

Why is the greatest country on the face of the earth, the United States of America, incapable—incapable—of doing this when these 11 NATO countries haven't? So I want to thank the many individuals over the years, particularly the Armenian National Committee of America, the Armenian Assembly, and so many others, who have worked so hard alongside me to ensure the U.S. abides by its commitment to the truth and to a world where genocide truly never happens again.

I have had a good friend and colleague who has been engaged with me in this latest effort, and I want to yield to him at this time, Senator CRUZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am proud to join with my friend and my colleague from New Jersey today in urging the Senate to take up and pass the resolution affirming U.S. recognition of the Armenian genocide. From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire carried out a forced deportation of nearly 2 million Armenians, of whom 1.5 million were killed. It was an atrocious genocide. That it happened is a reality that no amount of political doublespeak can cover up.

In fact, the word "genocide," which literally means the killing of an entire people, was coined by Raphael Lemkin to describe the horrific nature of the Ottoman Empire's calculated extermination of the Armenians. That is the genesis of the word "genocide."

As America, we must never be silent in response to atrocities. Over 100 years ago, the world sat silently as the Armenian people suffered and were systematically murdered. Many people today are still unaware of what happened. With this resolution—a bipartisan resolution—we are saying it is a policy of the United States to commemorate the Armenian genocide through official recognition and remembrance.

Let me echo what my colleague from New Jersey just said. Doing so is not incompatible with continuing to deal with Turkey as an ally. Just last week, I sat down with President Erdogan and President Trump in the oval office. Turkey is a NATO ally and an important one, but friends and allies can speak the truth, and we are not honoring America and who we stand for if we are afraid to speak the truth and willing to participate in covering it up. We have a moral duty to acknowledge what happened to 1.5 million innocent souls. It is the right thing to do, and it is my hope that the Senate will do so in a bipartisan manner.

I yield back the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Therefore, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 150 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; I further ask that the

resolution be agreed to; the preamble be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. I am reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, just yesterday, Secretary Pompeo joined the foreign ministers at NATO headquarters in Brussels, including Foreign Minister Cavusoglu from Turkey. Secretary Pompeo had quite a lot to discuss with him, as this administration continues its engagement with Turkey's leadership on the heels of President Trump's meeting with President Erdogan last week. In light of these diplomatic efforts, I respectfully object to this resolution at this time.

While the content of the legislation before us merits undivided consideration, its passage would undermine the administration's overcoming real challenges in our bilateral relationship with Turkey. I look forward to working with the administration and Senator CRUZ and Senator MENENDEZ in holding our NATO ally responsible for its commitment made when it joined the NATO community of like-minded nations founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I am not new to this issue. I have been pursuing recognition of the Armenian genocide for the greater part of a decade, and there always seems to be some reason why, in fact, it is not a good moment. Well, it is like a rope-a-dope. It is like a rope-a-dope. There is always another reason. There is always another excuse.

The 11 NATO allies have done this, and they are still in NATO and still working with Turkey and still have diplomatic relationships with Turkey. It is amazing to me the greatest power on the face of this earth can't just speak truth of history. It amazes me. And so there never seems to be a good moment.

Now, I have been here in the Senate long enough to know that objections to unanimous consent work both ways, so I am going to continue to bring this issue to the floor. I think Armenian Americans, the world, and history should record who stands on the side of recognizing genocide for what it is and who is not, and so I am not going to relax. If necessary, I am sure there will be moments in which those will seek consent on issues, and if the only way is to get a vote on this through the actual process on the floor, then I will force that issue because history demands it. Our conscience should call for it, and a decade of waiting to make this happen is enough.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator MENENDEZ always speaking up for human rights, regardless who the President is, regardless of any colleagues running for President, whenever the President calls on them, and Senator MENENDEZ has always been a Senator here that stands up for his principles on international human rights.

BIPARTISAN AMERICAN MINERS ACT

Mr. President, thank you to Senator MANCHIN and all of my colleagues for coming to the floor earlier today to remind this body that we need to act now on behalf of almost 90,000 miners who are living under the threat of massive cuts for the pensions they earned; 1,200 miners and their families could lose their healthcare by the end of the year because of the Westmoreland and Murray bankruptcies. That leaves us about a month.

The bankruptcy court could allow these corporations to "shed their liabilities," which is a fancy way of saying they could walk away from paying miners the benefits they have earned.

Two years ago, we worked to save thousands of miners' healthcare. We have to do it again. We can't leave these workers behind to lose their healthcare over the holidays just because of the date their companies filed for bankruptcy. We have to make sure they don't lose their retirement security on top of that.

All 86,000 UMW miners are facing crippling pension cuts. They aren't alone. This retirement security of hundreds of thousands of teamsters and ironworkers and carpenters and many other retirees and workers is also at risk. The crisis facing their pensions is real. It is immediate. It can have ripple effects across the country.

This week, the PBGC released a new report showing it could run out of money even sooner, and we should be concerned about that. If the multi-employer system collapses, if PBGC fails, we are looking at a potential recession. Small businesses that have been in the family for generations could face bankruptcy. Workers will lose jobs at businesses forced to close up shop. Retirees will face crippling cuts to their income.

Congress gave Wall Street a bailout a decade ago after they wrecked people's lives. These miner workers did what they were supposed to do. They gave up money at the bargaining table to put money aside for healthcare and pensions later. Is Congress going to abandon them? This is about our values. This is about whose side you are on. It is about the dignity of work. We should be committed to these miners, for these workers, these retirees. We should not give up. We are continuing to work for a bipartisan solution.

It comes down to the dignity of work. When people have dignity, when work has dignity, we honor the retirement security they have earned.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I think we are running a few minutes behind. We have had a real crush of business here in the last hour. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF DAN R. BROUILLETTE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, every Senator knows the House is now in the middle of an impeachment inquiry. Here in this Chamber, the Senate has been considering the nomination of Dan Brouillette to be Energy Secretary, replacing Rick Perry.

In my view, questions about Secretary Perry's conduct in Ukraine—and what Mr. Brouillette may know about that conduct—tie this nomination to the impeachment inquiry in an important way. I have come to believe there are several significant unanswered questions about Secretary Perry's role in changing the board of a state-owned energy company called Naftogaz.

What Secretary Perry, his campaign donors, and certain crooked associates of Rudy Giuliani stood to gain from those changes is something the Senate ought to be digging into. We have been hearing about Secretary Perry's role in Donald Trump's scheme with respect to withholding a meeting and military aid until Ukrainian President Zelensky agreed to interfere in the 2020 elections in the United States.

The investigations seem to be piling up. Every time a new piece of information comes to light, it raises yet more and more questions about schemes that sure look, based on the facts, to be corrupt. Somehow, Secretary Perry seems to be making his way out the door without facing much, if any, scrutiny. Now the Senate is trying to fast-track his replacement.

I will put it simply: Enough, enough. It is time for the Senate to get some answers instead of just saying everything is A-OK at the Energy Department.

I am going to take just a few minutes to explain what this is all about. Mr. PERRY is famously one of the "three amigos" who took control of U.S. ties with Ukraine under the direction of the President and his personal lawyer, Rudy Giuliani. Secretary Perry attended President Zelensky's inauguration in May. They held a private meeting. It has been reported that Secretary Perry pushed President Zelensky to fire members of the board of Naftogaz—a Ukrainian energy giant—and replace them with Secretary Perry's own political donors.

At a second meeting with Ukrainian government and energy sector officials, Secretary Perry reportedly said the entire board ought to be replaced. The Associated Press reported that one person who attended the meeting said that "he was floored by the American requests because the person had always viewed the U.S. government 'as having a higher ethical standard.'"

The changes Secretary Perry was seeking lined up with changes sought by two shady characters named Lev Parnas and Igor Fruman, associates of Rudy Giuliani's. They also wanted different leadership at Naftogaz.

I am going to read now from an Associated Press report.

As Rudy Giuliani was pushing Ukrainian officials last spring to investigate one of Donald Trump's main political rivals, a group of individuals with ties to the president and his personal lawyer were also active in the former Soviet republic. Their aims were profit, not politics.

This circle of businessmen and Republican donors touted connections to Giuliani and Trump while trying to install new management at the top of Ukraine's massive state gas company. Their plan was to then steer lucrative contracts to companies controlled by Trump allies, according to two people with knowledge of their plans.

Federal prosecutors are now investigating Rudy Giuliani's role. A Naftogaz official is reportedly cooperating in the investigation, and some of Rick Perry's political donors did get a lucrative oil and gas deal in Ukraine after Perry began pressuring the Ukrainian President for changes.

Perry admits he was in contact with Giuliani about Ukraine. It was also revealed in impeachment testimony that Perry was seemingly made aware in July of the Trump scheme where it seemed like everybody was involved in Ukraine.

To get it straight, I think this is the bottom line: Secretary Perry has somehow managed to stay on the fringes of this whole scheme, but it sure looks to me like he was right at the heart of serious ethical compromises. President Trump has claimed he made the call to Ukraine's President that prompted the whistleblower's complaint at Perry's request. Everywhere you look in the Ukraine scandal, it looks like there is crooked behavior all over.

I have a hard time believing that Secretary Perry booked his own flight for these meetings, sauntered out the back door of the Energy Department, and freelanced his own shady Ukraine policy without anybody knowing about it.

That brings me back to the Brouillette nomination. Dan Brouillette is currently the Deputy Energy Secretary. He is the No. 2 person at the Department. He is the Deputy to the "amigo."

At his confirmation hearing, sitting on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which I at one time chaired, I thought it was important to ask Mr. Brouillette some basic questions about what I have outlined here. What I wanted to know wasn't real complicated: Whom did Secretary Perry meet with regarding Ukraine and Naftogaz? He was a powerful guy, and he wielded major influence over a nation that is dependent on aid from the United States as it resists aggression by Russia. Who else was in the loop with Secretary Perry?

Deputy Secretary Brouillette acknowledged in my questions only that

there were meetings but provided no further details about who took part in them. In followup written questions, again, he just wasn't forthcoming. He wouldn't provide any answers.

I am sending a letter to Deputy Secretary Brouillette to give him yet another chance to answer basic questions: To whom was Mr. Brouillette referring when he acknowledged Perry held meetings on seeking changes at Naftogaz; when and where did those meetings take place; to whom outside the Department did Secretary Perry speak regarding changes in Naftogaz and the substance of those communications; and then, whether Department staff were involved in meetings at which changes to Naftogaz leadership came up, who the staff were, and what materials were produced.

I will make it clear, I find it implausible the Secretary of Energy was unstaffed on all this. I would think, for an important meeting like this, Secretary Perry would have individuals from the Department of Energy who were involved in these discussions that Mr. Brouillette has now acknowledged took place, but we can't get any names. We can't get any answers at all.

I think it is seriously an error for the Senate to just rush to this nomination without getting answers to the questions I have outlined. Indictments are flying. Investigations reveal major wrongdoing. Every stone that gets overturned in this process reveals a lot more generally about a rotten scheme. It just seems to me that Secretary Perry is a significant figure in this scandal, and he is just trying to get out of dodge.

To me, this ought to be an opportunity for this body, the U.S. Senate, to stand up and demand accountability from the Trump administration and all of those in the administration who can provide information that, I think, provides a modest amount of information—a modest amount of information—about discussions that could very well be relevant to this whole Ukraine scheme.

Mr. Giuliani already had associates indicted. Just yesterday, there were differences of opinion in the testimony about what Mr. PERRY's involvement was all about. Practically every day there are unanswered questions about this matter. Because I believe the Senate deserves to have answers to the questions I have raised, because I think this is just accountability 101 to have this information, I will be voting no today on cloture. My understanding is that no matter how the Senate is recorded today, there will be some opportunity over the holiday break for Senators, staff, and those who are doing investigative work on this to get more details. I certainly think that without the question I have been asking and the modest amount of information they would disclose—information, frankly, I think Secretary Perry, the Energy Department, and the Trump administration could produce quite