

RELEASE IN FULL

---

**From:** Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 13, 2010 8:25 PM  
**To:** H  
**Subject:** Fw: Urgent Message for the Secretary

Fyi traffic b/l

---

**From:** Verma, Richard R  
**To:** Pascual, Carlos (Mexico City); Mills, Cheryl D  
**Cc:** Valenzuela, Arturo A; Jacobson, Roberta S; Steinberg, James B; Lew, Jacob J  
**Sent:** Thu May 13 19:33:13 2010  
**Subject:** Re: Urgent Message for the Secretary

I am not so sure this amendment will pass. We will have to work against it, and we should get a letter from Gates opposing it. That will help a lot.

---

**From:** Pascual, Carlos (Mexico City)  
**To:** Mills, Cheryl D  
**Cc:** Valenzuela, Arturo A; Jacobson, Roberta S; Verma, Richard R; Steinberg, James B; Lew, Jacob J  
**Sent:** Thu May 13 17:24:32 2010  
**Subject:** Urgent Message for the Secretary

Madame Secretary,

You may get a phone call from Secretary Espinosa about the amendment offered by Senator Hutchinson to the supplemental appropriations bill to provide \$250 million to deploy 6,000 national guard troops on the border with Mexico in FY2010. Espinosa had called me to her office to discuss next week's visit by President Calderon. Roberta advised me of this amendment as I was on my way. I am told that the initial read is that the amendment will likely pass, that it will likely be on the Senate floor while Calderon is in Washington, and that a veto will be difficult since it is tied to funding for the oil spill, Afghanistan and Haiti.

I explained the situation to Secretary Espinosa. I also said that State had worked diligently to explain within the administration the negative impact of a national guard deployment on the border, while offering alternatives to increase our law enforcement capabilities. The Hutchinson amendment circumvents all the work that had been done within the administration.

Espinosa was shaken – literally shaken – by the prospect of this issue being debated while Calderon is in Washington. She asked me to convey to you the horrific impact that this would have in Mexico. “How can we be talking about cooperation? What our people will see is that you are putting the military on your border to keep out Mexicans. I understand the importance of funding for the oil spill, Afghanistan and Haiti, but are these more important than Mexico? This will overshadow all the good we are trying to achieve with this visit.”

Espinosa was clearly panicked about breaking this news to her boss. I said to her that if the amendment passed, then we will have to put the best light on how we implement this provision, making clear the administration's view that it is not against the Mexican people, and that the increased capacity would allow us to intensify inspections against arms and money flowing to Mexico. I said that I did not know enough about the amendment to know if it allowed us to deploy the National Guard in back office functions that would free up CBP staff to increase its patrols. I also re-emphasized that I had only a preliminary readout on legislative prospects and that things could change, but we wanted to give her the earliest possible alert to what had developed.

I am copying Rich Verma in case he has further information on the legislative prospects.

Carlos Pascual