

Re: On good authority...

Re: On good authority...

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-02/msg02861.html>

- *From:* MooseFET <kensmith@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 23 Feb 2008 13:23:18 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 23, 8:55 am, Jim Yanik <jya...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

James Arthur <dagmargoodb...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in <news:3f7dc710-93bd-4311-a6fd-32b4f6d6e...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:

On Feb 22, 7:23 pm, MooseFET <kensm...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 22, 5:27 pm, Jim Yanik <jya...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Andy Peters <goo...@xxxxxxxx> wrote

[...]

Bill Clinton was impeached
for a blow job, which of
course was
unrelated to his Presidential
job.

It was on "company time", by the employer
and management of the
intern, BESIDES the huge LIE to the
American People, and the PERJURY for
which he was disbarred for a too-short a
period.

There was no perjury. Check the record. Perjury requires that
the
subject being lied about be germane. The topic on which he
lied was

Re: On good authority...

not.

In a civil trial alleging improper relations (sexual harassment) with his subordinates, he lied about his relations with Monica Lewinsky, a subordinate.

The plaintiff was entitled to discover this in discovery in support of their theory that he had such habits, and had improperly pressed others—namely, had harassed—the plaintiff.

That's pretty important evidence in a he-said she-said affair.

Cheers,
James Arthur

the corrupt Liberals are all too willing to excuse such behavior and lies, when it's their crook who's in the hot seat.

No, this argument is about whether it was perjury or not. Not about whether he lied. We know he lied. We also know that it was not perjury because it was not germane to the case.

.