)

Red Cross = scam (billions)

Foreign Aid = scam (trillions)

WAR = scam (trillions)

.....on...and....on.....

Who audits where the money actually goes?

Who actually receives the money?

The US taxpayer is funding the very people we are engaged in taking down.

Slush funds everywhere.

Think GS pays for Antifa out of his own pocket?

The hole is deep.

Feel sick yet?

Q

<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/Dw0tCGkUYAA7a9i.jpg>