



Judicial Watch
Because no one is above the law

[Home](#)[Blog](#)[About Us](#)[Litigation](#)[News Room](#)[Special Projects](#)[Contact](#)[Donate](#)

Promoting Integrity, Transparency and Accountability in Government, Politics and the Law

Judicial Watch Announces Hillary Clinton Constitutionally Ineligible to Serve as Secretary of State

Contact:
Press Office 202-646-5188

Washington, DC -- December 2, 2008

Ineligibility Clause of Constitution Prohibits Clinton Appointment

Judicial Watch, the public interest group that investigates and prosecutes government corruption, announced today that Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton is constitutionally ineligible to serve as Secretary of State in the Obama administration.

According to the Ineligibility Clause of the United States Constitution, no member of Congress can be appointed to an office that has benefited from a salary increase during the time that Senator or Representative served in Congress. A January 2008 Executive Order signed by President Bush during Hillary Clinton's current Senate term increased the salary for Secretary of State, thereby rendering Senator Clinton ineligible for the position.

Specifically, [Article I, section 6 of the U.S. Constitution](#) provides "No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time." The provision is seen by most as designed by our Founding Fathers to protect against corruption.

Former President Richard Nixon circumvented this constitutional provision after appointing former Ohio Senator William Saxbe to the position of Attorney General. The Nixon administration managed to force legislation through Congress to reduce the salary for the position of Attorney General to the level that existed prior to Senator Saxbe's appointment. This scheme, known thereafter as "The Saxbe Fix," was also used to allow Senator Lloyd Bentsen to assume the position of Treasury Secretary under President Clinton.

"The Saxbe Fix" may reduce the salary of Secretary of State to previous levels, but it does not affect what is a clear constitutional prohibition. It cannot change the fact that the salary had been increased while Senator Clinton served in Congress. (President Ronald Reagan reportedly did not appoint Senator Orrin Hatch to the Supreme Court because of this provision.) Simply put, the Constitution does not provide for a legislative remedy for the Ineligibility Clause.

"There's no getting around the Constitution's Ineligibility Clause, so Hillary Clinton is prohibited from serving in the Cabinet until at least 2013, when her current term expires," said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. "Barack Obama should select someone who is eligible for the position of Secretary of State and save the country from a constitutional battle over Hillary Clinton's confirmation. No public official who has taken the oath to support and defend the Constitution should support this appointment. And aside from the constitutional issue, Hillary Clinton's long track record of corruption makes her a terrible choice to serve as the nation's top diplomat."

Comments

Tue, 12/02/2008 - 18:32 — Anonymous (not verified)

This raises the question of

This raises the question of whose responsibility it is to enforce the Constitution. In theory, wouldn't that be the Supreme Court? Or is Toobin correct, and no one has legal standing to challenge an appointment that is clearly unconstitutional?

For reference see <http://www.cnn.com/video/#/video/politics/2008/12/01/am.toobin.clinton.c...>

reply

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 15:24 — Tom (not verified)

In my estimation, the

In my estimation, the founders intended that every American citizen have standing to challenge constitutionality. The American citizens are the safeguard of the Constitution.

Some quotations from Thomas Jefferson to ponder:

"The people of every country are the only safe guardians of their own rights." --Thomas Jefferson to John Wyche, 1809

"The people...are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty." --Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, 1787

"No government can continue good, but under the control of the people." --Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, 1819

CNN is guilty of propoganda peddling in downplaying the role of the American public in upholding the laws of the Constitution.

reply

Mon, 12/08/2008 - 04:17 — Rob Kilker (not verified)

Constitutional

Since when do Americans care about anything other than whats on TV?
All current Gun laws are Unconstitutional.
Nafta is Unconstitutional..

Areas Of Interest

Political Corruption
Illegal Immigration
Open Records
Security & Prosperity Partnership
Gardasil



- Casa de Maryland and Day Labor Centers in Montgomery County, Maryland
- Documents Connecting Valerie Jarrett to Chicago Real Estate Scandals
- Documents Regarding Sen. Barack Obama's Previous Group Associations
- Judicial Watch Investigates Side-Effects of HPV Vaccine
- Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America

[more](#)

UN Membership is Unconstitutional.
Requiring churches to file 501c3 status and follow federal employment laws is Unconstitutional.
Allowing government officials to perform marriages(A religious ceremony)is Unconstitutional.
The Federal reserve is Unconstitutional.
The IRS is unconstitutional.
The Progressive tax rate is Unconstitutional.
Social security and all welfare agencies are Unconstitutional.
Federal or state involvement in public schools is Unconstitutional.

I could fill 50 pages with Violations.

In a few years, when America is just a territory in a global oligarchy,
It will be to late. But I'll bet you wish you would have done something sooner.
[The John Birch Society](#) See how you can help.

[reply](#)

Tue, 12/02/2008 - 18:39 — Anonymous (not verified)

Obama's advisers

that Obama's advisers are pushing this appointee precisely to poke a hole in the Constitution at a time when it is most vulnerable.

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 14:57 — Anonymous (not verified)

?

did obama vote for the pay raise for exec.branch like hilary did?, and did the vote increase the presidents salary?

[reply](#)

Tue, 12/02/2008 - 18:54 — Anonymous (not verified)

Gee such a thing for judicial

Gee such a thing for judicial watch to say...AND THE COMPLETELY IGNORED THE FACT, THAT obama does not submit a birth certificate certifying he was born a natural citizen of this country. So do they like the rest of the good old boys have a thing about Hillary and women and let a pretender like obama go free. Heck yes.

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 18:03 — Anonymous (not verified)

You sir are an idiot

You sir are an idiot

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 11:30 — Anonymous (not verified)

I'm not the poster that you

I'm not the poster that you called an idiot, but if that poster is an idiot, then I wonder what that makes you? There is overwhelming PROOF that Obama was not born in America, and you choose to neglect it because you're too shallow-minded to research and would rather buy his rhetoric. If you think Bush was bad, you just wait till an Obama presidency. Bush was the Alpha, Obama is the Omega. Not that McCain would have been good either, but at the very least, most of what McCain would try to do would get blocked by a Democratic Congress and most of what the Congress would try to do would get blocked by McCain, helping us to have a government that doesn't do much. And, a government that doesn't do much is a good government. Government interference is what got us into the current mess.

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 15:09 — Anonymous (not verified)

Actually do your research,

Actually do your research, this guy is 100% right, his birth certificate is a COPIED Hawaii birth certificate. This guy has had so many exceptions made so he can weasel his way into the presidents seat. This country is corrupt and going to hell on the express train.

[reply](#)

Sat, 12/06/2008 - 16:10 — Anonymous (not verified)

Believe it or not. I voted

Believe it or not. I voted for Obama, so did most of my relatives. I was so keen on voting for a democrat, that I did not pay attention to all the issues from all candidates. We have to protect our Constitution at all cost. They've stripped a little here, a little there, where is it going to end? And to think that Obama is a citizen of the U.S., it shows that you don't want to realize the truth. Before you post a comment, like the one you posted, please do your research and then get back to us. Thank you.

[reply](#)

Tue, 12/02/2008 - 22:08 — Anonymous (not verified)

Hillary and more.....

Do you all have nothing better to do than go after Hillary Clinton? If you are really concerned about Constitutional issues, why not go after Bush and Cheney for their abuses and ignoring of the Constitution? Or is that asking too much?

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 04:27 — Ryan (not verified)

They don't care

It's because they don't really care about the Constitution. It's simply an excuse to level yet more attacks against their political opponents. Nobody cares less about the US Constitution than Republicans.

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 11:28 — Anonymous (not verified)

The Constitution or what is

The Constitution or what is left of it. "W" said it was only paper.

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 11:35 — Anonymous (not verified)

Actually...

...Republicans traditionally are the champions of the Constitution--guys like Ron Paul used to be what the party were like. The last Democratic presidential candidate to show reverence for the Constitution was JFK, and he got a bullet in his head for his integrity. There is no difference between the two parties--both will tax you to the bone, wage wars to enrich the power elite, steal more of your civil liberties, force more mass media propaganda down your throat, fluoridate your water supply so that you lose your will to resist, and continue to preach fear to get you to give up your natural rights. Repulicrats--one party, one system. If Democrats were different than Republicans, they would have impeached Bush years ago. They're all on the same page, and involved in the same secret societies that JFK spoke against:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xhZk8ronces>

[reply](#)

Sat, 12/06/2008 - 07:30 — Anonymous (not verified)

Your one of the few who is

Your one of the few who is actually speaking the truth

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 13:49 — Anonymous (not verified)

Really?

it's true that neo-cons like Bush don't care about the Constitution, but REAL republicans like Ron Paul and the late Barry Goldwater definitely care(d) about the document. and how can say that Republicans care less about the Constitution than the Democrats? yea, i mean besides for the 1st amendment, i never hear the dems being too vocal in their support. both parties suck, that's why i voted for Bob Barr...

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 19:58 — Anonymous (not verified)

I would love nothing more

I would love nothing more than to put Bush/Cheney, and many of their little coherts in prison for life for charges ranging from CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY and WAR CRIMES for lying us into illegal/immoral wars, to more severe crimes like SPYING ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE with warrantless wiretaps, data mining, TIA, and "sneak and peak," and TORTURE of foreign and AMERICAN citizens. We should even investigate and consider the punishments for TREASON for many of these CRIMINAL SCUM.

However, that doesn't mean we should simply overlook other government officials, like O'Bama and Clinton, commit the crime of SUBVERSION OF THE CONSTITUTION by illegally running for President, illegally assuming the office of President, or illegally taking the appointment to Sec. of State.

There is NO DIFFERENCE between the CRIMINAL SCUM on the left and the CRIMINAL SCUM on the right, and this FALSE LEFT-RIGHT PARADIEGM needs to end right now, if our country is going to survive the coming crisis.

End the FED!!! Return to a monetary standard with actual value!!! Return to the intended principals of the CONSTITUTION!!!! And for GOD's SAKE, PUT THESE CRIMINAL SCUM IN PRISON!!!! It is the only way to save our country.

[reply](#)

Sun, 12/07/2008 - 22:22 — Skeptik (not verified)

Actually, we did do

Actually, we did do something. We gave the Dems a majority a few years back based on their promises to do something about Bush's ill-advised Iraq war and the constitutional abuses he engaged in to take us to there. They failed to lift a finger, except for one to give the voters a salute. Try again.

[reply](#)

Tue, 12/02/2008 - 23:09 — Anonymous (not verified)

This is such a dumb issue.

This is such a dumb issue. I mean really??? We shouldn't let someone serve because the salary increased... C'mon people, stop trying to make news, this is way overblown. If they lower the salary, what is the problem???

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 11:58 — Freedom Lost (not verified)

The Constitution a dumb issue???

Sir, your reply is about as Un-American as you can get, the Constitution and Bill of Rights are the two most important documents to ever be created for our country, ANY issue with these documents is VERY important, otherwise our very freedom is at risk, for these documents are ALL that protect us from tyranny and slavery to the corrupt who infiltrate our govt. Mabe more people should actually read and study them so more people would understand, what they are so quick to dismiss as unimportant!

[reply](#)

Sat, 12/06/2008 - 07:28 — Anonymous (not verified)

what freedom do you really

what freedom do you really have?

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 13:57 — Anonymous (not verified)

Because the Constitution is

Because the Constitution is supposed to be the absolute, fundamental law of our country. Lowering the salary back down wasn't correct when Nixon did and it would not be proper now. The fact is, a raise was given. There is no exception in the Constitution for a decrease in pay or other emoluments.

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 14:23 — Anonymous (not verified)

then why have the rule of

then why have the rule of law if you can just ignore the laws you don't like? in other words, if this is indeed true, then this is a slippery slope situation, and we should all be mindful and aware of situations like these.

[reply](#)

Tue, 12/02/2008 - 23:57 — Ron Wallace (not verified)

Clinton Sec of State

Where were you when Nixon named Saxbw? The country is in too much danger due to Bush/Cheney/Gram Republican incompetence and greed. Get a life, move on, and support the people of this country who need good leadership. Next you'll probably want to go back to the original Constitution and count President Obama as 3/5ths of a President.

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 09:25 — Anonymous (not verified)

Republican greed, Democrat incompetence

In case you haven't looked, the Democrats have crapped up for the last two years, not the Republicans. The black caucus refused to listen to McCain and Bush when they were warned about the excesses. To quote the lovely black Congresswoman, "You don't fix it if it's not broke." It was almost beyond repair then, but the Democrats were too busy making everyone feel good until it all hit the fan.

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 15:33 — Anonymous (not verified)

no 4/5

He's only half black so that would be 4/5. If you want to change the Constitution there is a remedy for amendment. You don't just ignore the whole thing because you think some part of it is irrelevant or has been routinely violated.

[reply](#)

Tue, 12/02/2008 - 23:59 — John Marshall (not verified)

Sen. Clinton appt. to SecState

give me a break, doesn't this org have something better to investigate. I can't believe it where have you been for eight years. Why not look for the WND's instead.....oh i forgot there were none

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 15:11 — Anonymous (not verified)

IDIOTS

This site IS going after other things, this is an issue that must ALSO be addressed, stop bashing this site as if this is the sole purpose of life to cover this story and destroy Hillary's rep. Hillary did that to her self, we don't need to "make news" to see the truth.

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 00:07 — Anonymous (not verified)

sour grapes from bitter

sour grapes from bitter conservatives

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 00:24 — Anonymous (not verified)

The clown show continues

As you probably know in your hearts, this "legal" argument is as ludicrous and out-dated as the many state laws against oral sex. Your clown-show of an organization only proves that in a country as corrupt, insane and deluded at the U.S.A., even the ethical watchdogs are evil and irrelevant and sick. I suppose your lack of seriousness as an organization should simply be answered by your members receiving ceremonial cream pies to the face. Maybe the applying a big round red noses, or dunce caps at various embarrassing public events would be in order. What about regularly showering you guys with oceans of urine or excrement? An understadable plan, no doubt, but I deem it excessive. Oh yeah... what this last 20 year period has taught us is that its the Clinton's fault! Calling them corrupt at this point is like reviling the Weimar Republic as the evil bad guys right at the close of the Nazi regime.

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 15:37 — Anonymous (not verified)

a law is not the same as the constitution

Laws change all the time but they cannot violate the constitution. When they do there is grounds to repeal them. If you want to change the constitution you have to amend it. Let me know the name of your law firm so I never make the mistake of hiring you.

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 00:31 — KYJurisDoctor (not verified)

Hillary Clinton and "Emoluments" problem.

I think the Founding Fathers enacted this provision to prevent public corruption, though I am of the opinion that they intended to prohibit situations where a CONGRESSPERSON votes to pass legislation increasing their own salaries with knowledge that they would be the ultimate beneficiary of the largess.

Since Hillary Clinton could not have anticipated that she would be the beneficiary of the increase in the Secretary Of State's salary, a simple reversal of her salary to the salary the position was prior to being a Senator -- the so called "Saxbe" fix -- ought to suffice for constitutional purposes. OsiSpeaks.com

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 01:22 — Jose (not verified)

Please let me know the

Please let me know the corruption that Hillary Clinton has done. I just love how you ended your essay like that. Give some facts.

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 02:20 — Anonymous (not verified)

Obama and the Birth Certificate Issue

We are approaching a constitutional crisis - since you are into nit-picking on the constitution, look into the fact that Obama is also ineligible of being President of these United States. He is not a natural born citizen --

Check it out

<http://news.aol.com/political-machine/2008/12/01/obama-birth-certificate...>

Obama Birth Certificate Rears Its Head - Again

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 02:36 — Anonymouse (not verified)

Constitutionally ineligible?

WHEN is Judicial Watch going to investigate the constitutional qualifications of the president-elect? His name is Barack Obama a.k.a. Barry Soetoro (see AP's photo of his first elementary school registration in Indonesia) and he seemed to receive lots of help from his friends the A.C.O.R.N. voter registrants.

Did you hear that Barack did not state his Soetoro name when answering the Illinois state bar's question "Full former name(s)"? WHY did he NOT? As judicial watchdogs, are you interested to find out? Why did he not mention the name he used when going to school in Indonesia at a time when ONLY CITIZENS of Indonesia were allowed to attend school there? That state bar form containing the non-answer of Barack Obama a.k.a. Barry Soetoro is online and thousands have seen it. Has Judicial Watch?

Why have you been silent about Obama's information-less CertificaTION of Live Birth? NO doctor signature. NO hospital named . . . but his half-sister Maya has named TWO different hospitals that hosted his birth in Hawaii. She also said in a pre-election CNN interview that Barry was out of Occidental College and in Columbia University when he dropped his Indonesian name Barry Soetoro. Are you able to find out under which name Barry Fill-In-The-Blank enrolled in those two institutions of higher learning?

The KENYAN ambassador himself stated in a post-election interview with Detroit's WRIF radio station that Obama's KENYAN BIRTHplace is "WELL KNOWN." WorldNetDaily can take you directly to WRIF's recording of that conversation with "Mike in the Morning" co-hosts. Now Ambassador Ogego is trying to claim he was talking about Obama Senior, but the ambassador didn't explain away his comment that Obama's paternal grandmother is "still alive." That's a tough one, considering the age Senior's grandmother must be.

Are you aware that an alleged employee of a CHICAGO law firm -- the firm that was Obama's second-biggest 2008 campaign contributor (and among his biggest 20 contributors in 2004) -- a firm that had Obama keynote a function for them in October 2005 -- wrote an extensive piece about the US Constitution's natural-born-citizen requirement? This is the start of her first paragraph:

The natural born citizen requirement in Article II of the United States Constitution has been called the "stupidest provision" in the Constitution, 1 "undecidedly un American," 2 "blatantly discriminatory," 3 and the "Constitution's worst provision." 4

The title of her paper? "Amending the Natural Born Citizen Requirement: Globalization as the Impetus and the Obstacle"

When did she approve its edits? November 2005. The year of its final form? 2006. Kinda coincides with Barack Obama's October 2005 keynote for the firm, no? Were some people looking ahead to 2008?

When you can google the blogs for that author's name -- Sarah P. Herlihy -- and for the law firm that employs her -- Kirkland & Ellis -- you'll find more information. This discovery is spreading through the blogosphere.

Who in your midst has been stifling your voice? Why are you headline-ing all these small-fish, small-potato justice items while uttering not a syllable about potentially and allegedly the biggest contemporary injustice of all? I sincerely hope you aren't waiting until after the Electoral College's vote to inform anyone about all this.

Why do ordinary citizens like me have to put this information under Judicial Watch's nose and beg you to sniff it out? I do not believe you live in a cave and are unaware of all this. What is the reason for your silence? Is it the same as the mainstream media's reason? Or are you afraid to disturb the status quo? Or do you fear a negative ruling from the Supreme Court and don't want to mar your success record?

Et tu, Brute?

[reply](#)

Fri, 12/05/2008 - 14:06 — Anonymous (not verified)

What about Bush and torture?

What about Bush and torture?

[reply](#)

Sat, 12/06/2008 - 14:21 — philgorp (not verified)

did you forget cheney

did you forget cheney haliburton wmds "bush lied",,,,,. what real turture is, is having to put up with some moron spouting off a bunch of moveon.soros garbage. are you even reading this discussion??. i see no reason that hillary clinton cannot be secretary of state. and i'm not suprized that her own party is making such a big stink about

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 10:20 — bink (not verified)

The issue

is the Saxbe fix...it has precedent...in other words the provision has been circumvented before. It will raise eyebrows but the Senators have no guts....

As to the wingnut 'birthcert' ploy!...asked and answered!

Move on to the real crisis' in the economy or wars or credit downturns!

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 10:47 — Ace (not verified)

Obama or Soetoro or whatever

Obama or Soetoro or whatever his name is today doesn't care about our Constitution, why should Mrs. Clinton?

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 11:34 — Anonymous (not verified)

This is hilarious

Half of you people here are probably the first in line to scream rape and murder about how our civil liberties are constantly stepped on and how our nation doesn't follow policy...but when someone actually DOES enforce a notion set forth in the CONSTITUTION of our country, you get pissed and say that it's stupid.

America. The nation of freakin' hypocrites.

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 12:09 — Anonymous (not verified)

This may seem to be a

This may seem to be a trivial matter, but we are talking about the Constitution here, even if it's been abused in the recent past. Apparently the issue turns on the ultimate meaning of "during such time." In the mean time, a bill will be passed to create some kind of exception to the rule, but this will never challenged in the Supreme Court -- who has standing to bring a case? I guess that the only conclusion one can reach is that if it were to reach the Supreme Court, "during such time" would be read in such a way as to allow Clinton to serve, and that the opinion would be for this instance only. In that light, despite how the Constitution is being twisted, it's basically a moot point. Much like the issue of a birth certificate is now a moot point.

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 12:16 — John K (not verified)

Constitutionally qualified

Why is there such resistance to investigating Barrack Hussein Obama's citizenship; passports; travel records; school records; college records (including his stated citizenship,courses taken and financial payments); selective service registration. To apply for a drivers license in New Jersey anyone MUST submit 3 forms of identification including an original birth certificate with seal. Why doesn't Obama have to submit ANY proof? Why does the media IGNORE this? If we are a nation of law - WE MUST ENFORCE THE CONSTITUTION - as written!

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 13:21 — robert wilson (not verified)

We have an Illegal Immigrant

We have an Illegal Immigrant as the President Elect. I think it's safe to say the Constitution doesn't matter anymore. Or does it?

[reply](#)

Thu, 12/04/2008 - 10:05 — jefferson's ghost (not verified)

we will know on 12-05-08.

we will know on 12-05-08.

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 14:03 — Anonymous (not verified)

So is it also Judicial

So is it also Judicial Watch's contention that ANY Senator or House Representative is also ineligible to serve in the Obama cabinet? John Kerry, Chuck Hagel, Dick Lugar were also mentioned earlier for the SOS position--they are also Senate peers who served during this COLA increase..or is this really just an opportunity for Judicial Watch to relive their glory days of Clinton witch hunts?

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 15:20 — Anonymous (not verified)

Obama and hillary

the both make me sick---neither any good,

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 15:39 — jeebus (not verified)

Wow, you guys clearly aren't

Wow, you guys clearly aren't worried about your credibility at all, are you?

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 15:42 — Anonymous (not verified)

I was wondering where all

I was wondering where all the (far right-)wingnuts went after the election. Turns out they've decided to finally start parsing the language of the Constitution, eight years too late. Where was all this boundless energy during the Bush presidency's endless defacing of the same document?

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 15:57 — philip r stone (not verified)

Clinton ineligible for SOS

Since Billy C has been a highly paid unregistered agent of foreign governments(Dubai for one)in violation of 18 USC and files joint tax forms with his wife, she is on a foreign payroll while a US Senator. This is probably a violation of her oath of office and should make her ineligible to be Secretary of State or have any other federal office. Billy claims he will divulge his income but this will not cure the problem. How do you un-rob a bank ?? Since Obama is an Indonesian citizen he is ineligible to be president and can't appoint her anyway.

[reply](#)

Wed, 12/03/2008 - 17:55 — Ohnjaye (not verified)

Clinton-hating Judicial Watch

Not a surprise that Judicial Watch would be going after Hillary Clinton -- it has a long history of Clinton hating dating back to when it repeatedly went after President Bill Clinton in the 1980s.

Judicial Watch is notorious for tying up the court system with endless litigation with no concern for the taxpayers footing the bill.

[reply](#)

[1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [next >](#) [last >](#)

Post new comment

Your name:

E-mail:

The content of this field is kept private and will not be shown publicly.

Homepage:

Subject:

Comment: *

- Web page addresses and e-mail addresses turn into links automatically.
- Allowed HTML tags: <a> <cite> <code> <dl> <dt> <dd> <p> <div>
 <i>
- Lines and paragraphs break automatically.

[More information about formatting options](#)

[Preview comment](#)

[Post comment](#)

[Home](#)

[Blog](#)

[About Us](#)

[Litigation](#)

[News Room](#)

[Special Projects](#)

[Donate](#)

[Contact](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

(c) 2007 Judicial Watch | [user login](#)