

about all the wonderful and positive things that one can do with a \$24 million a year aid program but let's not get carried away. This is not going to solve Indonesia's problems in governance or in poverty reduction. In fact, some would argue that in a world of scarce aid resources, perhaps Indonesia shouldn't even be on our list; it is not one of the poorest countries in the world by a long shot. Most of the poorest countries in the world are in Africa and they have a lot greater problems and challenges to deal with than Indonesia.

So that's one provocative thought I'd like to put out to you. But, if that's in fact the case how should Canada conduct its relations with Indonesia. One term that has been going the rounds in Ottawa these days is that of "policy coherence." You may have heard of the international policy review that most of the departments are supposed to be undertaking. From all reports, this has not achieved very much. But let's hope that it can achieve this thing called policy coherence. For example, is it conceivable that in the case of Indonesia all of our departments can work towards a common purpose? In Indonesia, this means not only CIDA and our Departments of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, but the host of other departments and agencies that must be involved in our relationships with Indonesia. Can they rally around a common set of objectives? For example, another thing that has not been mentioned this afternoon is the Millennium Development Goals. Is it possible for Indonesia to prioritize achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, starting first and foremost with at least halving poverty between now and the 2015, and if so, how could it array its strategies and resources in order to achieve that? And how can Canada position its policies, programs and resources, both through CIDA and through other departments, and in alliance with the private sector, to help Indonesia and the Indonesian people reduce poverty over the next 10 years? I think that this is totally conceivable, totally plausible. Let's just do it.

Finally I'd like to emphasize one thing that has come up a couple of times in other presentations, the issue of human rights. I think it's impossible to have a stable and long-lasting democracy unless it is based on a foundation of solid human rights. Otherwise you get what Fared Zakaria in his recent book *The Future of Freedom* calls "illiberal democracy" – or, in other words, when majorities are elected that ride rough-shod over the rights of minorities, be they ethnic or otherwise, unless there is a solid foundation of human rights that everyone, including the democratically elected majorities, respect and