Mr. President, it is said that politics is the art of

the possible. And while certain things are simply not possible, it is

our duty to try all the same.

So today, I will try to explain the unexplainable. The distinguished

junior Senator from Massachusetts has made so many statements on this

country's involvement in Iraq that he has taken every conceivable

position possible, and many that are simply not possible. The result is

a record of ``dizzying contradictions,'' as Charles Krauthammer

recently wrote, so confusing that the more he speaks, the less we

understand.

Mr. President, John Kerry has spoken on so many aspects of the

liberation of Iraq. He has been on both sides of just about every coin

in this entire debate. I want to address just four different positions

he has taken.

What is more disturbing is that he has taken these four positions on

the most basic question of the liberation of that country. The question

is not nearly as difficult as the multiple answers we continue to get.

The question is: Would you have used force to remove Saddam Hussein?

Back in 2002, the answer was clear enough. Citing Saddam Hussein's

use of weapons of mass destruction, his terrorist-like actions, and the

fact that he was part of a global scourge of terrorism, Senator Kerry

said he completely agreed with the President to effect regime change in

Iraq, unilaterally if necessary. So he voted for the Iraq war

resolution in October of 2002. Support in October of 2002.

Nine months later, Senator Kerry started to use another answer. He

now claimed that the war resolution he supported in October 2002 did

not empower the President to engage in regime change.

By January of 2004, around the time of the Iowa caucuses, Senator

Kerry had a new position. He was now the ``antiwar candidate.'' In

January of 2004, he was now the antiwar candidate, campaigning in the

Iowa caucuses, having been, in October 2002, entirely supportive of the

war.

He then went on to lock up the Democratic nomination for President.

So we are into the general election season, Mr. President. When

challenged by the President to answer whether he would have gone into

Iraq and removed Saddam Hussein based on what we now know, Kerry stood

on the edge of the Grand Canyon--a dramatic pose facing the Grand

Canyon--and said on August 11:

In August of 2004, in the general election, he seems to be back where

he was in October of 2002. He has gone from support to oppose and back

to support.

But that was last month. A week ago, on the ``Imus in the Morning''

show, Senator Kerry was asked:

That is a pretty simple question. Here was Senator Kerry's response:

This was last week. A month ago, he was in support of the war, but

last week he was back in opposition to the war. He says:

Let's try this one more time. Senator Kerry, on the ``Imus'' show

last week, said, in answer to the question:

He said:

When Kerry finished his interview with Imus, here is what Imus had to

say about it. Don Imus said:

That was Don Imus' summary of John Kerry's position on Iraq on his

program last week.

Well, Mr. Imus, you are not alone. The top ranking Democrat on the

Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Biden, recently stated:

That is our colleague in the Senate, an enthusiastic supporter of

Senator Kerry. He said why try to explain the unexplainable, referring

to Senator Kerry's various positions on Iraq.

We could all use clarity from John Kerry with regard to Iraq's

liberation, but none more than Prime Minister Ayad Allawi, who will be

here among us addressing Congress tomorrow morning. Dealing with the

terrorists and Baathist insurgents, he needs, more than anyone, to know

that the U.S. position of supporting the liberty of Iraq is clear,

unequivocal, and steadfast. He would not get that from reading John

Kerry's numerous positions.

Mr. President, a Senator's position on Iraq should not be all that

hard to explain because it is not a complicated question. It is,

however, a tough question, representative of the sort of tough issue

any Commander in Chief

frequently gets. In trying to answer and re-answer the most important

issue of this election, central to the struggle for freedom today and

tomorrow, we have a Presidential candidate who constantly changes his

mind. This is not some little issue; this is the biggest issue

confronting the country today. We are 6 weeks from the election, and

this is a man who flip-flops like a fish on the deck of a boat, back

and forth, back and forth, who doesn't know where he stands on the most

important issue we are confronting in our era.

For example, when asked if he would have gone into Iraq to remove

Saddam Hussein, Kerry recently answered:

Let me read that one more time. When asked if he would have gone into

Iraq to remove Saddam Hussein, Kerry recently said:

Not exactly Winston Churchill. Perhaps there is some nuance here,

such as an exclamation point or a question mark, that tells whether

this is a declaration or a question, but the answer to the most

critical issue in this election should not leave the world wondering

and more confused than before.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.