Twitter Thread by T. Greg "'Constitutional Lawyer'" Doucette



T. Greg "'Constitutional Lawyer'" Doucette
@greg_doucette

Strongly desirable, but 0% likelihood IMO

I'd love for the President's pardon powers to be restricted to before the election

> @greg_doucette What's the likelihood and desirability of a new constitutional amendment which says that presidents cannot pardon anybody in the last 100 days of each term?
>
> — Evergreen JM \U0001f1fa\U0001f1f8 \U0001f310 (@ElectronJ2) December 24, 2020

Very low

I won't put them at zero because you never know what could theoretically happen, but the last amendment was largely accidental and still 28 years ago

The last intentional amendment was ratified 49 years ago https://t.co/Nxzw3aLjcO

> What's the chances we ever see a Constitutional Amendment in our lifetimes, at this rate?
>
> — Jeremy (@11JustBreathe11) December 24, 2020

No

People shouldn't end up with fewer rights by banding together, that's just silly

https://t.co/r89MtoaBbi

> This one maybe: https://t.co/apWQyLD2i3
>
> — Evergreen JM \U0001f1fa\U0001f1f8 \U0001f310 (@ElectronJ2) December 24, 2020

Don't know the precise verbiage, but it would require the Wyoming Rule for House seats and expand the Senate to 3 Senators per state

https://t.co/thgPUwcWh5

> If you could unilaterally add an amendment, what would it be?
>
> — KJJBAA (@KJJBAA) December 24, 2020

Yes: that's the purpose of the House, and the # of electoral votes for President being rooted in the House

https://t.co/O8g8VTX2FR

> Yes Wyoming rule. No on 3 senators. The senate is broken now that CA has 39M people and Wyoming has 500k. Adding more senators doesn\u2019t fix that. Need to add some semblance of balance.
>
> — Bryan Duva (@duva60) December 24, 2020

The population of the smallest state (currently Wyoming) becomes the baseline size for all Congressional districts

It basically automatically increases # of Congresscritters to accommodate population growth, instead of freezing things at the current 435

https://t.co/xwRNbr7dDb

> So now I have to look up the Wyoming Rule. Unless you care to explain in the space of a tweet.
>
> — ScubaVal \u201cConstitutional Lawyer" For Now (@MajikaZulJin) December 24, 2020

You'd have 1 Senator on the ballot in every state during every election, instead of the current class structure where a third of the states have no Senate elections

https://t.co/ROfgsI6s93

> Why 3 senators per state?
>
> — Dan Spencer (@thewaiting28) December 24, 2020

I guess I just have more faith in Democrats that they can win the majority of an institution they had a majority of just a few years ago

¯_(■)_/¯ https://t.co/GO9WmvmysT

> 3 sen per state would only amplify the outsized influence of smaller states/small populations. Classic conservative move framing it as "one on ballot every election" (sounds pro democracy) instead of "permanently give control of Senate to rural states" (actually anti-democracy)
>
> — Ben (@benk1976) December 24, 2020

"We haven't had the Senate majority since Obama was President, BURN IT ALL DOWN" is a very pissbaby reaction tbh

"The Senate is biased against Democrats" is making my point. It's nonsense

And Wyoming doesn't "get the same representation" as California; Wyoming sends 3 people to Congress, California sends 55 (plus dominates Congressional leadership and the Electoral College) https://t.co/1kjyQ71AeL

> "Democrats are capable of having a senate majority" and "the senate is biased against democrats" are not contradictory views. It's just silly that Wyoming gets the same representation as California.
>
> — KJJBAA (@KJJBAA) December 24, 2020

If California consents to being divvied up, go for it https://t.co/QXBgJctDCd

> So you're saying California should be split into North, South, East and West California? Hard to argue with that...
>
> — Tom Forsyth (@tom_forsyth) December 24, 2020