

Ambassador Kurt Volker

1. Ambassador Kurt Volker was aware of no *quid pro quo* and the Ukrainian government—who trusted Ambassador Volker—never raised concerns to him about a *quid pro quo*.

Q. *Your text transcript, 9/9/19, 5: 19 a.m., from Gordon Sondland: Bill, I believe you are incorrect about President Trump's intentions. The President has been crystal clear, no quid pro quos of any kind. Would Gordon Sondland – would he make that up?*

A. *No. No. Gordon and I and, you know, Bill and other – were in frequent contact. And Gordon was repeating here what we all understood. [p. 170]*

Q. *And you're confident that if that was something they were concerned about, that they were worried that that was – there was a connection, a nexus, that they would have asked you or brought that up as a possibility?*

A. *It never came up in conversation with them, and I believe they had trust in me that they would have asked if that was really what they were worried about. [p. 301]*

Q. *In the last round, there was a conversation you had with Chairman Schiff that I just want to kind of clarify. First of all, the folks that you dealt with in Ukraine at the very highest level, I don't know, but I'm going to ask, do you feel like they had a fair amount of trust in you.*

A. *Absolutely.*

Q. *And I assess that too from the conversation that we had. So they would confide things in you if they had a question?*

A. *They would confide things. They would ask questions. They would ask for help. We had a very candid relationship.*

Q: *So you had said that you get the readout from the call that was basically congratulations, fighting corruptions, and then initiation to a White House visit, so to speak. That was the assessment.*

A: *That is what I was briefed as the content of the call.*

Q: *But in your conversation with Representative Schiff, he kind of implied and wanted you to intimate that there was an agreement based on that conversation that if you do the investigation, then you can have a meeting and maybe we'll consider this military aid.*

Q: *If that were the case from the call, do you feel, because they had some trust in you, that they would have come to you and said, "Hey, how do we handle this? Is this what the President of the United States is asking?" Would they confide -- would they ask you that?*

A: *Yes, they would have asked me exactly that, you know: How do we handle this?*

And, in fact, we had conversations, and some of them are in these text streams here, where they wanted to make a statement to show that they are serious about investigating the past and fighting corruption and turn a new page in Ukraine. And we engaged over what to say, what not to say.

Q: And so they did not ask you that particular question?

A: No. [pp. 168 – 169]

2. Ambassador Volker testified that there was no “linkage” between a White House meeting and Ukrainian investigations.

Q. Did the President ever withhold a meeting with President Zelensky until the Ukrainians committed to investigating those allegations?

A. We had a difficult time scheduling a bilateral meeting between President Zelensky and President Trump.

Q. Ambassador Volker, that was a yes-or-no question.

A. Well, if I – can you repeat the question then?

Q. Sure. Did President Trump ever withhold a meeting with President Zelensky or delay a meeting with President Zelensky until the Ukrainians committed to investigate the allegations that you just described concerning the 2016 Presidential election?

A. The answer to the question is no, if you want a yes-or-no answer. But the reason the answer is no is we did have difficulty scheduling a meeting, but there was no linkage like that. [pp. 35 - 36]

Q. So before we move to the text messages, I want to ask you a clarifying question. You said that you were not aware of any linkage between the delay in the Oval Office meeting between President Trump and President Zelensky and the Ukrainian commitment to investigate the two allegations as you described them, correct?

A. Correct. [p. 40]

3. Ambassador Volker testified that President Trump was skeptical about Ukraine’s corruption. Ambassador Volker testified that even back in September 2017 President Trump had a skeptical view of Ukraine.

A. President Trump demonstrated that he had a very deeply rooted negative view of Ukraine based on past corruption. And that’s a reasonable position. Most people who would know anything about Ukraine would think that. That’s why it was important that we wanted to brief him, because we were saying, it’s different, this guy is different. But the President had a very deeply rooted negative view. We urged that he invite President Zelensky to meet with him at the White House. He

was skeptical of that. We persisted. And he finally agreed, okay, I'll do it. [pp. 30 - 31]

Q. And you mentioned that the President was skeptical, had a deep-rooted view of the Ukraine. Is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. And that, whether fair or unfair, he believed there were officials in Ukraine that were out to get him in the run-up to his election?

A. That is correct.

Q. So, to the extent there are allegations lodged, credible or uncredible, if the president was made aware of those allegations, whether it was via The Hill or, you know, via Mr. Giuliani or via cable news, if the President was made aware of these allegations, isn't it fair to say that he may, in fact, have believed they were credible?

A. Yes, I believe so. [pp. 70 - 71]

4. Ambassador Volker testified that although the aid was delayed, he did not view the delay as significant or unprecedented. The U.S. never informed the Ukrainian government that the aid was delayed and ultimately it was provided.

Q. Looking back on it now, is [the delayed security assistance] something, in the grand scheme of things, that's very significant? I mean, is this worthy of investigating, or is this just another chapter in the rough and tumble world of diplomacy and foreign assistance?

A. In my view, this hold on security assistance was not significant. I don't believe – in fact, I am quite sure that at least I, Secretary Pompeo, the official representatives of the U.S., never communicated to Ukrainians that it is being held for a reason. We never had a reason. And I tried to avoid talking to Ukrainians about it for as long as I could until it came out in Politico a month later because I was confident we were going to get it fixed internally. [p. 80]

5. Ambassador Volker testified that he did not see Rudy Giuliani as speaking to the Ukrainian government on behalf of President Trump and that the Ukrainians asked to connect with Giuliani.

Q. Did you understand that Rudy Giuliani spoke for President Trump when he was dealing with the Ukrainians?

A. No.

Q. Did he – but you said he was his personal lawyer. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Was he – do you know whether he was conveying – Rudy Giuliani – conveying messages that President Trump wanted conveyed to the Ukrainians?

- A. *I did not have that impression. I believe that he was doing his own communication about what he believed and was interested in. [pp. 46 - 47]*
- Q. *Do you know what Rudy Giuliani and Andrey Yermak discussed in advance of the call between President Trump and President Zelensky?*
- A. *So the sequence here is Andrey met with me on the 10th of July. I reached out to Rudy to see whether -- and Andrey asked me to connect him to Rudy. I reached out to Rudy to see whether he could get together so that I could ask him whether he wanted to be connected to Yermak. I wanted both parties to want to be connected to each other before doing anything. [p. 138]*

6. Ambassador Volker testified he was never asked to do anything wrong by this Administration.

- Q: *Okay. Were you ever asked to do something that was wrong by this administration or anybody connected with this administration?*
- A: *No, I wasn't.*
- Q: *Including the President of the United States?*
- A: *Including by the President. I was never asked to do anything that I thought was wrong. And I found myself in a position where I was working to put together the right policies for the administration and using all the friends and network and contacts that you have, Pentagon, State Department, NSC, to stitch that together, and I feel that we were successful at doing that. [p. 343]*

7. Ambassador Volker testified that a Ukrainian investigation into potential interference in the 2016 U.S. election is legitimate.

- Q. *Right. So when you then say, as you are sitting here today, that you had no idea that President Trump was going to discuss investigations either related to Burisma or to 2016 on that call, that's not accurate according to this text message ["Assuming President Zelensky convinces Trump he will investigate/get to the bottom of what happened in 2016, we will nail down date of visit to Washington"], is it?*
- A. *Get to the bottom of what happened in 2016 is a reference to the prosecutor general's claims that there was interference. That to be investigated I always thought was fine, because that is just a matter of, you know, we don't want anybody interfering in our elections and did it happen. And my belief was that it didn't, and this is helping -- trying to help President Zelensky convey the right message in a phone call to build a relationship with the President that he needs to build just to have confidence in each other. [p. 146]*

8. Ambassador Volker disagreed with the idea that President Trump was manufacturing “dirt” on his opponents.

Q. Would you say that President Trump in the phone call – and you’ve read the transcript and you’re familiar with all the parties – was asking President Zelensky to manufacture dirt on the Bidens?

A. No. And I’ve seen that phrase thrown around a lot. And I think there’s a difference between the manufacture or dig up dirt versus finding out did anything happen in the 2016 campaign or did anything happen with Burisma. I think – or even if he’s asking them to investigate the Bidens, it is to find out what facts there may be rather than to manufacture something. [pp. 212 - 213]