

youth were more directly tackled by economic and social planners and policy-makers.

Now the fact is that Indonesia in the past and China and India today are able to sustain very impressive growth rates of over 7% per annum, and this indicates to me at least that this is again possible for Indonesia in the future. 5% is not enough. In fact SBY has mentioned 6.5%, and I would venture to say that even that is not enough. The bar should be a bit higher and Indonesia should be able to achieve at least what it was able to achieve before. This is affected by one very important thing, that is, that the world is a very different place today than it was ten years ago. Greater openness to global markets, globalization and liberalization make it much more difficult for developing countries to follow the kinds of strategies that Indonesia did before and China still does today. So, I think it's important to ponder on what the constraints and opportunities of globalization are because it strikes me and a lot of critics of globalization that a lot of the opportunities flow mostly to those who are well-positioned to take advantage of the opportunities - the elites and so forth. The costs and the drawbacks are borne by the poor. How can that be changed? That's the question that I would put forward.

One thing that I haven't heard much comment on is the importance of a rural development strategy for Indonesia. The statistics that I have seen suggest that some 58% of the population of Indonesia is still rural based, and therefore it seems to me that one cannot make much headway in poverty and growth unless one tackles the rural economy and agriculture in particular. And one of the graphs that we saw suggest that agriculture is a slow growth sector. How can you improve the lives of those involved in the rural economy if agriculture is only growing at 1.7%? Perhaps it's a good thing that SBY has done his PhD in rural economics and has perhaps some particular insights on what to do about the rural economy. Let's see if he can deliver on some of those thoughts.

What about Canada's role? Let me say something here that may be a bit provocative and may upset some of you. Canada's contribution to Indonesia is very modest. There is only so much one can do with a contribution of \$24 million a year to a country that has a gross national income of 700 or 800 billion dollars. In fact the percentage I put in my paper is wrong; Canada's bilateral aid it's not 1/90 of one percent of Indonesia's gross national income, it's more like 1/450 of one percent. So we have to be humble about what one can do. Amanda has told us