



REPUBLIC OF CUBA  
Permanent Mission to the United Nations  
315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016

**STATEMENT BY THE CUBAN DELEGATION. 5TH COMMITTEE. MAIN SEGMENT. 74TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. ITEM NO. 135: 2020 PROGRAM BUDGET. ESTIMATES IN RESPECT OF SPECIAL POLITICAL MISSIONS, GOOD OFFICES AND OTHER POLITICAL INITIATIVES AUTHORIZED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND/OR THE SECURITY COUNCIL. THEMATIC CLUSTER I: SPECIAL AND PERSONAL ENVOYS AND SPECIAL ADVISERS OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL. NEW YORK, 15 OCTOBER 2019.**

Mr. Chairman.

We thank the Controller, Mr. Chandru Ramanathan for the presentation of the Secretary-General's reports on the estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council. We also thank Mr. Cihan Terzi, Chairman of the Advisory Committee, for the related reports of this body.

Mr. Chairman,

For many years, the decision to create Special Political Missions has been made solely by the authority of the Security Council. However, these Missions are financed through the regular budget, accounting, on average, for more than 20 percent of the resources allocated to it. This is proof of the imbalance that exists in the resources allotted to the different priorities established by the General Assembly. In an age of serious lack of financial liquidity for the United Nations, this practice becomes onerous and unsustainable.

Bearing in mind the special responsibility of the Security Council and its capacity to create the mandates of both the Peacekeeping Operations and the Special Political Missions, it is an overwhelming logic that these Missions should be financed in the same way as the Peacekeeping Operations, which includes the use of the appropriate scale of assessments.

In addition, with regard to the Secretary-General's reports on all special political missions, we wish to mention with concern the inclusion of these budgets under Section 3 of the regular budget. This was done even though this Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 59 of its report A/72/7/Add.24, which requested that no changes be made to the structure of the budget, and in this regard, we would appreciate clarification from the Secretariat on this issue.

Mr. Chairman,

With regard to the estimates for Thematic cluster I: Special and Personal Envoys and Special Advisers to the Secretary-General, contained in document A/74/6/Add.2, particularly, section 2 relative to the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide, Cuba reiterates its full support for the functions of this Adviser, as part of our unchanging principled position against the crime of genocide. However, we must insist on our disagreement with the Secretary-General's proposal to include activities and outputs relating to "responsibility to protect", in the estimates of special political missions.

Citing paragraphs 138 and 139 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome document, does not justify at all the creation of the post of a Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, let alone that his work be funded from the regular budget. There is no resolution adopted by the General Assembly, the highest democratic organ of our Organization, which states that such post has been created. It is therefore illegal to grant resources for this post without an express and clear legislative mandate.

The existence of this Adviser is in fact a deviation from the letter and spirit of operative paragraphs 138 and 139 of resolution 60/1 of the General Assembly.

Paragraph 30 of the Secretary-General's report reads: "On 31 August 2007, in a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2007/721), the Secretary-General expressed his intention to appoint a Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect". This, a mere exchange of letters, is the genesis of this Adviser.

Mr. Chairman,

As already noted, there is no legal basis for the implementation of activities or the prediction of outputs relating to the "responsibility to protect". Let us recall that in paragraph 2 of resolution 63/308, the General Assembly decided only to "continue consideration of the responsibility to protect". We reiterate our view that no comprehensive intergovernmental debates or reviews have been conducted on the subject which may have led to the approval by the General Assembly of a definition of this purported concept.

Again this year, despite remarkable changes in the budget presentation, the level of resources associated with the activities and outputs linked to the Special Adviser on the responsibility to protect, which are blended together with those of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, cannot be clearly and transparently defined. This is also the case for the narrative on the job description for both Advisers. Ambiguous information of this kind makes it difficult for Member States to scrutinize and prevents us from accurately knowing whether the mission of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide fully complies with the mandates given or whether, on the contrary, it carries out activities with objectives that are not fully approved by Member States.

Mr. Chairman,

The so called principle of the "responsibility to protect" continues to pose serious concerns for many countries, particularly, to small and developing countries, due to the lack of consensus and definitions on several of its elements. Last 20 September, a vote was held in the General Assembly to decide about the incorporation of this item into the agenda of the current session, and with which, it was again demonstrated that this is an issue that lacks consensus among the membership of our Organization.

In addition, it is an issue that has been manipulated in the past for political purposes. History records sad examples in which, under the aegis of the so-called "responsibility to protect", the principles of the United Nations Charter and International Law have been undermined, putting at risk the sovereignty of States and their primary responsibility for the welfare of their population.

Mr. Chairman,

While we reiterate our unequivocal support for the work of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, based on the elements identified under the theme of the "responsibility to protect", my delegation will take part in the question-and-answer sessions and will put forward specific proposals to modify the presentation made by Secretary-General relating to the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide.

Thank you very much.