

ROVE'S RATHER UNCOOPERATIVE COOPERATION

Remember how Bob Luskin told Murray Waas that Rove had gotten all cooperative?

Well, it will surprise none of you that that's a load of horse pucky. In a letter to Luskin, John Conyers reveals that Rove is stalling on the February 23 deposition he agreed to in two ways: by insisting on bracketing off the Don Siegelman testimony, and by begging for (yet) another delay.

Though staff, I understand that you have offered to have your client testify voluntarily, but only on the Siegelman matter, and that in any event you have requested a further delay in the deposition. I cannot agree to either of these requests for a number of reasons.

With regard to the request to unilaterally limit Mr. Rove's testimony to the Siegelman matter, as we have previously discussed, I do not believe it is acceptable for the Committee to allow witnesses to unilaterally determine what they can and cannot testify concerning, again absent assertion of a valid privilege. Moreover, the proposed distinction between the Siegelman matter and the U.S. Attorney investigation generally does not appear to be a tenable or viable distinction. They are part and parcel of the same serious concerns about politicization of the U.S. Attorney corps and the Justice Department under the Bush Administration.

[snip]

Finally, conducting a voluntary

deposition under these circumstances could simply serve to further delay matters beyond the nearly two years I have been waiting, since the Committee could not then be in a position to utilize contempt or other enforcement mechanisms in response to any improper refusal to answer questions.

I also cannot agree to your request for a delay to accommodate Mr. Rove's schedule. As you know, the deposition was originally scheduled for February 2. On January 29 I in good faith acceded to your request for a delay since you were scheduled to be out of town at the time and requested more time to prepare. I also notified your office of the new February 23 date at that time. Thus, absent an actual commitment by Mr. Rove to comply with the subpoena, I am not in a position to agree to yet a further delay. In essence, given Mr. Rove's public statements that he does not intend to comply with the subpoena, I am puzzled as to why Mr. Rove needs a mutually convenient date to appear.

You get the feeling Conyers is itching to find out whether or not Holder's DOJ will enforce contempt of Congress?