Removing coal from our energy mix will have disastrous consequences for our recovering economy.

I couldn't agree more with our Democratic colleague.

It is time for the White House to stop pivoting from job-destroying policies to campaign-stop PR pitches for jobs right back to job-destroying policies. It is time for the administration to get serious about pursuing a truly workable strategy for this country, for energy, for the economy, and for jobs.

SENATE RULES

Briefly, on another matter, another day has gone by. We are still not clear that the majority leader is going to keep his word given back at the beginning of this Congress that the issue of the rules for the Senate of this Congress have been settled. They have been settled as a result of bipartisan discussions that occurred back in January leading to the passing of two rules changes and two standing orders, after which the majority leader had said it had been settled, that we had the rules for this Congress.

Later we learned that maybe we didn't, and there were these implied threats issued to groups around the country that he would exercise a so-called nuclear option. The definition of the nuclear option is to break the rules of the Senate in order to change the rules of the Senate.

The minority, and I suspect a reasonable number of the majority, are waiting to find out whether the majority leader intends to keep his word. Your word is the currency of the realm in the Senate. His word has been given. We expect it to be kept.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

BORDER SECURITY, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AND IMMIGRATION MODERNIZATION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 744, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 744) to provide comprehensive immigration reform, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Leahy modified amendment No. 1183, to strengthen border security and enforcement.

Boxer/Landrieu amendment No. 1240, to require training for National Guard and Coast Guard officers and agents in training programs on border protection, immigration law enforcement, and how to address vulnerable populations, such as children and victims of crime.

Cruz amendment No. 1320, to replace title I of the bill with specific border security requirements, which shall be met before the Secretary of Homeland Security may process applications for registered immigrant status or blue card status and to avoid Department of Homeland Security budget reductions.

Leahy (for Reed) amendment No. 1224, to clarify the physical present requirements for merit-based immigrant visa applicants.

Reid amendment No. 1551 (to modified amendment No. 1183), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1552 (to the language proposed to be stricken by the reported committee substitute amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 1553 (to amendment No. 1552), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two managers or their designees.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I have expressed my frustration many times, and more often in the last week, about the lack of progress on getting votes. We have been on this bill for 3 weeks. Yet we have only dealt with nine amendments. It is unclear if any more amendments will be debated and voted on. We have provided a list to the majority on amendments that we believe will make the bill better. It seems as though the only amendments that will be made in order before we vote on final passage will be the Schumer-Hoeven-Corker so-called grand compromise. This is the one that was concocted behind closed doors for days, stalling progress we wanted to make in the public. In other words, we lost a lot of time while this grand compromise was being concocted behind closed doors. Even while that was going on, we could have been debating amendments and voting on amendments.

Not only is the amendment before us, meaning the Schumer-Hoeven-Corker amendment, loaded with provisions that some would call earmarks, but it continues to promote false promises that the border will be truly secured. We get the impression from hearing the authors debate their amendment that tomorrow we are going to have a secure border. This is not going to happen, and I will explain that in a moment.

Let's get back to basics. We are a Nation based upon the rule of law. In that concept, every Nation has a right to protect its sovereignty. In fact, it has a duty to protect the homeland. Any border security measures we pass then must be real and, more importantly, immediate. We can't wait 10 years down the road to put more agents on the border or to implement a tracking system to track foreign nationals. We have to prove to the American people today that illegal entries are under complete control and the visa overstays are being punished. Being punished means leave our country when your visa says you are supposed to leave the country.

Unfortunately, too many people have been led to believe the bill before us, and this grand compromise amendment, will force the Secretary of Homeland Security to secure the border. The fact is, it doesn't do that, but we are led to believe that tomorrow the border will be secure. The amendment basically is a continuation of the basic premise of the underlying bill—legalization first, enforcement later, if ever.

It is very simple and it is wrong. People will be legalized merely on the submission of a plan by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

Will that plan secure the border? Who is going to know until a long way down the road. In the meantime, you have legalization and possibly enforcement, but you aren't going to know. Then you end up making the same mistake I made by voting for the bill in 1986. I don't intend to make that mistake again.

We are saying the Secretary puts forth a plan. This very same Secretary is the one who thinks the border is already strong enough, the same Secretary who has refused to even answer questions we submitted to her 2 months ago about how she might interpret some of this legislation. She obviously hasn't been forthright in answering what those department policies would be.

The amendment puts additional agents on the border, yes. It does it, quite frankly, in opposition to people on the other side of the aisle. Some of the sponsors of the bill have argued already that more agents aren't necessary. Maybe I should be satisfied we are going to have more agents. The point is, it is so far down the road—don't sell this amendment to me as border security.

Let's be honest with the American people. This amendment, this grand compromise concocted behind closed doors, may call for more Border Patrol agents, but it surely doesn't require it until the undocumented population, who are now RPIs, apply for adjustment status or a green card, and that is down the road several years.

I am all for putting more agents along the border, but why should we wait? It ought to be enforcement now, legalization later. Why allow legalization now and simply promise more agents in the future?

Even then, who believes the Secretary, like the one we have today, will actually enforce the law? When I say like the Secretary we have today, I mean the policy. She says the border is secure.

In this amendment there is the issue of fencing. One of the conditions that must be met before the Secretary can process green cards for people here illegally is the southern border fencing strategy has been submitted to Congress and implemented. This fencing strategy will identify where 700 miles of pedestrian fencing is in place. Note that this is not double layered, as in current law, so current law is weakened.

The amendment states the second layer is to be built only if the Secretary deems it necessary and appropriate. This is another delegation of authority to a Secretary who says the border is already secure.