

is not true of Indonesia. Jakarta is, of course, a large city, but the 27 provinces have very large capitals also.

The third point I would like to make is that it is not in a race really with Japan or with anybody. It is a race with poverty and unemployment and things like that.

But it is, very important to learn the experiences of more developed and industrialized countries, and in this sense the typology produced by the Professor just now I find very helpful in thinking about human resources development.

TORII:

In responding to the comments by Mr. Matsumoto, I think the catching up itself is not necessarily the final target of industrialization. The real target of industrialization or HRD is the level-up itself of the economic activities, including the employment or labor absorption.

In this regard, the selection of industrial projects or cooperation projects is very important. Even though the project seems not so modern, if it has the labor absorptive capacity, and if it has the power to level up the human resources, it should be promoted very strongly.

I remember a very typical example which we had in Malaysia in 1967. At that time, our iron and steel manufacturers and Prime Minister Rahman, agreed to implement an iron steel industry in Malaysia, and we established the so-called Malay Yawata Steel Industry in Batowas near Penang Island. This factory was very well designed. First of all, the capacity of the production was only 100,000 tons per annum, and this is only 2 percent of our normal scale of production but this scale of 100,000 tons is just the same as the domestic demand of Malaysia at the time, and it endured to supply the total demands for the construction materials in Malaysia until 1972.

Secondly, this project was very well designed in the sense that, instead of importing their coke and coal, they made charcoal from the waste rubber. As a result there were no induced imports.

Thirdly, the labor absorption was fantastic. The direct employment of this factory was local people 1,000, Japanese 1,000, 2,000 people operating for the first time, while at this moment only 2 Japanese directors are staying there and no Japanese workers there. A complete transfer of technology has been done. Also by utilizing the very indigenous traditional way of production, that means charcoal instead of coke, they have had to employ so

many lorry drivers, some other workers indirectly, and by my calculations--and this is amazing--about 200,000 people were indirectly employed by this project. The direct employment was only 1,000, but indirect employment induced by this project was 200,000!

This is a very fantastic case. I think this kind of project should be designed and pushed forward. Thank you.

YAMAGUCHI:

I am impressed by Prof. Torii's presentation, but from my perspective his presentation might have been slightly biased on urban areas and large companies.

In ASEAN countries and in the Pacific region they also have a need to create industries in nonurban and rural areas.

Let me quote one example. In Sri Lanka since a few years ago, I am assisting JICA's efforts there, and that is Appropriate Technology Research and Development Center. This center is located in the nonurban area which is a small town with a population of 6,000 people, and this project was initiated in the industrial zone situated in that small town, and we have dispatched an economist. That person worked with researchers in the Ministry of Industry and with other affiliated people, and the project was to utilize electricity generated by windmills at that site and it has turned out to be quite successful.

This uses wooden propeller and that is used to feed power to the turbine of the generator, and it also pumps up the water, so the efficiency is very good and it turns out to be quite economic to run such a project.

If we can introduce such a system in different areas and corners of ASEAN nations that will be a major benefit, so this is one example of the creation of new industries in rural areas as well as in nonurban areas.

In doing this, what we have to do is to work with the local people. That is something really needed in developing nations.

In our experience in Sri Lanka, we had to ask local researchers to live in that rural area. They didn't want to come because they wanted to live in Colombo because it's more exciting to live in Colombo rather than to live in a rural area. So it's also difficult for us to attract capable researchers, local researchers, to rural areas. But nonetheless this is one of the approaches which we might be able to take in the future.

CHAIRMAN:

Please.

HORIUCHI:

Mr. Matusmoto suggested some type of network of information system. I am not going to jump to conclusion of anything, but listening to this discussion yesterday and today we all realize that industrial structure is changing very fast, and we have to educate human manpower according to the changing needs.

But one thing I realized today and yesterday was that we thought we are doing fairly well, working in this region very well. However, we are still not systematizing on the regional basis the human resource development programs, and we do not know very much the institutions and opportunities or expertise or capabilities of various countries, not only Dialogue Countries but ASEAN countries or South Pacific countries. They all have their own capabilities and institutions. Maybe we can offer opportunities, and I was wondering whether in the future we could organize or systematize this type of knowledge, opportunities or capabilities and form a network so that we can exchange up-to-date information. Maybe we can even exchange our expertise or our experience.

CHAIRMAN:

Well, this leaves me with the difficult task of trying to come up with a decent conclusion on the discussion that we had this morning and this afternoon.

I think we started off very well with having Prof. Torii to present to us some kind of a conceptual framework, of what industrial structure or economic structure should look like when a country develops from the initial stages to the more developed stage.

I had hoped that with that kind of conceptual framework we should be able to place the experiences of each individual country in the ASEAN region as well as our colleagues from Papua New Guinea and Fiji in that particular conceptual framework.

I think we have been able to do that to some extent, and we finally realize that different countries could be located at different stages of the framework provided.

We agree that Brunei and perhaps New Guinea are at their inception stages as far as the industrial development is concerned. It is essentially an

extractive economy as far as Brunei is concerned. It is also extractive in the case of Papua New Guinea, but it has great potentiality in the agricultural sector. As far as Malaysia is concerned, we have undergone different stages of agricultural development as well as industrial development, and we do find different problems of development, and we should be able to identify what kind of human resources development program we need for those kinds of problems.

And then we move on to some other major points raised during the open discussion.

Number one, in the case of some countries, human resource development is actually the opportunity to get employment. In the case of Indonesia, for example, quality of human resources comes secondary compared to the opportunity, the basic right of a person to get a job.

When it comes to that particular issue, I think Prof. Torii has come up with very interesting views regarding the absorptive capacity of an economy. He was suggesting to us that we shouldn't look at the manufacturing sector as the sector that has the strong absorptive capacity. In fact, it is rather low compared to the medium and small scale-industries. The experience in Japan, and I think also in Taiwan, confirms the point.

Apart from those industries, the employment issue could also be tackled by looking at the other labor absorptive sectors, for example the construction sector with its strong backward linkages.

The other sector that Prof. Torii mentioned is the urban informal sector. He suggests that instead of treating it as informal the government of ASEAN countries should treat the informal sector in a formal way and, therefore, allow that particular sector to absorb the surplus labor in the metropolitan areas as well as the labor that would go on migrating from the rural to the urban areas.

Another point that has been discussed at some length is regarding the process of restructuring of national economies in the ASEAN region which has to take place because they have to tackle not only their own economic problems but also societal problems, i.e., the need to create more jobs, to raise income, to eradicate poverty, to improve equality of income in the community. So it has to go through the process of restructuring itself. It also has to industrialize because that is one plausible way of overcoming those problems and also to achieve that kind of aspiration.

In order to proceed with manufacturing or industrialization, we raised the possibility of relocating Japanese industries which have become obsolete, to search for new areas of investment, particularly in the ASEAN region, and hoping that the obsolete industries in Japan would relocate themselves and, at the same time, use as much local resources available in those countries.

I think on this particular matter Prof. Torii has made a cautious remark the extent to which restructuring of the national economies and also restructuring of the national economies and also restructuring of the international economy with a rather negative symptom of synchronization of economies.

I would like to make an additional comment here. Countries like Taiwan, Singapore, Korea and Hong Kong are rather fortunate because they went into the international market in the early seventies, after the sixties when there were rounds of Kennedy talks and also rounds of talk on the generalized trade preferences agreement which provided the mood for industrialized countries to open up their market.

But lately it has become more difficult to penetrate into the advanced markets and there is no other alternative but for the ASEAN countries to undertake industrialization, hoping that they could develop their own domestic markets.

But I would like to make another point on this matter. In the sixties we had also a process of relocation of industries, particularly the electronic industries. It had been expensive for America and Japan to employ labor to make components for electronics, so there was an attempt to take advantage of cheap labor in countries like Malaysia and other ASEAN countries but, as I said, the value added is rather low. So the ASEAN countries have to be very discriminatory in this context. Otherwise there would be very little economic gain that could be obtained from the relocation.

I think there is another point that has to be mentioned regarding the work ethics. I think perhaps it would be fair for me to conclude by saying that we have to look at the work ethics in the social or cultural context of the people we are talking about. It would be interesting to find out how work ethics could be developed in the Thai context or Malaysian context without going through so much stress and strain but finally achieving the objective of discipline and good work ethics to the extent that productivity from human resources is at the highest possible level that could be achieved.

I have not been well organized in my attempt to summarize the discussion. I would appreciate very much if you could give me some advice on what other things that need to be included.

Anybody else? Yes, please.

MAKIS:

I think up till now, or up till then, we were assuming that industrialization would satisfy or solve all our problems--our poverty problem, our unemployment problem--but I think there is an important role that small scale industrial development and the inducing of so-called appropriate technology in the rural areas can assist us in solving some of our problems.

This, to me for most ruralized countries, developing countries, is an important aspect, and I think with the technical knowledge that developed countries have, there is a role that they can effectively play in assisting us in this discussion in trying to put something together for us to put into the recommendations.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sayuti, please.

SAYUTI:

We shouldn't lose sight of the fact that behind small scale and large and medium scale, and even informal sector and rural activities are the implications on investment, choices which are being faced either by national governments or by donor organizations like JICA.

CHAIRMAN:

If there are no other views to be added, and if you have any more you could tell me during the one-hour break that we have.

May I take this opportunity to thank Prof. Torii as well as my colleagues from the ASEAN countries, as well as each and every one of you who has participated in the discussion.

8.1.3. Summary

The Summary of Session A was presented by the chairman of the session, Mr. Abdul Ghani Haji Othoman, as follows:

The Session A started with the lead-off Speech by Prof. Torii. It was an attempt to provide some kind of conceptual framework of development. He did try to emphasize the extent to which the path of industrialization as a means of development and growth of the ASEAN region was taken. And then he developed what the necessary conditions are that have to be met for industrialization to be successful. After that he moved on to what he calls the kind of structure that would develop in the process of time and in the process of sophistication of the economy concerned, and finally he touched on the implication on the development of human resources. The implication of necessary HRD is actually very much related to the kind of structure that would finally evolve over a period of time in these countries. Presumably the more sophisticated the structure, the more widespread and the more developed the skill necessary for that kind of economy.

Now, one or two people were not terribly happy with the conceptual framework presented. At least one particular gentleman said that we shouldn't be too inclined towards the experience of the Western countries, Japan or even Korea. Instead, what we should be trying to look at or develop is something genuine and something peculiar to the ASEAN experience now and in future.

Another reservation about the conceptual framework is that it is very much concerned about the delivery aspect of human resources development, what kind of technology or skills need to be given to the human resources in the developing countries. The reservation is that we should talk not only about

the delivery system but also about the condition of the recipients--: such as the social, economic and cultural context, the emotion or group instinct.

After giving you the two reservations, then maybe it is right for me to go into the presentation given by the ASEAN countries. This would give you a very strong reservation about the conceptual framework of Prof. Torii. If you take Brunei, for example, the industrial structure is at the very initial stage of development. It is still very dependent on the mining sector and extraction industry. In the case of Papua New Guinea it is very much agricultural-based and also depending on the mining. In the case of Thailand it is the mixture of agriculture and manufacturing. But in the case of Malaysia, it is a combination of agriculture and medium/small scale and developed industrial structure, and it is now in the process of embarking upon industrialization in the heavy industries.

So, the conceptual framework that restricts itself to the manufacturing sector needs to be expanded to include a range of areas from the traditional agricultural sector to the more advanced, heavy industry sector, if we want to look at the ASEAN region and the relevant Pacific countries as a whole.

Now, if we take that as the basis for looking at the requirements for HRD, the discussion would easily come to the conclusion that we have to develop HRD programs that take into account of all these sectors. So if we look at the human resources that exist in the traditional sector either in the rural or in the urban sector, then there is a need for a HRD program that helps to upgrade skill and technology. That would take care of countries like Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, Fiji, as well as countries that are already developed, into which we include Malaysia or Thailand.

If we move on from that traditional sector to something slightly more developed, the manufacturing sectors, it is argued that skill is of sufficient there. Technology is not sufficiently transferred to that huge percentage of

production workers. Therefore, there is a case for HRD program which gives retraining as well as re-upgrading in their skill and expertise.

Another area which requires some kind of HRD program is of course at the highest level of professional expertise as well as skill, either in the scientific area or technology or management. This is where every country despite of its level of development requires a program for it.

Finally, there is also a strong case for development of human resources that would be able to undertake research and development in these countries. There is no need to pretend the extent to which resources in this particular area would be able to compete with R & D in the advanced countries. But the expertise and capacity should be sufficient enough in order to adapt technology according to the needs and requirements as well as the resources available in the developing countries.

At the same time, the theme of HRD was discussed in the context of re-structuring of national economies as well as international economy. Countries like Malaysia, Philippines, and Thailand definitely would have to take up the challenge of the '80s, given the prevailing world economic situation. Consequently, they have to restructure their own economies so as not to become too dependent on their traditional exports. Furthermore, the restructuring of the national economies would have to be looked at in the context of restructuring of the world economy. If we take Japan, for example, there is a case to say that some industries become obsolete and therefore they have to relocate themselves elsewhere.

Now, the experience in the '60s should be learned in the case of receiving industries which are obsolete in advanced countries, particularly in the electronics industries which take advantage of cheap labor in developing countries. But these kinds of industries are rather footloose in nature. It could leave the country quite easily at very little value added into the

economy. So, developing countries have to be quite discriminatory in order to receive obsolete industries from advanced countries. The caution being made by Prof. Torii is that there is a negative symptom of synchronization of industries in the world economy. We would end up producing everything that we need at tremendous cost. In the case of agriculture, maybe there is this problem of synchronization and little move towards liberalization. But in the case of industries, there is a stronger tendency for shifts to take place based on comparative advantage.

So, the point I want to make here is that the shift of industries from developed countries not only bring investments but at the same time it also absorbs labors. So, this would take care of the issue raised by Indonesia, where employment has to come as the top priority in terms of HRD. So, the movement of obsolete industries to Indonesia, for example, should create as much employment as possible. So, it's labor-intensive instead of being capital-intensive. So, apart from labor absorption it should also take into account of whatever resources available in that country.

And finally, another conclusion was made. That is the need to develop some kind of network of information between countries of ASEAN as well as its dialogue partners. A network of information that facilitates understanding of what institution that facilitates understanding of what institution is available, what kind of curriculum is being taught in those institutions, etc. so, in the process, we would end up in knowing exactly what are the assets and the weaknesses available in these countries. And with that kind of information we should be able to embark upon the several HRD programs that I just mentioned now.

8. 2. SESSION B

The Desirable Way of Cooperation between Public
and Private Sectors in Human Resources Development

8.2. Session B:

8.2.1. Lead off Speech

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

by Mr. Koh Yoshino
Japan Federation of
Employers' Associations

1. The theme of my presentation this morning is "Human Resources Development in the Private Sector." I would like to explain briefly the situation in Japan, taking into account the purpose of the discussion in this sub-committee, which concerns cooperation between the public and private sectors.

2. In my presentation, I shall limit the scope of "the public sector" to government and the scope of "the private sector" to private enterprises.

Private enterprises are social institutions which aim to increase values by organically combining human, financial, material and information resources. However, characteristics of the behavior of private enterprises or companies differ even among market economy countries.

In discussing human resources development in Japan, I will touch on some characteristics of employment practices. Graduation from school takes place in March, but roughly six months beforehand, private companies hold recruitment examinations for students due to graduate. They tentatively decide whom to employ, and upon graduation sign employment contracts with the new recruits. This is the main method by which private companies hire people,

although they recruit others from the labor market from time to time as necessary.

This practice is feasible because there is a tacit understanding that companies will not dismiss employees and that employees will not resign except under special circumstances. There are no legal requirements, however, for employers or employees to abide by this understanding.

Because of such practices, companies need to use their employees effectively over a long period while employees constantly need to prepare themselves for promotion to higher positions by acquiring experience in different types of work within the company.

In other words, such employment practices call for constant development of the abilities of employees to assure the survival and development of the company.

Companies have various schemes to educate their employees. Some large enterprises have established education departments. Others have education sections within the personnel department. Ideally, education should be given to all employees although it is sometimes provided only selectively. It may be appropriate to add here that the main methods of employee education are on-the-job training and self-development.

Interest in the effective use of human resources within companies has grown recently in the U.S. and Europe. The OECD now uses the terms "the external labor market" and "the internal labor market." These reflect the division of recruitment into two categories, one that depends upon the labor market outside the company and one that depends upon recruitment from within the company.

3. Let me now take up vocational training in the narrower sense of the word, that is, the training of skilled workers.

As the above explanation shows, skilled workers in Japan are in principle trained within the company. In the case of medium- and small-scale enterprises, however, companies may have to entrust their training to outside organizations. This is because medium- and small-scale enterprises, the later in particular, may lack the facilities and personnel for technical training.

In this connection, I would like to briefly explain the Vocational Training Act of 1969.

The purpose of the law is to develop and improve the vocational ability of workers by providing them with skills and knowledge, and thus to contribute to the development of society as a whole. For that purpose the government has undertaken the following:

- (1) It has established various types of prefectural vocational training schools, which now total 386.
- (2) It subsidizes vocational training within companies when it is conducted in accordance with the standards established by the government.
- (3) It provides financial incentives to medium- and small-scale enterprises that allow their employees to receive vocational training.

4. This is a brief outline of human resources development in Japanese companies. For a clearer understanding of the system, I would now like to compare Japan with West Germany, which passed its Federal Vocational Training Act in 1969.

The purpose of the law is to obtain a uniform standard of vocational training in recognized types of occupation for young people under the age of 18.

The responsibility for providing technical training lies with the Chambers of Industry and Commerce, the Chambers of Trade, the Chambers of Agriculture and the Chambers of the professions while the actual training is

entrusted to enterprises under contract. Along with on-the-job training, youths are required to take theoretical training courses at vocational training schools or other authorized schools within companies. During the training period, an allowance stipulated in the collective agreement is paid by the company.

At present there are more than 500 kinds of curricula, and the training period is usually three years. Upon completion of the course, the final examination conducted by the Chambers must be taken. A certificate is issued to candidates who pass, and they are treated as skilled workers anywhere in West Germany.

5. The German system is also practiced in Austria and Switzerland, and may therefore be described as the system common to the German-speaking nations in Europe. In comparison, the Japanese system appears to place the initiative for vocational training in the hands of private companies with the government playing a supplementary role.

The difference stems from variations in employment practices, which in turn influence the wage system, personnel management and labor relations, and therefore the organization of training.

May I add that the level of education in Japan is generally high. Almost no one seeks employment at the end of compulsory education (9 years), and almost all receive at least 12 years of formal education.

How to deal with the relationship between formal school education and company requirements is in itself an important issue but this is to be treated separately. So I conclude my report here.

Thank you.

* * *

Now, I would like to add some short comments. (They are summarized as follows:)

- (1) The term Human Resources Development, and the Japanese equivalent, "Hitozukuri," have some conceptual gap.
- (2) Based on my experience, I have not seen much cooperation between the two sectors in HRD. However, in the area of vocational training, I can name an example for such cooperation: i.e. the Japan Productivity Center, which was established in 1955 and it was MITI who took the initiative in its establishment.
- (3) There was also something unclear about the term "public sector", here, I have taken public sector as the government.
- (4) Also the term private sector is a very wide term. For example, the self-employed people, or the agricultural sector, should they be considered as private sector? In my presentation I have taken private sector as private enterprises, particularly larger major corporations which are well organized.
- (5) "Private enterprises are social institutions", and I have used this particular definition in explaining the private enterprises.

In other words, I think private enterprises cannot simply be defined as institutions which aim at profit-making.

To give you the reason, if such a large corporation became bankrupt, this would have a disfavorable effect to the society and in such a case, most governments would consider subsidizing the corporation.

- (6) In Japan, companies are considered to be very long-term entities. For such companies to stay viable into long term, they make every year an estimation of employees required in 10 year's time, and you can imagine the difficulty involved in this task.

Such employment practice calls for constant development of the abilities

of employees to assure the existence and development of the company. If we compare the workers in Japan with those in the United States or Europe workers in Japan are less job conscious and more employment conscious.

- (7) Concerning the terms "the external labor market" and "the internal labor market", the Japanese practice of internal labor market has been well taken in such an important forum as OECD.
- (8) In order to compare the Japanese method, I had cited the vocational training in West Germany. The reason why I explain the system in West Germany is that it is typical of European countries. When you consider the development of training methods for your country, you can have a wider selection, ranging from the Japanese to be European system.
- (9) The term skilled worker used in Europe and skilled labor in Japan are different. In Europe, a skilled worker is a worker who has gone through a process of certain stipulated training course. If you have not taken this training course but have gone straight to the factory, then you become proficient worker, but never a skilled worker. On the other hand, in Japan, the worker is called skilled worker.
- (10) The Japanese personnel management is entirely different from that of Great Britain, for example. The personnel department in the British factory continuously recruits new workers, while that of a Japanese factory plays a major role in the training and placement of existing employees and they have to rotate the existing personnel, which is not an easy task.
- (11) As a result of the recent economic success of Japan the eyes of the world are now focussed on the Japanese management system. However, my opinion is that the Japanese system has also several problem.

8.2.2. Presentation by Indonesia

COOPERATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND
PRIVATE SECTOR IN HUMAN RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT IN INDONESIA

by Dr. Prijono Tjiptoherijanto
University of Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

During the Fourth Five Year Development plan (Repelita IV. 1984/85-1988/89), the number of Indonesian labor force will be estimated to grow into 9.3 millions, while with the same degree of employment absorption (elasticities) in the previous five years, the economic growth during the period will be estimated to absorb only 6.1 millions. Job creation programs, therefore, will become an urgent top priority to be implemented. The implementation of an appropriate responsive manpower planning mechanism has gained wide support and acceptance among Indonesian public as well as private institutions.

One logical consequence of job creation programmes is the expansion of vocational and skill training.

Besides the needs to establish appropriate manpower planning, to increase the productivity of Indonesian workers is one of the major problems. Among the Government officials, industrial managers and scholars, it is generally admitted through their careful observations that the productivity of Indonesian labor is relatively low as compared with that in other nations in Southeast Asia. In many cases, it may be caused by the reasons; deficiencies in health and nutrition, skills, workers motivation and discipline,

occupational safety and health, and better management practised. Improvement in the productivity will become the major issue to be given special attention during the Repelita IV. In this respect, the cooperation between the Government and private sectors is keenly desired to overcome these existing problems.

CURRENT PROBLEMS

There have been important achievements in the various fields of labor education in relation to the problems in manpower as well as employment. One of them is on the educational background of the Indonesian laborers. The recent statistics show the decreasing number of workers who have received no formal education at all.

In 1971, 17.6 million workers (42.7% out of all labor force at the time) had received no schooling. While in 1980, both the number of workers without schooling and its percentage to the total Indonesian labor force decreased; 15.3 million or 28.6% respectively.

On the other hand, the number of laborers who attained certain levels of education increased, particularly the number of those who obtained the education in general senior high schools (SLAU, increased 10.4% annually), vocational senior high schools (SLAK, increased 13.6% annually), academy/colleges (increased 7.4% annually) and universities (increased 7.8% annually). The progress in the educational background, during the period between 1971-1980, might be the results of economic development for the period which required the labor force particularly with the education in senior high school, academy and university. The above rates of growth were as high as economic growth for the period, or exceeding at some levels of educational background. During Indonesian development the more qualified workers are required, particularly the professional skilled workers and administrators in

various fields. About 50% new graduates of vocational senior high schools, academy and universities obtained jobs in these two fields.

Because of the increasing demands for various professionals and skilled workers, among managerial as well as production workers in various fields such as services, manufacturing, transportation and others, the lack of qualified laborers occurs in both the Government and private sectors.

In relation to the employment opportunity and education, the skills and the interests of manpower do not often fit to the existing employment opportunity. Or sometimes the locations of employment make the laborers less interested in the jobs. The conditions bring about the unemployment among the educated workers, though such tendency decreased during the period between 1971-1980. In 1971, 172,800 among the totally unemployed labor force had education in senior high school or the upper levels. In 1980, about 164,700 among the unemployed were educated in senior high schools and the upper levels. The unemployment among those with such education decreased from the rate of 4.8% in 1971 to 4.5% in 1980.

The lack of qualified laborers, particularly in private sectors, causes serious problems for long-run. Because of the problem, the process of transfer of technology takes longer.

PRESENT POLICIES

1. General policies

Increasing productivity of workers through training as well as developing entrepreneurship is the central objective of the Indonesian Government to achieve rapid economic development. The purposes of training for future development are to urge the growth of work ethics which increases motivations, creativity, desires to make efforts by oneself, and further to achieve disciplined as well as efficient labor force.

To achieve the above purposes, the programs of training are designed to produce manpower in management, production, marketing, agriculture, administration and clerical works, and services. Various training programs are provided by the Government as well as private sectors. By the participation of society to pursue the programs, particularly by the private business sectors who can afford such training, may decrease the financial burden of the Indonesian Government.

The training programs to improve managerial skills in enterprises are also developed. Other activities such as in-service training as well as off-the-job training are encouraged and developed. In connection with these activities, the special incentives are offered to the companies which promote training of their employees.

2. Policies for the Youth

To support the development of business sectors and to increase good job opportunities for the youth, the vocational training programs are intended to be promoted. With these purposes, the politechnical schools are developed to produce the skilled manpower who will be able to create own jobs after one- or two-year work experiences upon graduate. Another program is designed to produce graduates who will be ready to work to fulfill the demands of entrepreneurs after two- or three-month work experiences.

3. Policies for Private sector

To supplement the limited number of technical and operational workers, the capacities of private training courses are improved. The kinds of private training courses whose quality is improved are those relating to the fields of automotive/diesel, repair of TV set/radio and clerical works. Besides these, guidance is given to the instructors who conduct the training programs for the

employees at private companies are kept to give adequate government supports and guidance so that their employees are able to increase their productivity.

While to supplement the managerial manpower which has been scarce, the private educational development programs which produce MBA degree holders will be continuously supported. At present three private institutes which conduct such education exist, those are

IPMI (Indonesian Institute for Managerial Development),

IMPM (Prasetya Mulia's Management Institute) and

LPPM (Institute for Management Training and Development).

These three private educational institutes receive technical assistance from abroad. The first two institutes cooperate with Harvard University, while the other receives assistance from USAID.

On the other hand, several universities also provide educational as well as training programs for the company's employees. The Management Institute of FEUI has various training programs. Extension programs of FEUI also provide individual opportunities to workers to improve their expertise, and further they are able to obtain degrees in management and accounting.

THE PANCASILA INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Indonesian Government seeks the principles of ideal labor relations among the national philosophy of Pancasila or the Five Principles. Pancasila has been the national guidance to Indonesian nation as enunciated in the preamble of the 1945 Constitution.

The five principles of Pancasila say as follows:

1. Belief in the One Supreme God
2. Belief in just and civilized humanity
3. Nationalism

4. Democracy, and
5. Social Justice

The formulation and the application of Pancasila philosophy are based on the Indonesian values of mutual co-operation (gotong royong), deliberation towards unanimous agreement (musyawarah), and harmony (serasi).

According to the Pancasila Industrial Relations, Indonesian workers should have:

- (a) a sense of belonging
- (b) a sense of responsibility, and
- (c) a sense of self-correction and self-improvement.

Thus they also emphasize the traditional Indonesian value of harmony.

The Government, workers, and employers are expected to work together harmoniously to achieve the ultimate goals of national development, social justice, and the equitable share of economic development to all the nationals in conformity with their function and performance.

The concepts of tripartitism among the Government, workers and the management in the Pancasila Industrial Relations are important because it is expected to smoothen the conflicting interests among the three parties. Collective labor agreements are considered to become the means to promote the senses of co-ownership and co-responsibility that play principal roles in the Pancasila philosophy. In principle, strikes and lock-outs have no place in the harmonious co-operation of Pancasila Industrial Relations.

CONCLUSION

To raise the living standard and the level of knowledge among the entire Indonesian people is the prime efforts of the development programmes. Furthermore continuous efforts have been made to strive for more equal and just distributions of income and welfare for the whole population.

Raising employment opportunities, increasing productivity as well as its enhancement, will become the most important aspects of development in the Fourth Five Year Development Plan (Repelita IV). It is the biggest challenge to the Government.

Implementing the Pancasila Industrial Relations through the establishment of collective labor agreements for all companies is an extremely important to promote stable relationship between employees and employers as well as to increase the productivity of workers.

In this respect, the acceptance of the Pancasila Industrial Relations among private sectors is necessary to future national development; if cannot be said, is a must.

8.2.3. Comments and Discussions

CHAIRMAN:

Before opening free discussions, I am aware of three other participants who have papers to present. They are Mr. Sallehuddin from Malaysia and Mr. Hiraga from Japan, and Dr. Prijono from Indonesia. Perhaps we could start with Mr. Sallehuddin.

SALLEHUDDIN:

My presentation is essentially what Malaysia views in terms of the coordination of public and private sectors. I am pretty aware of the fact that in yesterday session and also this morning's session, especially from the paper given by Mr. Yoshino, there is a very strong emphasis on the Japanese economy, about the role of the private sector in terms of training in Human Resources Development. In fact, there was somebody yesterday who argued that there should not be any intervention by the public sector as far as training is concerned.

The first part of my paper essentially goes into the historical development of manpower training in Malaysia. In the Malaysian scenario, the early phase of national development, especially the period between '60 and '75 was one of the periods which was characterized by the government playing a leading role in its effort to build up a strong and efficient public service to take over from the British. Therefore, during that period, there was certainly the government input in terms of human resources development and this was done to various schemes such as the Colombo Plan and most of the training at that period was done in the Commonwealth countries, in Britain, Australia and New Zealand. But, now the emphasis has changed and we have even got Malaysian trainees all over the world - in Japan, in Europe and the United States.

The early period of '60 to '75 also saw the establishment of various HRD institutions in our country. For example, the establishment of University of Malaya in 1959, which was actually an extension of University of Malaya in Singapore which was established after the war in 1949. Then, there was the setting up of the National University, there was the setting up of the MARA Institute of Technology, and also the National Institute of Public Administration, and I am proud to say that some of these Institutions have become centers of excellence where not only participants from Malaysia but

Institution like the National Institute of Public Administration, for example, have trainees from all over Asia, as well as from other developing countries.

There were some amount of private sector input in terms of training in the early phase of our national development period. - I am referring to '60 to '75 - but that was the training given merely in terms of the firms' profit-making interest rather than in the national interest. This was understandable, of course, because at that point of time in the history of our national development, the ownership and equity and the objectives of the industries were still controlled and managed by foreigners. Public sector/private sector coordination then was very minimal.

Although it is desirable for public and private sector cooperation in the area of HRD it must be with certain qualifications. Malaysia does not subscribe to the thesis that public and private sectors must cooperate at all costs. The choice of whether to have public and private sector cooperation in the area of human resources development has to be viewed in terms of practicability, efficiency, economy and experience, both from political as well as administrative angles and also other socially related forces, things like culture and some have argued in Malaysia, even religion.

In other words, it has to be looked into from the merit of each case, as well as from the point of view of the national interest and therefore I think there has to be some amount of trade off whether one pursues a strategy of purely private sector or purely public sector, or combination of both.

From Malaysian prospective, there are merits of having closer cooperation - firstly, cooperation between public and private sectors is in conformity with our newly announced concept of Malaysian Incorporated where private sector will have to play a more important and active role in the process of economic development and nation building. This is consciously done in Malaysia, not only from the view point of reducing the government's budget deficit but more importantly not to install into Malaysians the danger of subsidy mentality and over-dependence on the government sector.

Private sector's role in HRD has become more vital in Malaysia of late, taking into account the government's budgetary limitations in the face of unstable world commodity prices which characterizes the present international economic scene and to Malaysia this is a great problem in a sense that the amount of money that the Government can channel into training is becoming less and less. So, this is one question that Malaysia is now trying to resolve and

I hope the result of this Symposium could be of some use to us in terms of solving the problem.

There are, on the other hand, mitigating circumstances which may limit government's liberal approach to public and private sector cooperation in Human Resources Development. In the first instance, there are sectors such as Defence, Security, Cultural Development and others which, by their very nature, inhibit private sector participation.

In the Malaysian scene, there are again certain HRD activities which necessarily have to be borne by the government at least in the next 5 to 10 years in terms of meeting the targets and the objectives of the new economic policy.

Public sector/private sector cooperation in the HRD is also limited due to the mismatching of public and private sector objectives. Thus, the criteria of selectivity is of utmost importance in planning and managing public and private sector cooperation in Human Resources Development and this problem becomes much more acute on a multilateral plan such as the ASEAN-Pacific Co-operation in Human Resources Development.

Despite the limitations that I have dealt with above, we in Malaysia have experienced a reasonably successful cooperation between the private and the public sectors in HRD, especially in the last 10 years or so. This cooperation is indeed real when one looks at the planning and the management and also the courses undertaken in HRD programs in the Malaysian National Institutions such as the Malaysian Institute of Management, the Malaysian Export Centre, and the National Productivity Centre. These cooperations will continue to develop as the private sector becomes more involved in the process of national economic development.

Presently, in Malaysia, there is no coordinating institution to manage this cooperation and it is only natural, in the not too distant future, I think, that a Malaysian Institution will be set up to establish the coordinating of this function.

There is another method that I would like to discuss in my presentation and that is the problem faced by Malaysia in terms of Human Resources Development training. This is the problem of pinching well-trained professionals from the public sector into the private sector. In fact, there was a stipulation recently came out of our Public Service Department because the flow of well-trained and experienced people from the public sector to the private sector has been on the increase especially as Malaysia becomes more

privatized. The offers and perks that are given by the private sector are substantial and it becomes a problem to us in Malaysia, so one of the ways and means of the Government to stop that sort of outflow, which to me can be healthy, is to put on various regulations and of late. One of them, for example, is, if you have served in the government, and have taken a housing loan from the government, which is very low, subsidizing about 4% in the Malaysian market, and then if you go later into the private sector, you have to pay back the loan to the government based on the interest on the market value.

With this little note I will end my presentation and perhaps we could talk more details later in the Session for question time.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Sallehuddin. Well, I will call on Mr. Hiraga of Ministry of Labor next for his report.

HIRAGA:

What I would like to present is in relation to the paper presented by Mr. Yoshino. There are three points in my remarks:

The first point is the inevitable question of education. At present, all the people have 9-year period of compulsory education and 90% of these people further receive 3 years of senior high school education, which makes majority of Japanese people have 12 years of high level of education. In addition, 30% go to 4-year university level. Therefore, the firmly established educational system, as Mr. Yoshino emphasized, serves as the basis for the in-house training or on-the-job training. The new recruits have no experience upon graduation from schools. Enterprises conduct planned training to those new recruits and within a short period of time they can become effective work force. I think this is made possible because of the firm bases of education. We have witnessed the technological sophistication and structural change of industry and again, thanks to the solid educational base, workers can easily adapt themselves to the new production processes. At the moment, there is a very serious discussion going on in Japan on the question of how to improve the educational system. We have a special ad hoc council for that purpose.

Well, there may be many problems. However, it is also a fact that we have a very high level of education firmly established which in turn serves as

accumulate those efforts it will not only be conducive to development of your enterprises. It will eventually result in the socio-economic development at the nation. I think every enterprise should be fully cognizant of this fact and appropriate measures should be taken.

It seems that in the ASEAN and Pacific countries, the Human Resources Development is needed in parallel, or sometimes even prior to the industrial development. At that stage, the government must perhaps play a greater role. Taking into considerations of this reality, we, the Ministry of Labor, are of the opinion that we would like to extend as much cooperation as possible for the establishment and management of public vocational training centres and for the promotion of manpower development policy.

In response to the enlarged cooperation efforts by Japan on the training of skilled workers in private sectors, we have a newly created organization called Overseas Vocational Training Association(OVTA), since fiscal year 1984. We would like to respond to the diversified needs of the recipient countries through these channels established.

HRD in Asian countries are very important. I would like to see the further promotion of HRD by private and public efforts so that the further foundation for the future prosperity would be solidified. Wishing that, I would like to conclude my comment.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, Dr. Hiraga. Dr. Prijono, please.

PRIJONO:

(He presented the prepared paper which is compiled in this report in 8.2.2.)

CHAIRMAN:

I have two more participants who so far expressed wish to speak in this Session, Mr. Mendoza and Mr. Karu.

MENDOZA:

I would take off from the last sentence of Mr. Sallehuddin which says: "at present, in Malaysia, there is no coordinating institution to manage this cooperation and it is only natural in the not too distant future that some institution to take over this function will have to be established." I would

a firm foundation toward the good adaptability of the work force to the changing production environments. This is my first point.

My second point is the role played by the public sector which is needed for the Human Resources Development in the industry.

As Mr. Yoshino mentioned, the framework should be built by public sector or, in Mr. Yoshino's words, the Government. But in the industry, the private companies are playing a very important role in HRD through the on-the-job training, and this Human Resources Development within the company is closely connected with the traditional employment practice in Japan. As Mr. Yoshino mentioned, the practice of on-the-job training is different, depending on the size of companies, and there is also a need for the retraining of the unemployed for re-employment. In right of these circumstances, the Labor Ministry, is providing, at our public training institutions, training for the unemployed as well as the engineers and technicians demanded by small and medium scale industries in a particular region. We also give subsidies toward the on-the-job training conducted by medium and small size enterprises. In addition, we maintain the certifying system in which skill certification is given to the trainees and we also have a system of giving award of merit to excellent skilled workers in order to brew, so to say, the atmosphere where skill is regarded important.

We are now suggesting the revision of the Vocational Training Law of 1969 at the Diet. According to this revision, the name of the Law would be changed to the "Law concerning development and promotion of vocational capability" and the main objective of this Law will be to enhance the training capability in the private sector. When it comes to the training by the public sector, it will only play a supplementary role to the private sector.

We are witnessing the aging of the Japanese society. Responding to the need of the time we will have a full cooperation of private and public sectors for the development of lifelong lasting qualifications of the workers.

The third point is my view regarding the Human Resources Development or Manpower Development in the Asian and Pacific countries. Reflecting the experiences of Japan, I would say that every country should establish the system which is appropriate to their needs. On-the-job training within the company must take into considerations the difference in employment practices and so forth. You cannot directly transplate the Japanese system into your own country. However, it is a very important fact that you should conduct the education, training and manpower development of employees. And if you

like to talk to that point and to emphasize what, in my opinion, is very important - the danger of the government trying to overmanage this area of Human Resources Development - the value of giving the private sectors freedom to be able to respond to the marketplace. Perhaps I should start my talk with looking a little bit at the Philippine situation.

First of all, I think one is to realize that in our context education is done, not only by the public sector but also by the private sector.

In effect, we have, we might say, divided task of education between the government which takes care of the lower level of education and the private sector which takes care of upper level education and even postgraduate education. At this point, I would like to give as an example to illustrate the point I am making, the institution that I am connected with which is the Asian Institute of Management.

The Asian Institute of Management is a graduate school of management. It was founded in 1968 by two private Philippine universities, non-profit, and with the help of the Harvard Business School. We went to the business community and asked for their support and they gave us land, buildings and funds to set up the Institution. We went to the government and very wisely our government gave us the authority to operate, in effect sanctioned our existence. But at the same time they set us free to seek the needs of the market of Asia. The only condition they made was that we should get an Asian Board of Governors to determine our directions.

Since our founding in 1968, we have had more than 2,000 who have graduated from the MBA from the Masters program and about 5/6,000 executives who have gone through our Executive Development Programs. About half of them have come from outside the Philippines.

Now, because the government was wise enough to set us free, we have been able to determine for ourselves what was important for an Asian Management School. So we have gone into rural development management or into quite a lot of research and small and medium-scale businesses. Furthermore, we have worked closely not only with the private sector, but in Malaysia, for example, we have run courses for MARA or worked with Saba Foundation, and in Indonesia we worked with the Bank Management Institute.

We have gone in directions that have been indicated to us by the market as important and we would like to think, we have, during the 17 years we have been in existence, been able to help to alleviate some of our management development problems.

Let me go very quickly therefore to the conclusion that I reach. I feel that the role of the government should be to set general directions in the field of Human Resources Development. Its role also is to make it easy for the private sector to do its own thing. To follow the market, and to respond to the needs of the market.

We talked here about the difficulty of educational institutions in holding its faculty. Part of this is because of the civil service ceilings that are set on salaries and emoluments. If we allow the private sector to do it, then it needs not be bound by the multitudinous requirements of the government and the multitudinous constraints that the government operates under.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Mendoza. Mr. Karu.

KARU:

I am a member of a private sector organization, Japan Committee for Economic Development, and for a long time I have been involved with the promotion of economic cooperation. The private and public sectors should cooperate to promote the Human Resources Development and I think there are more areas in the future where cooperation is necessary and possible. The private sector has certain initiatives and there will be many areas where private sector will have stronger initiative to start.

Actually, there are four programs that my organization would like to promote and I would like to introduce to you those four projects.

As an illustration of the private sector initiative, our organization, Japan Committee for Economic Development, so far has been involved in expanding investments from Japan to Southeast and Asian countries and we have been also involved with the facilitation of the management of the cooperation in these countries. Particular questions were the transfer of technology and human resources development. These are the areas in our view where our efforts should be concentrated.

The first program is the management exchange program. Through the 1970s, we regarded that Southeast and Asian countries developed rapidly and many innovative young managers came into being. We realize that and these young managers would like to improve their sensitivity in the management, and in order to facilitate improving their capabilities as managers they would like

to see further extended inter-change with the developed countries. Therefore, the private economic organizations got together and we have provided a forum where the Japanese management and the Southeast and Asian management could exchange their views in an extended and expanded way so we could invite these managers to Japan or vice versa. Now, this is the program that we are envisaging.

The second program aims at expanding the technology transfer in the private sector. In our judgement, particularly of recent, in the Southeast and Asian countries, the managers would like to have various kinds of technical information, that is of recent trend. They would like to establish joint venture with the Japanese companies. While many large corporations of Japan are recently making their investments to the Asian countries, if you turn to small and medium-sized enterprises, there are still lot of opportunities of investments from Japan to these countries.

If you look at the medium and small-scale industries, there is a company in the Philippines where they manufacture special kind of footwear. The company of a medium scale closed down its factories in Japan and went to the Philippines. They now bring all the footwear produced in the Philippines to the Japanese market. So, if an arrangement can be made in this regard, it will have great contribution in rectifying the trade imbalances. Also, to name some other examples, there is a company producing furniture in the Philippines, a meatball producing foodstuff company in Thailand, a company which deals with the medical herbs or a project on tinned bamboo shoots in Indonesia. The large Japanese companies may invest and they produce in local countries and they export to the third country or they would like to sell to the recipient country. But in the case of small and medium scale enterprises, they bring all the products back to Japan. This is one characteristic.

Another characteristic is that the industry category is the labor-intensive area, I think this is an area where we should place a lot of attention in the future.

How can we expand such a business interchange, as I have introduced? When we made the survey of these companies we realized that the most difficult point for these enterprises was the preparatory process before actually starting the operation. For example, they approached the farmers in the host countries, they talked about the bamboo shoots, how they caught fish, and how the fish should have been transported and so forth. So, the transfer of technology in this regard was very difficult and important. In Japan, the

medium and small-sized enterprises have many incentives and I think there are many conditions conducive to promoting their investments. And also in the host country side, there are many systems for facilitating investments but this area is something that private joint venture is planned and the operation itself is run by private sector. These enterprises are small and medium size, therefore the cost of transfer of technology is very prohibitive.

The idea is good and both sides want it but sometimes the conditions are so difficult that they cannot materialize in the form of actual operation. There are many cases of this failure. Therefore, with the private initiative, JICA, other public organizations, financial institutions, etc. can come to the whole picture so that the medium and small-scale industries investment can be promoted to the Asian countries and the liaison and the coordination between the interested parties could be improved, and, of course, private sector will participate and we will financially cooperate and such project could be promoted.

The third program, is in connection with the second program that is introduced. That is the creation of the Technical Information Centre, especially in view of the ASEAN countries. These Centres can be created in ASEAN countries and people could be dispatched from private sectors and the financial burden can be, to a certain extent, met by the private sector but mainly by JETRO, Japanese Embassy and JICA; they have to cooperate in this endeavor. The local technical information may be collected at the local centre and the Japanese private sector can create a receiving body where the Asian technical information may be collected.

What we are aiming at in this connection is as follows:

The Asian management would like to have further exchange with the Japanese management. They would like to have expanded access in terms of technology. We would like to facilitate and smooth this technology flow between Japan and the ASEAN countries. The type of technology does not have to be sophisticated high technology, for example, how to produce a special kind of sweetened soy beans, or sweetened beans.

The fourth area is the field of general education.

The middle school and high school level teachers can be exchanged. With the United States we have a private foundation for the exchange and it does the exchange of civics teachers or social studies teachers. So, such exchange could be introduced vis-a-vis ASEAN countries. In this way, we can have the full grasp of the ASEAN scene as well as the other developing countries.

I am sorry my presentation became so lengthy but we would like to promote the above mentioned four programs .

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Karu. Mr. Nishikiori?

NISHIKIORI:

I have a broad understanding of HRD and I would like to state my experience and comments based on the perspective of the small and medium enterprises, because I am a member of National Federation of Small Business Associations.

The agricultural and forestry business in Japan numbers 6.23 million as of 1981, as of which 99.4% is occupied by small and medium enterprises. Also, amongst the number of workers, 81.4% work in small or medium businesses. The share of small businesses occupies 51.2% amongst the manufacturing industry and 61.5% for wholesale industry, and 79.2% for retail industry. So, the small and medium size enterprises are playing a major role in the Japanese economy. The definition of small businesses at the moment is for the manufacturing, transportation and construction industries - those companies with less than 300 employees. The wholesale industry, less than 100 and for retail services less than 50 employees.

If we look at the bottleneck of management to small businesses which are enumerated in International Small Business Survey, announced in Holland in October last year, as a common problem to the 11 countries to the 5 Continents, including Japan and Indonesia, are those with such problems as inflation, economic slow-down and financial interest rate and government regulations in competition with major companies.

To assure the supply of human resources is also enumerated as a problem. Of course, to assure the supply of human resources is not synonym to the training of human resources, but in Japan, traditionally speaking, the companies are responsible for conducting on-the-job training and off-the-job training for their employees. So, I believe they are rather more of a synonym in the Japanese environment.

The objectives pursued by Japanese small businesses are technology, information and human resources as pointed out in the this year's White Paper on Small Enterprises. However, according to the same Paper the actual situation is quite different: those companies who do not conduct training and

education are 40.5% amongst small businesses while only 3.5% for the major companies.

In Japan, in order to assist the human resources development in small businesses, both government and private sector are promoting various measures. For example, our Federation has been organized for the purpose of meeting various problems encountered by small businesses. We have a self-help objective but the government is also extending guidance and assistance.

Since medium- and small-scale enterprises have a small management scale and since their management foundation is vulnerable, they must get together and modernize and rationalize jointly so as to enhance their competitiveness. More specifically, by reducing cost through joint undertakings in production processing, purchases and sales, and by quality improvement and expansion of sales outlet, they can achieve this objective. Education and information dissemination is also one of the efforts. As a major grouping of the organizations, one can name cooperative associations and commerce and industry trade associations. At a lower level of the grouping, one finds trade associations, regional industry associations, sub-contractors associations, industrial estate associations, volunteer chain associations and commercial district associations.

The human resources development activities of such associations encompass longer than one year programs as well as those of one day or few days. Their content is also very diverse, ranging from basic training to modern subjects.

If we classify by the clientals, there are courses catered for managers down to those for the newly employed.

Since small enterprises are by definition very small in scale but their number is very large. Consequently, it is rather difficult to grasp actual status of such small enterprises. It is therefore very advantageous to form these organizations from the point of view of knowing their status or of propagating government policies and measures. Some of them may function as a pressure group and this may sometimes may cause difficulties to the government. But there is a tendency among the politicians to welcome such an aspect.

Let me give you some concrete examples. One is the Osaka Men's Wear Industry Trade Association. They are very enthusiastic in developing personnel. They have a school, Osaka Men's Wear School, which is authorized as Vocational Training School and offers various courses. The school trains

about 500 people annually. They also have designers clubs where they conduct information exchange, joint studies, and study meetings on human engineering.

Next, I would like to show you a case in which such HRD activities are carried out in cooperation with large enterprises. The Kawasaki-Gifu Cooperative Association is composed of sub-contractors of Kawasaki Heavy Industries. This association has a training centre where they carry out plant training on new technologies or new skills. The instructors as well as technical information are provided by the parent company, the Kawasaki Heavy Industries.

Another example would be an association organized by automobile mechanics enterprises. They have a training centre in each prefecture and they have mechanics courses for the newly employed as well as for the experienced workers.

In some cases, the government subsidies or support is given to them. Since 65% of manufacturers in Japan are engaged in sub-contractor activities, we should not ignore the technology transfer from the large enterprises into such subcontractors. Of course, as a pre-requisite the small enterprises must carry out their own social responsibilities through their own efforts.

CHAIRMAN:

I think we have an hour and a half for further discussion. I had promised Dr. Chira that he could be the first speaker.

CHIRA:

I would like to suggest a few things that I guess would be an important frame of reference in terms of HRD.

First, when we talk about training, we have to be, very careful about what we mean by that, because training and education has been interchangingly used without too much of the distinct definition. I have suggested yesterday that human resources development is a long period of development. And I think, in the world of technological change, some of the investment in education during our school time, or during our university time, could be obsolete given the new technological change, especially in the working life of any society as long as perhaps 40 years. So, it seems to me the training is a good system but not only from supply side that we want to train somebody but there must be a need for training, that fills the gaps of the society need, namely, the economic need. I think we ought to look at the efficiency of

training in terms of labor market conditions and I think that is very important.

Now, of course, it would be important, for each country later on to define training needs based on her economic and technological stage of development. I would say that in the case of the Pacific Cooperation, for example, Japan, your role in assisting us probably in high-tech training, using your technology, your experiences, but in the case of a country like Thailand, we still are an agricultural society. Of course, we can not just go into industrial training without looking at the basic fundamental foundation of our society. I think I could say that also for the Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia where agricultural employment is important and the new technology in improving agricultural productivity, this is very important.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the difficulty with training as component in our cooperation is definitely the different stage of development and I think each country in ASEAN must examine their country needs carefully. Of course, this is not a forum in which we examine that carefully but I hope that some of our colleagues from ASEAN would be able to generate a priority in which each country needs the most.

In terms of public and private sector cooperation, the word private and public sector cooperation is a very nice word. I think it generates a lot of constructive future for cooperation even within the country but the real question to ask, is whether you can effectively carry out public/private sector cooperation. Permit me to say that for the case of Thailand: until recently, Government and private sector seemed to stand on the opposite directions. Now, in the last 2 or 3 years, the philosophy of bringing private sector into the main stream of economic activity, I think in ASEAN in particular, has been very strong, and recently, at least in the case of Thailand, there is a government committee at the level of Prime Minister and they discuss the role of private and government sector all the time. But, unfortunately, as I said before in my paper, the private sector and government sector cooperation has been concentrated on the non-human resources development, such as tax policy or investment.

Of course, I can sympathize with the private sector because their objective is to make profit. There is no private sector who are making the objective of training people, except it pays for them to do it. In this connection I would like to suggest that the kind of different philosophies, I

think, our friend from Malaysia has been saying and that should be borne in mind.

And, secondly, the degree of private sector readiness to come in is different from the Japanese case. You have a whole long history of cooperation. MITI is a good example. Even though I agree that the government should not play a role, the readiness of private sector to play this role somewhat depends on the stage of development. If you want to carry on private sector/government sector cooperation, you have to understand the limitation of the readiness of private sector.

Now, thirdly, I think the government must play a catalytic role in this context. The Government can induce active incentives to allow for private to play the role of human resources planning or training. At the moment, if you look at the objective of tax policy, it is a revenue. Every time private sector wants to ask for some reduction in tax because training is an expenditure for tax reduction, the Finance Minister in Thailand probably does not understand it yet. So, I think in the context of overall economic strategy, all the key ministries must be in the game, not only the Labor Department. The government must understand that different incentives must be given to the private sector and I guess that requires a lot of efforts by the government at the moment.

And fourthly, I think our employment system is probably different from that of Japan. I can notice that by the views of the Japanese scholar as well as the speakers who have been saying that the so-called life-time employment in which the turnover rate in the labor market is less than 3%. In my country, the average is more than 10%. So, it does not pay for some firms, of course, to invest in training where they cannot recoup their profit.

Five: If we want to understand Japan, it is a good model, I accept that. But to use Japanese experience and applying it to the countries like ASEAN it is not very easy. Let me give you one example: In the case of Japan, your labor cost is not a variable cost, but it is a fixed cost, because of your retained earning has been accumulated in the past and being a country where you continue to export in the world market consistently for the last 20 years, you allow the ability to train people, keep them even at the time of recession. It makes the situation very very different from us. In the case of ASEAN, we are subject not only to the recession but subject to commodity prices: rubber, tin, rice - they fluctuate so much and that affects our economy very strongly.

I think about the future role of trainings and I want to reiterate that we believe that there is a role to play in cooperation, especially in training, but we must re-examine ourselves carefully. Don't jump to the kind of optimistic feelings that because Japan can do it, we can do it. I submit that we would like to learn and we very much appreciate the Japanese case which is a good case, including other Western countries, but we must know our own limitation, our structure of economy, our employment system, and if we understand that I think we can move ahead in a more systematic and realistic direction.

CHAIRMAN:

Well, I think we are in a fairly free-flowing discussion stage of the meeting now and I invite anybody who wishes to express some further views to do so.

LIM:

I would like to pick up the point made by Mr. Hiraga. He made a point that possibly the public sector must play a bigger role initially and this is the point where, from Brunei experience, I would like to illustrate his point.

Talking about Brunei, after listening to quite a lot of speakers, we are in a very different position. In a sense that the public sector dominates the whole economy in Brunei. The economy is dominated by the oil industry and the government itself is one of the biggest employer. We do not have many sort of big firms apart from Shell and they have on-the-job training for the local workers, and basically for their own people. Now, apart from that, we do not have any institutions or any training facilities provided by the private sector. So, most of the training is being provided by the government in a sense that we have trade school, we have an institute of technology and recently we have set up a mechanical institute for mechanical automation with Mitsubishi. So, here in Brunei the role of the government is not only vital but it is the only one. We cannot depend on the private sector because it is non-existent in that sense. So, I am only trying to make that particular point.

Also we are now working on a system where we use the turn-key sort of system of contract with the foreign firms coming in. In other words, once the project is completed we may even be asking some of the companies to retain

some of their people there for another 3 years in order to give us a chance to have the transfer of technology completed.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Lim. Mr. Sallehuddin.

SALLEHUDDIN:

This morning we have debated at great length about the pros and cons of private sector or public sector in terms of giving the support for HRD and I am sure that a consensus being evolved that there is certainly a place for the private sector to play an important role in this ASEAN-Pacific Co-operation and even at the meeting in Jakarta last January, one of the guiding principles of this ASEAN-Pacific Co-operation which I would like to quote here.

I am referring to Paragraph 11 of that Senior Officials' Meeting, Appendix C to that report and I quote "in formulating and implementing the program maximum use should be made of existing institutions including private sector entities" - I would like to stress this "private sector entities" particularly those based in ASEAN countries.

Now, I think in terms of recommendation in helping Prof. Hirono, to come up with something concrete from this meeting, I think we have to look at our deliberations both at this session and that session in conjunction with some of the decisions made at that Jakarta meeting. And as you all probably know, in terms of areas of HRD, at Jakarta meeting there was a consensus of agreement as to the area of HRD where we can zero-in, so to say, the one that I listed yesterday in my paper, and those are the areas of management on partnership, science, technology, agriculture, forestry, fisheries industry, transport and communication, trade and services, research and HRD planning. The other consensus that was arrived in Jakarta in terms of formulating this Pacific Co-operation which was mentioned in the policy direction paper, is to divide the program into what is called as "Immediate Action Program" and "Intermediate Programs."

Then, the other important decision at that Jakarta Meeting in terms of action measures, I would like to quote here: "ASEAN and Pacific Developed Countries welcome the identification and formulation of action programs as agreed for immediate implementation."

First, and this is very important: in terms of launching it, the program should start as soon as possible. After the 18th ASEAN Ministerial Meeting,

both Ministerial Conferences should be held in Kuala Lumpur in July 1985. So, given that framework I think we should explore here. We know for a fact that there is a consensus that there should be some public sector input into the program, maybe we should explore it in terms of what can be done, in terms of the intermediate, in terms of the immediate programs. We want to start this thing in accordance with the decisions made in Jakarta and also taking into account as a backdrop to making our decision here. Those areas of concentration that we have agreed upon in Jakarta.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Sallehuddin. Mr. Akita.

AKITA:

To this Symposium, as a participant from a purely private organization, I would like to share with you some of our experiences.

Matsushita Electric Company, which I belong has been supported and assisted by many people of ASEAN and Oceanian countries. You have patronized our company. We have 83 overseas companies as our company. Of them, 1/3 exists in Asia and Oceania. If you take up the production companies, 20 production facilities including joint ventures are in Asia and Oceania. In terms of the local employees, it exceeds 18,000 people and we have the Japanese Matsushita employees dispatched to these local facilities and there are more than 200 expatriates from Japanese Matsushita.

What I would like to emphasize, first of all, is in the education of local staffs. We are taking a very long term perspective. It was about 20 years since we started the opening up of companies in Asian countries. At the time when the company was very small, we already started the education of key persons and we took a very longlasting perspective and made a large scale investment on continuous basis.

As one method of doing that, local OJT is of course very important but we also invited those key people to Japan where they can learn and be trained. From Southeast Asian Countries in the past, on accumulated basis, more than 2,000 local people or, in other words, most of the managerial position people came to Japan in order to receive the training and education. Of course, this system is not without problems as so many of you have been discussing so far. Upon their return they sometimes quit their companies, but if you are fearful of that you can't make any advancement. To a certain extent, you should be

prepared of such cases. We don't fear this and we are continuing this type of training.

Fortunately, upon their return to their countries after their training in Japan, the rate of mobility is only 20%, the remaining 80% of people still remain within the company. So, I think the rate of remaining is very high in my judgement.

Now, what kind of things do they learn in Japan? In the beginning we tried to teach mainly production technique and technology in narrow sense of the word and skill, but recently it has changed its direction drastically and now they are learning more or less managerial studies. I can fully agree with this change in direction because when we say transfer of technology or skills, they are something which is dependent upon the good merit or demerit of the managerial capability. If managerial capability is good, technology will be viable.

In fact, management is not only concerning technology and know-how. The management of the company itself, in an exaggerated way, I would say, how you regard the human being. I think this is very important. In my company, we solicit the participation of the employees to the management of the company. I will give you one concrete example: the formulation of QC circles, or suggestion system, or there are many other group activities, through which the employees can participate in the running of the company. We would like to collect wisdom of the many. Management is something that cannot be done by the management itself. It has to have the involvement of all the people throughout the organization in the total activity, that is management of the company.

In foreign countries, when there is management activities, and technology transfer is conducted, behind the cultural perception difference, sometimes the total aspects or comprehensive aspects of the management recedes too much, in my opinion. For example, when you collect suggestions by means of QC circles, you may wish to suppress complaints and grievances while trying to absorb only the good suggestions well, you can't do that. You have to be prepared to turn your ears to the grievances and complaints from the employees and if your information is good, then that information has to be disseminated to the lowest echelon of the corporate structure. Otherwise, the total management of the company is not made possible. Corporate climate, or organizational climate has to be established. Otherwise, the superficial

technology transfer may be sought but it does not work smoothly. That is the result of experience of running many overseas plants and companies.

Thus, in Matsushita Electric Company, during the process of training the local managerial people, our major concern is to develop a right corporate climate. That is the target of our major efforts and toward that end we would like to transfer technology as much as possible. These are in our view the both sides of the coin.

Everything including monthly revenue and turnover and balance of the company is open and made clear to the employees so that they should be aware of the future program of the corporation. In other words, we exert all our efforts in converging the direction and orientation of the efforts of our employees. In so doing, sometimes there may be a mismatch between the Japanese employees and the local staff, but as long as there is a convergence of the basic orientation and direction, there is a ground for the dialogue; thus, if there is a problem, the solution is found rather easy.

To give you more specific examples, we have meetings together on production planning or if there is a party for celebrating the attainment of goal and targets, the local people and Japanese expatriates will get together and celebrate till late in the evening. Every activity incorporates all the employees and it has to be continuous and persevering.

In short, what I want to say can be summarized in the following way:

Good society needs good infrastructure to make that society good. For a private sector, infrastructure is the willingness of the employees, the work ethics and sense of responsibility of the employees. These are the infrastructure for the private enterprise. If such infrastructure does not exist, even sophisticated technology could be introduced but it won't develop for the tomorrow's development. It may be transferred but it stays there and it doesn't develop from that point onward. So, I hope that we continue to have your kind cooperation and assistance henceforward.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Akita. Do we have anybody else who wishes to speak at this moment? Yes, Prof. Prijono.

PRIJONO:

I would like to respond to Dr. Chira's submission in the training needs and also what have been discussed by our colleague from Malaysia, Mr. Sallehuddin.

If it is not so premature at this stage, I would like to propose that after the Symposium we could write a project proposal on Human Resources Development for the ASEAN and South Pacific region in one side and then may be our friends from industrialized countries can also write down something that they can offer to the developing world. In that sense we need to have some Centre to become a clearing house for that kind of activities. I don't know whether Japan will act as a clearing house or other countries will take part of this matter.

CHAIRMAN:

Well, I think we could keep that suggestion in mind as the discussion proceeds. Any other...? Yes, Prof. Hirono.

HIRONO:

We have been making some joint studies on different issues on the industrial cooperation between Japan and the ASEAN countries. Last year, we selected a topic on technology transfer and skill enhancement in ASEAN countries. And what I would like to present is a nutshell of the recommendations in Japanese Paper on this particular subject and let me read these recommendations because they are very short. (The recommendations are omitted here.)

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, Prof. Hirono. Any further comments? Yes, Dr. Chira.

CHIRA:

Just to respond briefly to Prof. Hirono's comment. Dr. Hirono just suggests an ambitious program on transfer of technology in which ASEAN and Japan in particular could reach an agreement in the future, but to me Human Resources Development is not the same thing as transfer of technology. There are some elements where they could fit together but I think our deliberation here is part of Dr. Hirono's comments. I appreciate that but I hope all the

audience in this room will understand that we all want to achieve 10% of what Dr. Hirono recommends. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sallehuddin.

SALLEHUDDIN:

I do take the point of Dr. Chira that what we do on that ASEAN-Japan joint research is something on a bigger scale than we are, but I think the point to recognize is that in terms of recognition of the areas that we could develop later on, in terms of HRD, coincides with the areas that were identified in Jakarta and the thinking of the Japanese officials and ASEAN officials. I think that is the most important thing to bring out at this particular session.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Sallehuddin. Yes, Mr. Hatch.

HATCH:

I would like to make a few observations about the purpose of this discussion and that is the desirable way of cooperation between the public and private sectors in human resources development.

I think when we talk about with cooperation, Mr. Hiraga spoke of the trend in Japan, to work towards the government to organize the framework for HRD, and the private sector possibly be encouraged to do a little bit more within that framework. I can say this as a very useful start for the smaller countries if we had a government that were capable of setting up that framework and I have no doubt that in our case, we do have a government that could do that. The private sector, I believe, can do everything better than the government can anywhere, to my knowledge, anyway. I do believe that it would be extremely important for the private sector to participate in national development in that way.

I listened to Mr. Akita speaking of training in his company. He said when the turnover of labor was small, this encouraged them to participate in training because they would not lose people through labor turnover. Well, in the national context, training is a part of the national effort and it is not only for organizational purposes.

I heard Mr. Sallehuddin say in his talk this morning that perhaps the private sector only trained for profit and not in the national interests. I would suggest that perhaps if in some countries profit is in the national interest and if we encourage people to train for profit, that, too, is in the national interest.

Just to conclude, I do believe that somehow the governments in this region, particularly the Pacific region where I come from, could perhaps be encouraged to look to the private sector to do more in the field of human resources development.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Hatch. I think the remarks raised some interesting points. Perhaps some people around the table might like to take up the question of "in what way governments in this context could play such catalytic role?"

Another might be Dr. Priyono's suggestion of group attempting to perhaps at a later stage draw up some sort of a program, the project proposal. Can I invite any further remarks? Mr. Oldham.

OLDHAM:

When it comes to the questions of facilitation of Government's role and trying to facilitate the training role in a private sector come to one quite practical consideration.

When I was in Indonesia, there was a very interesting example where the Inco Company established a large plant and there was a great deal of training done by Inco of a practical kind. Now, one of the things which the Indonesian government introduced into the roles of the game, this was something Inco knew before it came in was that there would be an Indonesianization program. In other words, gradually the Canadian managers and technicians who had come to the plant would be phased out and the Indonesians would be trained to do those jobs and right now I gather after what, almost 8 years, may be 10 years, since that project began, may be there are 3 or 4 Canadians left in that large plant and here's quite concrete example of the way the Indonesian government set up a structure which required the transfer of not technology but the transfer of human resources development.

CHAIRMAN:

Any other suggestions? Yes, sir.

OGUMA:

I am from K.D.D., Kokusai Denshin Denwa Co.,Ltd. Japan's International Telephone Information Service.

Well, in fact, at K.D.D. in the field of international telecommunications, it is a purely joint venture activities. Every country has a particular line of business. In the field of telecommunication between your country and Japan, we have the connection with the cables and we have the connection via satellite with the earth stations in many places. At the same level the operation maintenance has to be conducted in many countries of the world. If one side does not work up to the required level, the telecommunication will not occur. In this context, we conduct 6 training courses in a year for the people from the ASEAN countries. The operational maintenance of telecommunications and other fields are taken up at the training course. Naturally, we have a very good relationship with JICA.

We belong to ITU, one of the specialized agencies of UN. There, we talk about technology transfer and training and there is a great amount of requests from the developing countries to the ITU. Last year, in December, we have compiled one report or recommendation rather, the title is the "Report of the Independent Commission for Worldwide Telecommunications Development", so-called "the missing link." There is an executive summary and I would like to introduce to you only the portion regarding the training. They are as follows. (Omitted here)

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Karu.

KARU:

Looking at the cooperation extended by the public sector concerned on HRD, it seems to me that it mainly deals with training of staff necessary for producing export goods for the second stage of the industrialization. So, if I just focus on this type of human resources development, I think much cooperation has been extended from the public sector to the developing world.

As Prof. Chira stated, there are differences among various countries and some countries have not been able to reach a consensus in their private sector

about the necessary cooperation and some Chambers of Commerce and Industries have not been able to reach an agreement, and some of these requests from the developing countries have not been conveyed effectively to the Japanese side. To remedy the situation, the public sector and private sectors of the developing countries should get together and discuss about the requests they wish to make to our side. The governments of these developing countries can then convey their requests to the private sectors of the developed countries. Only then, we can exert out maximum efforts to meet the expectations of the developing country's private sectors.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, Mr, Karu for that very sensible set of suggestions.

HARADA:

I work for a construction company, named Nakanogumi.

The Japanese construction industry to which my company belongs to, has had a special request from Malaysia and in the past several years we have been engaged in receiving and training construction engineers from Malaysia. We accept 50 to 100 trainees every year and they receive training for 1/2 year to 1 year in the Japanese companies. In spite of these our efforts, after they return to Malaysia they do not always highly appreciate what they have learned in Japan. That is what I hear from time to time.

In this connection, I was very impressed by what Dr. Chira mentioned about the importance of agricultural sector in the developmental process of ASEAN countries. My feeling in listening his comments is that technical transfer in the area of construction is perhaps only a very minor part of expectations of the Look East policy of Malaysia and that the great part of the expectations should be in the agricultural area.

Then, even if the Japanese try very hard to provide technical transfer, the efforts may not be directly connected to the overall development in Malaysia. This could be the background behind the criticism that we had received. We should therefore try to avoid any misunderstandings on the expectations whatever cooperative efforts we take in HRD. Thanks to this symposium, I have become keenly aware of this problem.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Harada. Dr. Chira.

CHIRA:

Let me suggest that, the regional cooperation is only part of the national development in each country. The human resources development in the context of regionalism would be a thing that would speed up or facilitate the existing policies and I think it is important that each country should examine your own human resources development carefully. Otherwise, it would be difficult to use regional project to fit in your grand policy.

Now, let me try to suggest the concrete policies in which the regional project could take place.

First, I can see that, at the level we are discussing at the moment, we are still in the government to government level. If we want to promote private sector contribution, first I think the regional project like this must allow for private to private sector in different dialogue countries to get together in a more easier manner. I think this is the difficulty: they normally don't have very quicker or easier way to get together. So, I think there should be a committee at the level of private sector. If we can facilitate that kind of activities, perhaps subsequent meetings would be very useful. In that philosophy, we can capture the dynamism of the private sector of ASEAN, South Pacific and dialogue partners.

Secondly, I think that my idea of catalytic role would be to device strategy in which we allow the private sector to perform HRD on their own interest. Perhaps subsidy would be a good word, too, but government must not, if the private sector can. I mean the government should encourage, provide incentives. I think each country must do it because regionalism or regional context would not help because you cannot advise my Minister of Finance to give tax deduction if a firm is giving training.

For example, in my paper, I suggested a skill-development fund whereby there should be some sort of a policy at the national level to generate some kind of tax in which firms could get a return or reduction or get compensation, if that firm actually conducts some training. That kind of tax is called levy tax, a levy on training. You can collect it from maybe half a percent on total sales but that revenue should perhaps go back to Ministry of Labor and that Ministry of Labor can use that to encourage trainings in each firm.

Third. I think I would tend to agree with Dr. Hirono about transfer of technology, although I said in the beginning that we don't equate HRD and transfer of technology completely. I see the role of foreign investment in

ASEAN to be a very important instrument for skill development. Here, I guess we need another seminar about how each firm actually conduct human capital transformation. In Thailand, we have studies already looking at American and Japanese firms about their conduct of training in each particular firm. And, here, as I said yesterday, the government in Thailand probably do not maximize the benefit of transfer of skill in the firm.

And finally, I think our friend from Japan, Mr. Okita, has been saying we must device our medium term and long term industrial plans. We should think about what would be an industrial structure of ASEAN in the next 20 years. We should not remain a country in which we remain static in our technology. The kind of industries that we want is also very important in skill development, because the ability for some workers to learn something depend on the technology. So, I think the first question is very important that each ASEAN country must examine their own industrial policy carefully. So, only when we understand our own economy carefully and completely, the regional project like this would speed up the process of HRD. I don't want us to discuss isolated cases of training without relating our own economy.

CHAIRMAN:

A long as you can make it very quick, Mr. Sallehuddin.

SALLEHUDDIN:

On the regionalism that you were talking about, I think the regionalism is not to be all for our exercise. I think you must put this back in the context of what we have agreed in Jakarta, that is, to supplement existing multilateral and bilateral projects.

Secondly, your point about private sector and private sector cooperation: as you know, the cooperation so far between dialogue countries are G to G, more or less. But in this particular field I don't find the private sector to private sector cooperation has developed very well so far. I mean, one can tell, for example, in terms of dialogue partners in the Pacific, I think the ASEAN/U.S. Business Council is fairly ongoing. I think the ASEAN/Japan is fairly ongoing, but we don't have such thing with Canada, New Zealand, or with Australia. Thus, we have not had all these establishments with all the dialogue partners. In addition, some of the existing establishments do not cover all the private sector: for example, the ASEAN/U.S. Business Council.

does not cover the whole of the private sector of the United States as well as ASEAN.

And, the 2nd point in terms of your suggestion of having a committee, I would like to make a word of caution because one of the basic philosophy underlying this exercise, we had agreed in Jakarta, is not to form any other committees or any other institutions or any other bureaucracy. I think there was a fear amongst all of us in Jakarta that we should not be instituting other new bureaucracies or new establishments to run this program.

CHAIRMAN:

Well, thank you everyone for your comments and cooperation.

8.2.4. Summary

The Summary of Session B was presented by the chairman of the session, Dr. Raymond John Spurr, as follows:

Firstly, as an example or a model of the training system, the Japanese system was presented by Mr. Yoshino where the importance of on-the-job training was perhaps dominant. It was suggested that this was possible in Japan, because of the life employment system and because of the high level of educational attainment. This led firstly to the conclusion that the training method or system must be tailored to countries' own culture, values, social system and management methods. For example, its wage system and its personnel management. Each government clearly has to formulate its own manpower to fill up development policies. Secondly, it emphasizes the importance of the general level of education in designing training programs, and hence the role of the public sector in that area.

It was felt in the discussion that the role of the government in manpower training should be basically to set the general framework and to provide an environment, for example, perhaps through incentives which encourages the private sector to engage itself in HRD in their own interests. However, at the early stage of development of small/medium scale industries, the government may have to play a direct as well as an indirect role in developing manpower resources.

An additional important factor in the encouragement of HRD was thought to be related not only to needs but also to costs and the question of efficiency and the effective use of resources.

With regard to assisting developing countries in HRD, both the public and private sectors of the highly industrialized countries have their respective

roles to play in the field of technical cooperation; for example, governments acting alone or in cooperation with one another can function as a medium to facilitate the flow of information between countries and as a land for communicating product sector requirements.

Concerning the roles of the private sector, it was suggested that small and medium scale industries particularly can also make significant contributions through various measures and programs, although they particularly may need help and encouragement from governments.

There was extensive discussion about the way in which larger private companies can do already provide HRD programs. And a number of Japanese representatives in the session gave descriptions of the part that their own companies play in this.

It was pointed out in relation to the role of governments working in cooperation with one another, that there was a relationship or a close relationship between this symposium and the processes which were began at the last ASEAN Foreign Ministers Meeting in Jarkarta to initiate a program of cooperation between the ASEAN countries and the five dialogue countries and to also involve countries from the South Pacific in the field of HRD. A particular role for the private sector was envisaged in this program.

In this respect, attention was drawn to the substantial mechanisms for cooperation between countries in the region which already exist. An important consideration to bear in mind in such cooperation is therefore the need to utilize these existing institutions and resources more effectively, rather than to duplicate them.

Finally, possibilities for the use of trade and private sector associations in the region for enhancing communication was also referred to in this respect.

9. CLOSING REMARKS

9. Closing Remarks

by Mr. Noboru Nakahira
Executive Director, JICA

Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf of JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency) I would like to extend the concluding remarks at this time. First of all, I would like to thank all of the participants at this symposium for attending the symposium in a very enthusiastic manner both yesterday and today.

This is the first experience for JICA to hold such a large symposium with a large number of representatives from both developing nations and industrialized nations. Perhaps we were not perfect in proceeding with the symposium, however, fortunately with your kind cooperation, we are now about to conclude this symposium in a great success, for which I would like to thank you sincerely. Particularly, Prof. Hirono has been exercising his excellent chairmanship in proceeding with our symposium, and I would like to thank him dearly.

At this symposium ASEAN and the Pacific Area has been pointed out to be one of the most promising area in the global economy toward the 21st century. And it has been mentioned that the potential is great for this area to become one of the centers in global economy. In order to ensure this positioning it has been pointed out that it is very important to extend and cooperate among ourselves in this region. Furthermore, the private activities are predicted to become much more vitalized in future, together with the economic development. The recent changes and development in economy are quite rapid in pace compared with the long history of mankind. In this particular request, the human resources development in order for both the public and private

sectors to nurture appropriate personnel becomes all the more important in time of changes and development, as was mentioned by Dr. Okita in his keynote speech.

The human resources development must be conducted not only in the industrial areas but also in other areas which would support the development. JICA would like to continue to proceed with our responsibility by reflecting the discussions which have taken place in this symposium as well as the propositions which have come up during the symposium.

In this July in Kuala Lumpur the Post-Ministerial Conference of ASEAN countries together with the Pacific dialogue partners will be held, at which time we hear that cooperation in the field of human resources development will be taken up in the area of ASEAN and the Pacific. We will be very happy if this symposium would have something to contribute to that Conference.

Lastly, I would like to extend our heartiest appreciation to all those who are concerned in holding this symposium. As was mentioned by our Chairman, Prof. Hirono, the word of appreciation has been given to the translators and interpreters. I was also planning to thank interpreters myself. But it will be an overlap. The major reason for having such a success for the symposium was the performance of interpreters and I would feel that every time we hold such an international conference, we are indebted to the interpreters greatly. And I thank you very much.

アセアン・南太平洋地域における
人造りシンポジウム報告書

1985年4月24日—25日

主催 国際協力事業団
後援 外務省

はじめに

人造りシンポジウムは昭和59年7月に開催されたアセアン拡大外相会議において、安倍外務大臣より提案され、アセアン諸国より歓迎されたことにより開催されるに至ったものである。本シンポジウムの目的は、アセアン諸国を中心とした太平洋地域の経済発展を展望し、これに対応した養成すべき人材の分野、養成方策を模索することであり、基本テーマとして「21世紀にむけてのアセアン及び南太平洋諸国の経済開発と人造り」がとり上げられた。

同シンポジウムには、アセアン、南太平洋および米国、カナダ、豪州、ニュージーランドよりの代表者と日本側関係省庁、学識経験者及び民間有識者が参加し活発な議論が行われた。これらの討議の内容は本報告書のなかに収録されている。

21世紀は太平洋の時代であるといわれているように、今後、日本、アセアン及び南太平洋諸国による緊密な協力の展開が予想されており、とりわけ人造りはその中で重要な分野として認識されよう。人造りについて効果的な官民協力のあり方が課題となるような状況に鑑み、本報告書がこれらの協力促進のための一助となれば幸いである。

国際協力総合研修所

所長 長谷川 正 男

目 次

1. 要約と提言	1
2. プログラム	5
3. 参加者リスト	11
3.1. 参加者リスト	13
3.2. 分科会参加者リスト	15
4. 開会挨拶(国際協力事業団総裁 有田圭輔)	17
5. 歓迎の辞(外務政務次官 森山真弓)	21
6. 基調報告	25
6.1. 「アセアン・太平洋地域の途上国の産業発展の展望」大来佐武郎	27
6.2. 「国造りの基礎としての人造り」サユテイ・ハシブアン	32
6.3. 討議	35
7. 国別報告	39
7.1. 日本「わが国の人造り協力政策」藤田公郎	41
7.2. ブルネイ「開発戦略及びプログラム」 リム・ジョク・セン ダニアル・ビン・ハジ・ハナフイア	46
7.3. フィジー「フィジーの政府職における人造り計画と戦略」 アピサロメ・トウドレウ ヘクター・レックス・ハッチ	48
7.4. インドネシア「インドネシアにおける人造りの現状」 サユテイ・ハシブアン ブリヨノ・チプトヘリヤント	51
7.5. 日本「日本の製造工業部門における人造り」尾高煌之助	58
7.6. マレーシア「マレーシアにおける人造り」サリフディン・ビン・アブドラ	63
7.7. バブア・ニューギニア「バブア・ニューギニアの現状」 エフレム・マキス セオドレ・バーピアム	68

7.8.	フィリピン「わが国の開発戦略とその達成手段」	
	サムエル・T・ラメル	
	ガビノ・A・メンドーサ	77
7.9.	シンガポール「わが国の人造り戦略と人造りプログラム」	
	ウインストン・テオ	80
7.10.	タイ「経済の変化と人造り」	83
	チラ・ホングラダロム	
7.11.	討議	96
8.	分科会報告	107
8.1.	分科会A:	
8.1.1.	リード・オフ・スピーチ「アセアンの産業構造の変化と展望」	111
	鳥居泰彦	
8.1.2.	討議	118
8.1.3.	要約	134
8.2.	分科会B:	
8.2.1.	リード・オフ・スピーチ「民間部門における人造り」	139
	吉野衡	
8.2.2.	パネリスト報告	143
8.2.3.	討議	151
8.2.4.	要約	163
9.	閉会挨拶(国際協力事業団理事 中平立)	165

1. 要約と提言

1. 要約と提言

1. 人造りの重要性と内容の多様性の共通認識

- (1) 経済開発、所得・生活水準の向上（雇用増大）の基礎としての人造りの重要性
- (2) 国の事情に対応した人造りの必要性。すなわち、それぞれの国で一次産業、輸入代替産業、輸出産業等、産業により、企業により、国により重点が異なり、これに対応して、人造りも画一的なものではありえない。
- (3) 既存産業における、新しい技術の導入や、ハイテク等を活用する必要性さらに産業構造の高度化は、どの国を問わず一般に高まってきており、そのための人造りは今後の共通課題である。

2. 人造り；教育と訓練

人造りの基本は、基礎・一般教育にあるが、単に知識のみならず、勤労意欲、健全な労働観の育成が重要である。実際の生産活動では、職務を遂行するために必要な技術、熟練が不可欠であり、このためには経営管理能力の育成、職業訓練が決定的重要性を持っている。この場合、On the Job Trainingの果たす役割が極めて重要である。なお、途上国の経済開発の促進のためには、NGOを含む民間ベースの技術移転、政府ベース技術協力の増大が不可欠である。

3. 業界の育成と官民の協力

訓練を主体とする人的資源の開発は、基本的には、市場原理に基づいた民間企業の活動に委ねられる。他方、開発途上国にあつては種々の制約により、政府の役割（国内法体制、諸施策の整備等）も大きく、また政府援助の貢献しうる余地がある。

具体的には次の3点が指摘される。

- イ．開発途上国の民間企業によるOJTの重要性の認識の強化
- ロ．開発途上国における業界育成の重要性
- ハ．民間企業のOJTを促進するための政府の諸施策の必要性

4. 継続的努力としての人造り協力（結論と提言）

- (1) 人造り協力とは、組織的人造り政策の推進に向つての国内的、国際的な官民協力のプロセスである。
- (2) 各国で異なる多様かつ複雑な人造り政策を成功させるためには、各国及び国際機関の努力を有機的に連携・組織化することが重要である。そのためには、新たな制度を作るという方向ではなく、各国の既存の関連諸機関をネットワーク化し、人的交流、情報の交換を緊密化することが効果的である。ASEAN拡大外相会議の場で行われている太平洋人造り協力も

かかる努力の一環である。

- (8) 今回のシンポジウムにおける自由な意見交換も、かかる観点から有意義であった。今後は、現存の具体的なプロジェクトを推進するとともに長期的観点にたつて意見交換や共同研究を通じて効果的な人造り協力のネットワークを育成していくことが重要である。

2. プログラム

2. プ ロ グ ラ ム

1. 背 景

人造りシンポジウムは、昭和59年7月開催されたアセアン拡大外相会議の際、日本・アセアン外相会議の場で安倍外務大臣より披露し、アセアン側より歓迎された。

2. 目 的

アセアン諸国を中心とした太平洋地域の経済発展を展望し、これに対応した養成すべき人材の分野・養成方策を模索する。特に経済発展に伴い拡大が予測される民間活動の人造りに対する役割を探る。

3. 基本テーマ

「21世紀にむけてのアセアン及び南太平洋諸国の経済開発と人造り」

— 人造りにおける官民協力のあり方 —

4. シンポジウムテーマの枠組み

効果的に、シンポジウムを行なうため、各報告、取纏めのポイントを以下のように考慮する。

	基 調 報 告	現 状 報 告	分科会 A	分科会 B
ね ら い	太平洋地域が21世紀の成長地帯であり効率的発展のための人造り政策の重要性の確認	多様性の中での発展のための各国の人造りニーズが異なることと、これに対応した援助の必要性	産業構造の高度化に対応した人造りの進め方	人造りにおける官民協力のあり方
日 本 側 の 発 言	太平洋地域の開発途上国の産業発展の展望 大来佐武郎 国際大学学長	わが国の人造り協力政策 藤田公郎 外務省経済協力局長 産業発展に対応した人材養成におけるわが国の経験 尾高煌之助 一橋大学教授	アセアンの産業構造の変化と展望 鳥居泰彦 慶応義塾大学教授	日本の経験—民間部門における人造り 吉野 衡 日本経営者団体連盟 常任理事
途上国及び先進国側の発言	国造りの基礎としての人造り (アセアンの代表)	各国の開発戦略と達成のための手段 (途上国8ヶ国)	途上国産業発展の展望と人造り (発言希望参加者による報告)	人造りにおける官民の協力の現状と将来 (発言希望参加者による報告)

シンポジウム第1日

於：ホテルニューオータニ

4月24日(水)

1. 開会式

(ふじの間)

	司 会	中 平 立	国際協力事業団理事
10:00 - 10:10	開会の挨拶	有 田 圭 輔	国際協力事業団総裁
10:10 - 10:20	歓迎の辞	森 山 真 弓	外務政務次官 (安倍外務大臣挨拶代読)
10:20 - 10:30	議長、パネリスト紹介	(司 会)	
10:30 - 10:45	コーヒーブレイク		

2. 基調報告

(ふじの間)

10:45 - 11:15	『アセアン・太平洋地域の開発途上国の産業発展の展望』	大 来 佐武郎	国際大学学長
11:15 - 11:45	『国造りの基礎としての人造り』	サユティ ハンブアン	ASEAN, 太平洋諸国の代表
11:45 - 13:20	議長主催昼食会		(かつらの間)

3. 現状報告

(ふじの間)

13:30 - 13:50	『わが国の人造り協力政策』	藤 田 公 郎	外務省経済協力局長
13:50 - 14:10	ブルネイ		
14:10 - 14:30	フィジー		
14:30 - 14:50	インドネシア		
14:50 - 15:10	日 本		
	『産業発展に対応した人材養成におけるわが国の経験』	尾 高 煌之助	一橋大学教授
15:10 - 15:30	コーヒーブレイク		
15:30 - 15:50	マレーシア		
15:50 - 16:10	パプアニューギニア		
16:10 - 16:30	フィリピン		
16:30 - 16:50	シンガポール		
16:50 - 17:10	タ イ		
17:30 - 19:30	国際協力事業団総裁主催レセプション		(はぎの間)

シンポジウム第2日

4月25(木)

1. 分科会 A及びB

分科会 A : 産業構造の高度化に対応した人造りの進め方 (ふじの間)

10:00 - 10:30 リード・オフ・スピーチ

『アセアンの産業構造の変化における人造り』

鳥居泰彦 慶応義塾大学教授

10:30 - 11:00 パネリスト発言希望者による報告

11:00 - 11:15 コーヒーブレイク

11:15 - 12:00 パネリスト発言希望者による報告

12:00 - 13:30 昼食ブレイク

13:30 - 15:00 上記発言にもとづく自由討議

15:00 - 16:00 コーヒーブレイク

分科会 B : 人造りに関する官民協力のあり方 (あやめの間)

10:00 - 10:30 リード・オフ・スピーチ

『日本の経験—民間部門における人造り』

吉野 衡 日本経営者団体連盟常任理事

10:30 - 11:00 パネリスト発言希望者による報告

11:00 - 11:15 コーヒーブレイク

11:15 - 12:00 パネリスト発言希望者による報告

12:00 - 13:30 昼食ブレイク

13:30 - 15:00 上記発言にもとづく自由討議

15:00 - 16:00 コーヒーブレイク

2. 総括 (ふじの間)

16:00 - 16:30 分科会報告 分科会座長

16:30 - 16:45 総括 広野良吉 成蹊大学教授

3. 閉会式

16:45 - 17:00 閉会の辞 中平立

3. 参加者リスト

3. 1. 参加者リスト

(1) 開発途上国側参加者

ブルネイ	リム ジョク セン	外務省ASEAN国内事務局長
	ダニアル ビン ハジ ハナフ イア	開発省農業局長
フィジー	アビスロメ トッドレウ	人事院次官補
	ヘクター レックス ハッチ	国立訓練委員会理事
インドネシア	サユティ ハシブアン	BAPPENAS次官
	プリヨノ チプトヘリヤント	インドネシア大学人口統計研究所長
マレーシア	サリフディン ビン アブドラ	ASEAN国内事務局副局長
	アブドル ガーニ ハジ オズマン	上院議員
パプア・ニューギニア	セオドレ バーピアム	人事院次官補
	エフレム マクス	応用社会経済研究所長
フィリピン	サムエル T. ラメル	外務省ASEAN国内事務局次長
	ガビノ A. メンドーサ	アジア経営大学院長
シンガポール	ウインストン テオ	国家生産性庁計画研究開発局次長
タイ	チャワット アルタユクティ	タイ外務省大使
	チラ ホングラダロム	タマサート大学人材開発研究所長

(2) 先進諸国（アセアン拡大外相会議メンバー国）からの参加者

豪州	レイモンド J. スパー	外務省次官補代理
	アレックス ブカナン	在マレーシア豪大使館科学問題担当官
カナダ	ピーター A. オルドハム	在日カナダ大使館参事官
ニュージーランド	デビッド J. ブラックストック	在日ニュージーランド大使館参事官
米 国	デビッド J. アレン	国務省太平洋問題補佐官
	ステファン メイ	在日大使館一等書記官

(3) 日本側参加者

議長	広野 良吉	成蹊大学教授
基調報告者	大来 佐武郎	国際大学学長
パネリスト	藤田 公郎	外務省経済協力局長
〃	尾高 煌之助	一橋大学教授
〃	島居 泰彦	慶応義塾大学教授
〃	吉野 衡	日本経営者団体連盟常任理事
〃	太田 博	外務省経済協力局参事官
〃	坂柳 迪夫	農林水産省農蚕園芸局普及教育課長

パネリスト	齊藤真人	通商産業省通商政策局経済協力部技術協力課長
”	平賀俊行	労働省総務審議官
”	加留博	(社)経済同友会経済研究所所長代理
”	錦織璋	全国中小企業団体中央会常務理事
”	山口仁秋	(社)海外コンサルティング企業協会専務理事
”	松本洋	(財)国際協力推進協会専務理事
”	秋田忠志	松下電器産業(株)海外研修所長
”	中平立	国際協力事業団理事

3. 2. 分科会参加者リスト

(1) 分科会 A

〈海外〉

ブルネイ	ダニアル ビン ハジ ハナファイ	開発省農業局長
フィジー	アビサロメ ドウドレウ	人事院次官補
インドネシア	サユティ ハシブアン	BAPPENAS次官
マレーシア	アブドル ガーニ ハジ オズマン	上院議員
フィリピン	サムエル T. ラメル	外務省ASEAN国内事務局次長
タイ	チャワット アルタユクティ	タイ外務省大使
豪州	アレックス ブカナン	在マレーシア豪大使館科学問題担当官
ニュージーランド	デビッド J. ブラックストック	在日ニュージーランド大使館参事官
アメリカ	ステファン メイ	在日大使館一等書記官

〈日本〉

鳥居 泰彦 (リード・オブ・スピーチ)	慶応義塾大学教授
尾高 煌之助	一橋大学教授
太田 博	外務省経済協力局参事官
坂柳 迪夫	農林水産省農蚕園芸局普及教育課長
山口 仁秋	(社)海外コンサルティング企業協会専務理事
松本 洋	(財)国際協力推進協会専務理事
中平 立	国際協力事業団理事

(2) 分科会 B

〈海外〉

ブルネイ	リム ジョク セン	外務省ASEAN国内事務局次長
フィジー	ヘクター レックス ハッチ	国内訓練委員会理事
インドネシア	ブリヨノ チプトヘリアント	インドネシア大学人口統計研究所長
マレーシア	サリフディン ビン アブドラ	ASEAN国内事務局副局長
パプアニューギニア	エフレム マキス	応用社会経済研究所長
〃	セオドレ バービウム	人事院次官補
フィリピン	ガビノ A. メンドーサ	アジア経営大学院長
シンガポール	ウィンストン テオ	国家生産性庁計画研究開発局次長
タイ	チラ ホングラダロム	タマサート大学人材開発研究所長
豪州	レイモンド J. スパー	外務省次官補代理

カナダ ピーター A. オルドハム
米 国 デビッド J. アレン

在日カナダ大使館参事官
国務省太平洋問題補佐官

< 日本 >

吉 野 衡 (リード・オフ・スピーチ)	日本経営者団体連盟常任理事
広 野 良 吉	成蹊大学教授
斉 藤 真 人	通商産業省通商政策局経済協力部 技術協力課長
平 賀 俊 行	労働省総務審議官
加 留 博	(社)経済同友会経済研究所所長代理
錦 織 璋	全国中小企業団体中央会常務理事
秋 田 忠 志	松下電器産業㈱海外研修所長

4. 開 会 挨 拶

4. 開 会 挨拶

国際協力事業団総裁

有 田 圭 輔

森山外務政務次官、各国代表ならびに御列席の皆様、本日は御多忙中のところ、又、諸外国の皆様には遠路はるばる本シンポジウムに御参加下さり、心から御礼申し上げます。

昨年7月アセアン拡大外相会議において、参加国間の協力関係を更に強化する方策が検討され、その一環として、安倍大臣より東京において人造りをテーマとするシンポジウムの開催が提案され、本日開催の運びとなつたわけであります。国際協力事業団がこの重要なシンポジウムを主催することは、さらには太平洋諸国の一層の発展につながる協力に結びつくことを心から願うものであります。

本シンポジウムの課題は、国造りのための人造りであります。現在人造りの重要性については広く認識されているところであり、国の発展のための生産設備やインフラストラクチャーへの投資と同様、あるいはそれ以上に人材への投資は大きな成果が期待されるといっても言い過ぎではありません。東南アジア、東アジアの最近の目覚ましい経済成長は、これらの諸国における長年の人造りの成果と言えましょう。

昨年、国際協力事業団は創立10周年記念を迎えましたが、その時掲げたキャッチフレーズは「人造り、国造り、心のふれあい」であります。国際協力事業団は政府ベースの技術協力と無償資金協力の実施を行っており、1984年度における事業の実績は凡そ2,000億円に達するものと見込まれますが、国造りの根本は人造りであり、技術協力の視点からいえば人造りは、人と人、すなわち心と心の触れ合いを伴って、技術が移転されるときに完成されるものと確信しております。

技術協力は、その金額においてはわが国ODAの11%に過ぎませんが、円借款、無償資金協力によって完成した設備も、供与された機材も、それらを効率的に動かす人なしでは途上国の開発に貢献することができません。日本の経済協力をより一層効果的・効率的なものとするためには、技術協力を伸ばすことが必要であり、ODAに占める技術協力の比率を、倍増することが緊要でありましょう。

鈴木前総理が1981年にアセアン五カ国を訪問した折に提唱されたアセアン人造りセンタープロジェクトは、着実に進行し、本年度より本格的な活動に入るものと思われまふ。これに対応し、わが国でも当事業団の付属機関として、沖縄国際センターが完成し、4月17日に開所式を行いました。

人造りを中心とするわれわれの技術協力の経験から、21世紀に向けてのアセアン及び太平洋地域の発展を考える時、政府部門と民間部門のそれぞれが、人材の育成計画を効果的・効率的に調整発展せしめていくことが、極めて肝要であると考え次第であります。

今回、シンポジウムにおいて、人材養成における官民のあり方をとりあげたのは、まさにこうした問題意識からであります。幸に今回はアセアン諸国、南太平洋諸国から有識者の方々に参加していただいておりますので、この点、十分に論議をし、今後のわが国の援助や協力のあり方、国際協力事業団の役割といった点について参考となるような成果を上げられることを期待するものであります。ともに、一般参加者におかれましても、最後まで積極的に討議に加わっていただきますことを期待いたしまして、開会の御挨拶にかえさせていただきます。

ありがとうございました。

5. 歡迎の辭

5. 歓 迎 の 辞

外務政務次官

森 山 真 弓

(安倍外務大臣 挨拶代読)

きよりは安倍外務大臣がお伺いしまして、皆様にごあいさつを申し上げる予定でございましたが、あいにく参議院の本会議が同じ時間に開かれてしまいまして、こちらへ大臣がお伺いすることができませんので、私がかわってごあいさつを代読申し上げます。

開発途上国の持続的な発展を支えるものといたしまして、その国の各層にわたる人的資源の開発が重要でありますことは、かねてから指摘されているところでございます。私自身幾つかの開発途上国を訪問し、我が国が実施しておりますプロジェクトをつぶさに視察いたしまして、またそこで活躍する専門家あるいは先方の政府の関係者と親しく懇談いたし、これらを通じて国造りの基本が人造りにあるということ、改めて痛感いたしました。

このような認識のもとに、私は昨年7月、インドネシアで開かれたアセアン拡大外相会議の場で、人造りに関するシンポジウムの開催を提唱いたしました。本日ここにそうそうたる方々の御参加をいただきまして、実現いたしましたことをうれしく思いますとともに、関係国政府並びに参加者の皆様、さらには国際協力事業団に対し、心から謝意を表したいと存じます。

一口に人造りと申ししましても、一朝一夕に達成されるものではなく、各国のニーズに応じた中・長期的な戦略が必要でございます。また、人造りの達成には民間活力の協力が不可欠でございます。かかる観点に立てば、今回のシンポジウムのテーマである「21世紀に向けてのアセアン及び南太平洋諸国の経済開発と人造り—人造りにおける官民協力のあり方—」というテーマは、まことに時宜にかなった適切なテーマであり、本件シンポジウムが実りあるものとなるよう心から願う次第でございます。

さらに私は、本件シンポジウムは次の2点において、内外の関心を引くタイムリーなものであるということをつけ加えたいと思います。

その1つは、このシンポジウムが我が国のアセアン人造り協力プロジェクトの始動の時期に行われるということでありまして。我が国は1981年、アセアン各国に人造りセンターを設置し、さらにまた我が国にも沖縄に国際センターを設置する旨発表いたしました。アセアン各国の協力を得まして、これら人造りセンターは、今年中に本格的な活動を開始する見通しでありますとともに、沖縄センターは先般無事開所式を行ったばかりでございます。同センターにつきましては本シンポジウム参加者の皆様には、このシンポジウムの後視察旅行をしていただく予定と聞いておりますが、このシンポジウムはこのような我が国の人造り協力の諸施策の一環として位置づけられるものでございます。

次に、このシンポジウムは太平洋協力の諸プログラムの1つとしても位置づけられるということでありまして。昨年7月のアセアン拡大外相会議で、太平洋の将来が取り上げられ、インドネシ

アのモフタル外相の提案に基づき、当面人造りの問題に取り組んでいくということに合意が見られました。この太平洋人造り協力については、現在関係国間で協議が重ねられているわけですが、今日ここにアセアン各国のみならず、南太平洋諸国のフィジー、バブアニューギニアの参加を得、さらに太平洋協力の観点から、関係先進国の参加を得ましたことは、このシンポジウムの内容を一層充実するものと信ずる次第でございます。

このシンポジウムの成功を祈り、また各国から参加されております皆様の日本滞在が、快適を楽しいものでありますよう心から願ひまして、私のごあいさついたします。

ありがとうございました。

6. 基調報告

6.1. 基調報告

「アセアン・太平洋地域の途上国の産業発展の展望」

国際大学学長

大 来 佐 武 郎

1. 21世紀に向けてのアセアン・太平洋地域の産業発展の特徴と展望

近年において、東アジア及び東南アジアとは、日本、NICsおよびアセアン諸国とに大別される。

日本は第二次大戦後、特に60年代に年成長率10%強という高度成長を達成し、その経済規模を著しく拡大させた。また戦後日本の高度経済成長は発展途上国の経済発展を刺激する一つの要素になったといえよう。ただ、70年代になると逆に日本の経済成長率は5%に落ちる一方、日本近隣のアジア諸国の成長率の方がむしろ大きくなり国によっては10%以上の二桁成長を実現するに至った。70年代での二度に亘るオイルショック、そして70年代末における世界経済の景気停滞を経ながらも、NICsおよびアセアン諸国が相対的に高い経済成長を達成したということは注目に値する。

こうした東アジア・東南アジアの経済発展は輸出の伸びに牽引され実現したというようにいわれているが、必ずしもそうではない。日本の場合でも、内需と輸出がほぼ並行してきたと言われ、また一般的な特徴としては、マーケットメカニズムを利用する形で経済発展がなされ、私企業の発展も促進されてきた。政府もこの経済発展に重要なリーダーシップをとってきたが、どちらかといえば、民間企業家の活動を十分発揮させることを助長する方向で政策運営を行ってきた。例えば、日本の経済計画なども、経済発展のオリエンテーションを示し、政策の方向づけを行なうことで、経済活動の勧告以外に直接干渉するようなことは避けてきた訳である。東アジア、東南アジアについても、その発展段階の問題もあるし、それぞれの国の政治的な背景にもよるが、概して、このマーケットメカニズムを働かせながら民間主導型経済への移行を図るということが大切であろうと思われる。

去る1月にアジア開発銀行で開かれた [Privatization] という会議に出席したが、そこで討議された民間企業の活力を引き出すということは、先進国においても数年来の問題となっているところで、アメリカでのデレギュレーションとかいうものは政府の産業発展に対する直接的関与を避けるという意味がある。また途上国においても、政府の指導・役割を、従来の直接的な経済の運営から、間接的なエンカレッジメントを重視する方向に変化する傾向が見られる。社会主義国である中国でも、最近のリフォームは行政と経営とを分離し、所有権は政府、社会に置きつつ、マネジメントはできるだけ多くの人間に認め、さらに経済運営には、マーケットメカニズムをできるだけ取り入れていくといった試みもなされている。これは先進国、途上国を通じて、近年見られる1つの動きといえよう。

途上国が発展するには計画が必要であるという1つの考え方がある。途上国の産業発展を完

全に流通経済メカニズムに委ねたのでは既存の先進国の産業に対する競争力をなかなか持ち得ないであろうし、産業発展も順調には進まないと考えられるからだ。あるいは、外国企業、先進国企業のエンクレーブみたいなものができており、その国全体のレベルアップに必ずしもつながらないというような例もある訳で、そうしたことから政府による計画と指導が必要なのではないだろうか。この場合の計画として「Planning with market mechanism rather than planning against market mechanism」という考え方もありうるだろう。例えば新しい産業をスタートしていく時点で政府が計画を作成する。その計画作成段階でその国にとってどういう産業が比較優位を持ちうるのか、あるいは、どういう産業がその国の条件に適合しているのか、といったことをある程度調べてその結果にもとづいて、どういう産業からどんな順序で発展させていくか、といったやり方が「Planning with market mechanism」と言えるのではないだろうか。

しばしば途上国には非常に非経済的な産業、すなわち、製品コストが国際価格よりもはるかに高いため政府の補助金なしではやっていけないというような産業を維持するために、その国の乏しい資本を使うということが見られる。また、外国から融資を受けて産業をおこしてもそうした産業自体が返済能力を持ってないということで、なかなか viable な産業になりがたい。だから例えば、プランニングでどういう品物をどれだけ作るかというようなことの他に、ある産業に一定期間の保護を与えてその保護を毎年少しづつ減らしていき、5年、10年先には保護なしに自立できるような産業の育成を図るといった、コストの面を含めたプランニングというものがあってもよいと思う。そのため、政府には民間企業が活動しやすい環境を作ることが求められる。そうした環境の一つとして「人作り」ということが重要であろう。つまり、政府は、ある程度の企業家として働きうる人間、そうした産業で働くエンジニア、職工長とか、熟練工といった人的要素を整えることに役割を果たすべきである。また、法的制度とか、輸送、通信等のインフラストラクチャの整備をある程度行い、経済活動の能率を高めるための新しい環境作りをすることも政府の果たすべき役割の一つである。こうした点について、東アジアや東南アジアは比較的合理的な発展路線をとってきた。勿論その途中には色々な無駄があったかも知れないが、そういう政策の方向づけがこの地域の経済成長率を高め、世界の他の地域よりも比較的順調な発展を遂げてきた背景となっている。

もう一つ重要なことは、農業と工業が平行して発展するということである。農業の発展はその国の資本の本源的蓄積を生むためにも必要であり、それなしでは、工業製品を作っても、国内市場が発達しない。また、工業発展なしでは、農業の生産性を高めるためのインプット、例えば、肥料とか農機具等の普及につながらない。途上国のなかには、ある時に極端に工業化を重視し、農業にとって不利な状況を生んだ国もあった。例えば、農産物を非常に低い価格で買い上げるといった政策をとった例が多い。しかし、大多数の途上国については農業が経済の最大部門である段階から徐々に工業化を進め、農業部門の成長が工業化を支えていくというよう

な関係が望ましい。この点についても、東南アジア諸国の一部では試行錯誤的な段階を経つつ現在では、農業、特に食糧生産が非常に強化されてきている。米の自給率も高まってきている。例えば、タイでは、人口が25年のうちに倍増した一方、米の輸出量も倍増している。同時に農業についても、新しい技術の導入とか、新しい質の農産物の発展、例えば、過去におけるゴム、紅茶といった輸出農産物とは異なるタピオカ、パームオイル、とうもろこしといった新しい分野の開拓が見られる。その意味からもこの地域は割合に農業と工業のバランスのとれた発展をしていると言える。

2. アセアン・太平洋地域の産業発展の課題

この地域の産業構造の変化としては工業化の進展が予想される。ところがすでに韓国、台湾では、10年位前には輸出に占める工業製品の割合が30%（現在では90%）に達していた。一方、アセアン諸国の場合にはかつては約5%でしかなかった工業製品比率が、今では、国により異なるが、20~30%とかつての韓国、台湾のレベルに近づいている。工業化の進展に伴い、国際的にも競争力のある工業発展が望まれるというパターン、つまり輸出収入が増え、そのことがまた発展に必要な資材の輸入を可能にしていく。将来の発展過程では徐々に西太平洋地域というか、北東、東南アジアの国々の間の水平分業が進んでいくのではないだろうか。

60年代は、日本の高度成長が他のアジア諸国の発展を引き上げる力を発揮したが、最近ではむしろ、それらの国々の成長率の方が日本のそれよりも高くなり、日本の成長率が落ち込むことを逆に支えるような面も出てきている。また、日本がかつて、例えば、アメリカに対して輸出していた繊維、雑貨等の面で、他のアジア諸国、特にNICsが徐々にシェアを増やしていくという調整が行なわれている。

次の過程としては、日本がさらにこの地域からの輸入を増やすという段階がいずれは来るのではないだろうか。それというのも、他のアジア諸国の工業水準が次第に高まってきているからである。日本も賃金水準が高まり、より先端的な産業に段々と特化していくということが予想される一方、アジア諸国では資源加工型の産業の発展が考えられる。例えば、アルミニウム産業については日本がボーキサイト、石油などを輸入し、生産していた訳だが、その量はかつての四分の一に減ってきている。アサハンにアルミニウム精錬工場を造り、そこでできたアルミニウムを日本が輸入するということや、木材関係では、現在見られる原木輸入から木材加工品、半製品を他のアジア諸国から日本が輸入するという循環が考えられる。農産物の中でも例えば、野菜類、果物については、かなりこの地域内の貿易の拡大が予想される。ただ当面は農業について保護主義が強いため十分な進展は行われまいだろうが、将来、段々こうした相互の交流が強まるのではないだろうか。

ヨーロッパでも、イタリアとその他のヨーロッパ諸国とか、さらには中東諸国をも含めた野菜・果物の交流が随分と拡大してきた。アジアでは、熱帯産の農産物と温帯産の野菜・果物の

交流などの発展の可能性があるだろうし、こうした農業の面での、単に米や麦を作るということ以外に複雑な農産物を作るための技術の発展とそのための人材養成ということも次第に重要性を増してきていると思う。工業の面では、当分のあいだ、資本財および設備の供給はかなりの程度は日本から行われると思うが、次第に機械類などの資本財の自給率が他の東南アジア諸国でも高まっていくだろう。こうした発展過程を通して、先程ふれた水平分業がさらに促進されるだろう。

日本が急速な工業化をし、NICsが追随をした。そして、次の段階として、今、準NICsというか、主としてアセアン諸国の工業化が進み、工業製品の輸出が増えるという段階が続いていくのではと思われる。日本からみれば、他のアジア諸国の工業化が進むと、それが日本と競争的になるといった、いわゆるブーメラン効果が起こるといわれるが、我々がもう少しマクロ的にみれば、そういう心配はあまりいらなないと思う。例えば、20年前に日本から韓国に対する輸出は1億ドルであったが、現在では60億ドルを超えるということが可能になっている。このことはやはり、韓国の工業化が成功し、輸出も伸びて、所得および外貨収入が増えた一方より多くの輸入をする経済力がついてきたことによるものといえる。それは同時に日本の利益にもなっていると思う。また、中国の近代化についてもほぼ同様のことがいえるし、その他のアジア諸国の購買力の増大ということは、マクロ的に見ても双方の利益にもなりうると思われる。こうしたアセアン・太平洋地域の発展の展望に対応して、各国の人造りがより一層重要な役割を占めることになるとと思われる。

3. アセアン・太平洋地域の協力の方向

私は、今から20数年前、経済企画庁で所得倍增計画の策定に関与したが、当時においても人造り、特に科学・技術の分野での人材養成が非常に大切であるという認識のもとに、文部省と協議し、技術者養成計画を作成した。現在では、例えば、電気工学系の学生を日本の方がアメリカより毎年余計に卒業させているというような、その後の日本の工業化を人の面から支えるという重要な要素が検討されていた。この所得倍增計画で我々が政策の重点を置いた点は以下の通りである。

- (1) 社会資本の整備（インフラストラクチャーの整備）
- (2) 産業構造の高度化
- (3) 国際貿易と経済協力の推進
- (4) 人的能力の向上と科学技術の発展
- (5) 格差の是正

これは、その後の日本経済の発展の方向づけの上で重要な役割をはたしたと思われる。そうした方向に基づいて、所得倍增計画を作った翌年に、今度は人的能力向上の部会を作って、大卒者から熟練工に至るまでの科学分野の人材養成について検討し、人造り計画を作成した。

当時、人間の問題を経済発展と一緒に扱うのは間違いだという議論も、特に教育を重視する人々からあったが、やはり、社会的需要、つまり、どういうタイプの人間が必要かということと、そういう人材の供給というものをある程度マッチしていかなければ、いたずらに失業インテリを作ることになる。

私が当時、強調したことは、教育と経済計画、経済発展というものは同心円ではなく、中心の異なる二つの円、それもかなりオーバーラップする面のある2つの円だと考えたらいいのではないかという点であった。だから、こうした経験を省みても、今後は、人造りと経済発展の展望というものの間に密接な関係を持たせることが大切であると考えた。

その当時から考えると、現在では技術発展が相当急速に起こっている。特に、マイクロエレクトロニクス(ME)というような新しい技術分野が開けてきて、そのことが開発途上国の経済発展にどういった影響を持つか、もしくは、そうしたME化の時代に備えた人造りというものはどうあるべきか、という新しい問題なども考えなければならない。やり方によっては先進国のロボットと途上国の低賃金労働力とが競合することもありえよう。一方、ME化の発展は技術移転を容易にすることもある。簡単にいえば、ビデオテープでインストラクションを与えたりすることができるようになるといった可能性が開けていく訳である。また、ソフトウェアの発展については、開発途上国の人々のプレーンというものが段々と重要な役割を果たすようになるだろう。できる限り、ME化とか、情報化時代といわれる新しい発展を、この地域の経済発展と有利に結びつけていくような研究が、今後必要となってくるのではないだろうか。そういう点も人造りのための重要な要素となっていくであろう。

6. 2. 基調報告

「国造りの基礎としての人造り」

BAPPENAS次官

サユティ・ハシブアン

1. まずはじめに、アセアン及び太平洋諸国の同僚を代表し、今回この人造りセミナーを主催し、かつ我々を招待して下さった日本の関係各位に対して、心からの感謝を申し述べたい。
2. この会議のテーマ及びこのテーマに対するアセアン・太平洋地域の多大なる関心を見ても、この会議は非常に重要なものであると考えられるが、それは単に将来の協力をうかがわせるという意味だけではない。すなわち、人的資源という戦略的な資源をいかに開発の目的に役立てていくことができるのか、というテーマについて、ここで意見の交換が出来るということが更に意義深いことと考えられる。
3. 国家及び開発の目的のために、人材の能力を向上させるより良い方法は、常に明らかなわけではない。それは開発それ自体と同じくらい複雑であるかもしれない。
4. それには主として2つの理由がある。まず第1に、開発プロセスにおける要素としての人的資源というのは、実際には人間的側面から切り離すことはできない。その人間のためにこそ、すべての開発が成されるのであって、人的資源とはまず第1に人間なのである。
そして、今回のシンポジウムのメイン・テーマは、資源の側面を扱っているが、経済開発において人的資源を最大限に活用するためには、非資源を統合させ、かつ組み入れることも必要である。この非資源というのは、例えば文化、伝統、信条の体系または人的資源のさまざまな役割のことである。しかし、この問題は、計画面でも実行面でも、まだ未解決のままである。
5. 人造りの方法が常に明確ではないことの第2の理由として、途上国の経験が示すように、経済が急成長を見せた場合に、自動的に人的資源を十分に活用できるわけではないということがあげられる。経済がある程度急速に成長してゆくことは必要であろう。しかし、人的資源を十分に活用するという点に関しては、これだけは十分ではない。成長の過程では、その成長率は十分高くなければならぬが、その組成にも注目することが大事であり、マンパワーをできるだけ製造部門で吸収し、かつ失業を最小限に抑えるものでなければならぬ。
6. 一方、逆の状況も起こり得るという点も指摘しておく必要がある。すなわち、経済が成長すると、人材不足をきたす恐れがある。そしてこの人材不足が、さらに一層の成長を阻んでし

まうということがある。このために事前に周到な計画を立て、技能を持つ人材であれ、他の人材であれ、人材不足が起きないように、また経済の潜在性が100%実現されるように図っていかなくてはならない。

7. 上に述べたような状況が実際に起こってしまった場合、例えば、人的資源の諸条件を十分考慮しなかった、もしくは成長プロセスが不十分でマンパワーを吸収することができなかった、あるいは人材不足をきたして一層の経済成長を図ることができなかったということが生じた場合、これは国造りのベースとなる技能者やその他の人的資源が完全に活用されたとは言えない。

8. この意味において人的資源を十分に活用することが大切なのであり、国家とその開発の目的として、アセアン及び太平洋地域において人材の活用に関して協力することは実りの多いものと考えられる。これには以下のような具体的ないくつかの理由がある。

8.1. 1984年の世銀開発レポートによると、アセアン及び太平洋地域のすべての国々において、1982～2000年の間に人口と労働力が増加すると予想されている。例えばアセアン地域だけでも1億600万の人口が増えると予想されている。またカナダ、アメリカ、日本、ニュージーランド、オーストラリアを合わせると、4,500万人の増加が予想され、パプア・ニューギニアにおいても82年の300万から、2000年の500万へと200万人の人口増加が見られる。しかもこれだけですべてを網羅しているわけではない。

したがって、アセアン・太平洋地域はチャレンジに直面していると言えよう。一国のレベルでも、また地域全体としても、これから少くとも1億5,000万人増えてくる人材に対しどのように能力をつけさせていくかということ、わずか18年という短い期間の間に行っていかなければいけないのである。

8.2. アセアン・太平洋地域は、さまざまな集合的な経験を持っている。それらは、政策をつくるに当たっても、人造りの活動においても利用し合うことができると思われる。一方、GDPの年成長率は、世界基準から見ると高い方に属するが、1970～82年の期間でも低い国では1.8%、高い国では8.5%とかなり国別で格差が見られる。非農業部門のGDPは低いところではインドネシアで74%を占め、最も高いアメリカでは97%を記録している。また、サービス部門での就業人口も、10%に過ぎない国から、66%を占める国まで、その比率はまちまちである。一方、1981年の中等教育の就学率を見ると、国によって13%から97%までと大きな格差があり、高等教育でも、2～3%から58%までと同様である。

9. このように、構造的にも、開発の段階でも、アセアン・太平洋地域はさまざまな位置を占めているので、お互いの経験を利用し合える可能性は広いだろう。もちろん、人造りの政策は、例えば妊婦への医療サービス政策から、民間部門をどのように人造りに活用してゆくかといっ

た政策まで、それぞれ国によって異なることは言うまでもない。しかし、時間の制約上、これらすべてをこの会議で取り上げることはできない。

10. いずれにせよ、アセアン・太平洋地域は、今後も各々の経験を分かち合い、知力を結集して、人造りの政策及び戦略を打ちたててゆくことが必要であろう。これまで、人的資源はあまりにも当然のものとして考えられてきた。しかし、このような結集した知力を、もし十分に活用できないのであれば、それは残念なことであり、大きな損失になってしまうだろう。

6.3. 討 議

(2つの基調報告を受けて、以下の討議が行われた。)

-議長(広野) ただいまのお二人の基調報告について、コメントやご質問のある方は、していただきたいと思います。

-チラ(タイ) ディスカッションを刺激するという意味で、大来先生の発表に言及しますと、大来先生は、将来の人造りを工業、投資、貿易などの経済活動との関連においてどのようにやっていくかという状況を描いてくださいました。経済生産が拡大すると、労働に対する需要が当然起こってきますので、これは適切なお指摘だったと思います。が、また、大来先生は各国がそれぞれ自国の比較優位に従って、国内消費や輸出のための生産を行う一方で、マクロ経済レベルでは労働力の分業体制がなければならないと言われました。日本には日本の、アセアンにはアセアンの役割があり、それぞれ経済コスト、便益に従って各々の役割を果たさなければならない。その通りだと思います。しかし、そのようなアプローチは、果たして現実的でしょうか。国際貿易、投資といった舞台では非常に強い競争もあるわけです。大平洋地域は、現在のところまだ共同体になっておらず、このような問題について常に対話ができるという状況ではありません。ですから、大来先生のお考えは心から尊敬するものでありますが、私の意見では問題を解決するのは難し過ぎるのではないかと、もっと現実的な解決策はどのようなものとお考えか、お聞かせいただきたいと思えます。

-大来 確かに私の講演においては、比較優位ということを強調しました。しかし、時には一見すると不経済な産業を興したように見えても、長期的には経済的な競争力のある産業を興すことにつながったという場合も考えられるのではないのでしょうか。ですから、比較優位を長い時間をかけて見る必要があるのではないのでしょうか。"幼稚産業論"という理論がありますが、どのような産業を興すかということを考えるときには、政府の企画立案者は、いずれは自分たちの比較優位がどこになるのかということに関する認識を持たなければなりません。もちろんそれは簡単なことではありません。しかし市場メカニズムを見ると、経済的なフィージビリティをはかる一定の尺度がわかり、それに従って新しい産業を興すことが可能だと思えます。また市場のメカニズムを見ることによって、コスト面での考慮も色々出来るようになり、長期的に利用可能な資源の配分がより良くできるようになります。この点について、多くの途上国では、第二次大戦直後や独立時に比べると今ではもっとコストを認識する現実的な態度をとるようになってきました。タイはその意味で典型的な例だと思えます。農業を多様化することに成功し、新しい農産品が市場で競争力を持つようになってきました。ですから、注意深く調整をとり、計画と市場メカニズムの組み合わせを考えることが必要になります。ただ、民間の市場メカニズムを重視するというイデオロ

ギー的なアプローチをとるだけでは、特に開発途上国においては十分ではないのです。それからもう一つ申し上げておきたい点は、経営の民営化というのも有用なことであります。ただし、所有の民営化は社会的な不平等が起こるといふこともありますので、経営の民営化と、所有の民営化は分けて考える必要があります。

—メンドーサ(フィリピン) 私は、まずサユティさんが、人造りということは結局のところは人間なんだとおっしゃったことに、非常に感銘を受けております。この点こそ深く認識すべき点だと思います。国際的な場で人造りを討議すると、多分、これはエコノミストの支配が強いからだと思うのですが、人的資源を何か生産の要素の一つとして受け取る傾向があるようです。しかし、人造りのセミナーを行うに当たり、まず認識すべき点は、人的資源は人間であるということ、手段ではなく目的であるということに常に念頭に置くべきだと考えております。そして、途上国がこれから先進国から協力を受けるにあたってパートナーシップの精神に基づいて遂行することが大切であり、技術を移転する場合にも、それが受け入れる国の文化と伝統に合致したものであるということを確認しなくてはいけないと思います。

—議長 私も、エコノミストの一人でありますので、いわゆる人的な資源を生産の要素の一つとして考えがちですが、一つ申し上げたい点は、約1カ月前に、日本労働研究所が、労働省の後援を得て、エコノミストを集めまして会議を開いた時に、人的資源は経済開発の手段だけではない、そして人的資源の開発は、それ自体が目的であるという合意がされたことです。このシンポジウムでも、また将来もこれを常に念頭に置いておく必要があると思います。私どもが本当に目指しているのは、技術のみを強調するのではなく、感情と心、人間が持っているそのようなものをすべて考慮に入れて、現在変化しつつあるアセアン・太平洋地域の人造りを考えていきたいと思っております。何かコメント、質問ありますでしょうか。

—オールドハム(カナダ) ただいまの点について、私は人的資源という言葉自体、やめた方がいいのではないかと、よく思うのです。リソースという言葉を使いますと、お金、土地などの生産手段と同列に人間が並んでしまうからです。生産をやめたり、生産の形を変えると、今まであったリソースは使わなくなる。つまりお金はカットし土地は売る、そして人も要らなくなるから、追い出してしまふということになります。こういうやり方が人について行われるのは、とても受け入れられることではありませんので、用語を少し工夫した方がいいのではないのでしょうか。

—議長 私ども、アジア・太平洋地域の人間というのは大変柔軟な人間ですから、今のご発言は十分に考慮したいと思っております。

-川野 私は、日本に來ている留学生のお世話をする団体の手伝いをしてありますが、海外からの出席者の皆様に対して、質問させていただきたいと思います。それは "Human Resources Development" という場合に、内容的には2つあると思います。まず、先進国において既に実現している技術知識を受け継ぐ、そのための訓練・教育をするということが1つ、もう一つは、その既存の知識と技術を打ち破って新しい発展をするということではないかと思います。ここで問題になっているのは、第1のケースでしょうが、問題はそのカテゴリーの教育を受ける人間をどのように発見するかということです。日本ではポテンシャルな能力を持った人間を発見することについて、義務教育があり、非常に厳しい入学試験があります。しかし、日本に來ている留学生について、そのファミリー・バックグラウンドを見ますと非常に恵まれている。すなわち、恵まれた地位の人々しか教育を受ける機会がないのではないかという疑念を持ちます。日本では、テストの結果が非常に重視され、不正が許されないのはもちろん、ファミリー・バックグラウンドも役に立ちません。これがポテンシャルな人材を発見する1つの条件になっていると思いますが、皆さんの国ではいかがでしょうか。

-議長 サユティさん、ただいまのことに関してコメントがございましたか。

-サユティ(インドネシア) インドネシアの場合、最近非常に厳しい試験制度があり、国立大学などの高等教育は少数の人しか受けられません。よって高等教育を受けたいと考えている人たちは、どうしても海外留学の道を求めるようになり、多額の金を使います。インドネシアには、40以上の国立大学高等教育機関がありますが人口の増加が著しく、これだけの大学ではすべての学生を吸収することができないのです。

-サリフティン(マレーシア) 非常に恵まれた家庭環境にある人だけが海外の大学に行けるというのは、マレーシアの場合には当てはまりません。政府の奨学生が海外へ留学するのは、その功績に基づいています。以前は、漁民の息子が医者になるということは考えられませんでした。現在ではかなり一般化しています。マレーシアではそのような状態です。

-議長 時間がなくなりましたので、他の発言はこの2日間の会議の席上において取りあげることとし、これを持ちまして午前の会議を終了します。

7. 国別報告

7.1. 国別報告（日本A）

「わが国の人造り協力政策」

外務省経済協力局長

藤 田 公 郎

1. 政府開発援助

この報告ではまず、最初に日本政府の経済協力政策全般について述べ、その後、人造りの分野における我々の協力努力について述べる。

日本は、その他の先進工業諸国同様、この数年大幅な財政赤字に苦しんでおり、現在、日本政府にとって最もプライオリティの高い案件は、全面的に政府の歳出を削減しようという財政改革との取り組みである。

このような財政的な制約の中にありながら、経済協力に対する予算は年々引き上げられ、特にこの10年、目覚ましく伸びている。1978年に日本政府は、3年間でODAを倍増する計画を発表した。この計画を達成した後、政府は、現在さらにODAのレベルを引き上げるべく努力している。具体的にはODAの累積額を1981年から85年の5年間に、それに先立つ5年間の2倍にすべく努力を行っている。4月1日より始まっている本会計年度には、わが国政府は、国会に対して、前年比10%増のODA予算を求め、国会はこれをごく最近承認した。支払いベースでは、最新のOECDの統計によると、1983年には、日本のODAのレベルはアメリカ、フランスに次いで第3位となっている。昨年は、我々の暫定的な計算値によると、日本は世界の中でアメリカに次ぐ第2位の援助国となっている。

2. 技術協力

次に、人造りの分野での日本の協力は、主として技術協力を通じて行われてきた。国際協力事業団（JICA）は技術協力をオフィシャルベースで行う中心的な組織として活動しており、年間に途上国から4,500名内外の研修員を受け入れ、また海外に2,000名程度の専門家を派遣している。このような研修プログラム以外に、政府が資金を出している海外青年協力隊のプロジェクトがあり、またJICAのもとで行われている短期間の専門家派遣プログラムがある。また、学生奨学金制度は文部省によって推進されている。

OECDの統計によると、1983年には12,394名の研修員並びに学生が海外から日本に留学し、また、11,094名の専門家並びにボランティアが政府の資金によって、途上国に派遣されている。しかしながら、パーセントで見ると、全ODAに占める技術協力の割合は約10%であり、これは他のDAC諸国の平均シェアの約半分に過ぎない。このような低い数字となっている理由としては、いくつかの制約要因が指摘されており、例えば技術的な能力と言語能力を兼ね備えている人々の数が少ないということも1つの要因である。また、資金協力とは異なり、技術協力の性格上その事業を一挙に拡大するということは容易ではない。

このような状況にはあるものの、技術協力特に人造りの分野における協力は、量的かつ質的な拡充に現在力が入れられており、今後とも日本の経済協力の中でもっとも高いプライオリティが付与されていくであろう。

3. 人造り協力

1981年1月に鈴木前総理がアセアン諸国を訪問した折、人造りの分野は、アセアン諸国への経済技術協力の中で、農業・地域開発、中小企業振興とあわせて重要な分野であることが指摘された。

また、昨年7月、アセアン拡大外相会議が開かれた時に、インドネシアのモフタル外相がイニシアチブをとられ、参加国間での太平洋協力が打ち出されたが、その中で人造り協力はその優先分野として取り上げられた。これに対し、安倍外務大臣は先鞭を切つてこのイニシアチブを支持した。我々が、人造りが社会経済開発の基礎であることを深く確信しているのは、日本の歴史をふり返った時にそう思いばかりではなく、我々が途上国と協力をしてきた経験からもそのように信ずるものである。

事実、アセアン諸国では、人造りプロジェクトや諸計画が順調に実施されてきており、職業訓練センター、教育施設、医療施設、身体障害者のためのリハビリセンターなどが、資金協力と技術協力の組み合わせによって、建設され運営されている。

このように積み重ねられてきた経験を念頭に置きながら、我々が直面している人造りの分野において、幾つかの項目を取りあげてみたい。

- (1) 伝統的に行われてきた分野、あるいは部門に加えて、現在、コンピューター、バイオテクノロジー、素材科学、原子力、環境プランニングなどの新しい協力分野が生まれてきており、これらの分野での協力の需要は高まっている。その背景には、途上国のニーズの多様化があり、これは科学技術の発展から生まれてきたものであると同時に、途上国間での開発段階に差異があるということにも起因している。このような新しい需要にこたえるべく、我々援助国側は、技術協力のメカニズムの拡充と多様化を図っていかなければならないと考えている。
- (2) 新しい形の協力が、最近日本とアセアン諸国の間で生まれてきている。その1つは、技術協力をさまざまな形で組み合わせたものであり、規模を大きくし相関関係を持たせた協力が行われている。先に述べたように、日本の鈴木前総理の呼びかけによって1981年に始まったアセアンの人造りプロジェクトは、この新しいタイプの協力の1つである。この人造りのプログラムの中では5つのセンターが建設され、既に運営されている。これらの5つのセンターは各々独立して運営されているが、沖縄にある連絡センターを中心にお互いに交流を図っている。また、科学技術における日本・アセアン協力は新しいタイプの協力のもう一つの例と言える。また、第3の例として、アセアン青年招聘計画（21世紀のための友情計画）

は文化交流、人的交流を進めながら、あわせて人造りを進めるものである。これら新しいタイプの協力が生まれており、それによって日本側の予算面、実施面での調整が必要となってきたが、しかし、同時にこれら新しいタイプの協力は、技術協力活動に新たな局面を開くものと思われる。

(3) 資金協力と技術協力の組み合わせが、我々の人造り協力政策の中での新しいテーマになっており、このテーマに我々はいつそ力を入れるようになってきている。それは、特に我々の資金援助によって打ち出されているようなプロジェクトを、効率よく運営するためには、このような組み合わせが必要と考えられるからである。

(4) 三角協力、多角協力の形でのプログラムが最近では打ち出されてきており、将来に向かって有望なもの認められている。この形の協力には次の3つのカテゴリーがある。

(a) 第三国研修プログラムを含む地域協力プロジェクト

(b) 援助国ジョイント・プログラム

(c) 人造りにおける太平洋協力

この中で(a)の三角協力について少し説明を加えると、日本はこの協力を第三国研修という形で、1975年から行っており、既に63件の第三国研修の実績がある。このやり方は、途上国に研修センターをつくり、そのセンターで行う研修コースをその自国の国民に対して提供するというものであり、その際にかかる第三国の研修員の旅費及び研修経費は日本政府が負担するというものである。このようなやり方は、途上国間技術協力の実現として、被援助国からは歓迎されており、この途上国間技術協力(TCDC)は国連の決議によって主張されているものである。

4. 太平洋協力

第三国研修という形での三角協力は、アセアン・太平洋協力の中でも応用することができると思われる。私は、アセアン諸国が南太平洋諸国に専門家を派遣する、あるいは南太平洋諸国の研修員が、アセアン諸国の人造りセンターで研修を受ける、そしてその際の費用は日本がサポートをするということを提案したい。そしてこのような協力が行われることによって、将来の大規模な太平洋協力プログラムへの道が築き上げられるのではないと思われる。

中曽根総理は、今年1月、太平洋・オセアニア地域を訪問した際に、日本が南太平洋大学の人造り基金の設立に、資金的に協力することを約束すると同時に、フィジーの看護婦及び医療従事者の訓練センターのための無償協力を約束したが、この訓練センターでは、フィジーの国民ばかりではなく、その他の太平洋諸国の研修員を受け入れることが計画されている。これらは、日本が人造りの面で、太平洋協력에積極的にコミットしていかうとする姿勢のあらわれである。

また、太平洋協力に関するオフィシャル・レベルの会談では、日本は中・長期のプロジェクト

トは短期間の間に実現するものではないが、21世紀へ向かって我々の努力を力づけるようなものと言えよう。

5. 民間部門

日本の人造り協力は政府のみによって行われてきたのではなく、効果的な協力とは、広くコミュニティ全体を包括するようなものでなければならないという考えから、政府は、地方自治体や民間組織の活動を支持してきた。そして、今後も支持してゆくであろう。これらの機関では、人対人の接触を通じて、草の根レベルで活動が行われている。

ここで、今回のシンポジウムの大きなテーマの1つである官民協力について、1つコメントを加えるならば、過去において、政府による技術協力では、主に雇用の拡大を目的とした職業訓練が行われていた。しかし、これだけでは、途上国の収入を増大させるには十分ではなく、途上国の側から、生産技術の移転、あるいは輸出志向型のインフラストラクチャの改善などの経済政策により直接結びついた協力に対する要望が起こった。

これらの要望に対して直接的に応えるものとしては、ジョイント・ベンチャーによる現地調達、現地生産という方法があり、ここで民間部門の果たす役割は非常に大きいのである。

また、先に述べたように、多様化がすすむ途上国のニーズに応えるために民間部門の参加を刺激していく必要が、政府の側で増えていくであろう。そして、このような政府と民間部門の協力を促進するための方法について、このシンポジウムで有意義な討論がなされることを期待している。

6. 受入れ国側の自助努力

技術移転というものは、受入れ側がその技術をマスターした時点ではじめて完成するものである。したがって人造り協力が成功するかどうかは、協力を携わる人々の努力とともに、受入れ国側の自助努力にかかっている。この点に関して、とくに次の2点を強調しておきたい。

- (1) 最初のポイントは、いかにして技術を普及させ、定着させるかという点である。我々は専門家を通じて、一定の数の個人に技術を伝えることが出来るのみであり、その技術を更に広く社会に普及させるためには、受入れ国側のより多くの努力が必要である。中には、ある個人によって習得された技術が、彼個人の財産になってしまい、それを皆で分け合うということをしなないという場合がある。このような場合には、その受入れ国の政府が、技術を共有することを奨励するために、何らかの方策をとるなり、制度的枠組みを作ることが必要だろう。
- (2) 第2点としては、各国の経済開発計画の重要な一部分としての人造りの中・長期戦略をつくることの必要性である。過去においては、プロジェクト志向型の財政計画に力点が置かれ過ぎていたように思われるが、思うに、受入れ国政府は、その社会・経済開発のニーズに見合うような中・長期の人造り計画にもっと重点を置くべきである。そうすることによって、

日本としても協力政策をより効率的、効果的に実施することが出来ると思われる。

7. 結 論

日本は、約100年前に開国して以来、社会の近代化を経済開発に向かって努力を続けてきた。また、同じようなプロセスが、戦後、国の再建と復興のためにとられてきた。そして、発展途上国との経済協力の分野では、日本はほかの援助国のレベルに追いつくべく努力してきた結果今日世界第2位の援助国になっている。

1950年代の終わりから、さまざまな開発や援助の戦略あるいは方法論が工夫されてきたが、その中でもツラ・ギャップ・セオリー、つまり投資と貯蓄のギャップ及び収支のギャップの理論や、ベーシック・ヒューマン・ニーズ戦略などが話し合われてきた。また一方、UNCTADや国連の総会においてさまざまな要望やプログラムがつくられている。このような議論や要望は、一部正当化できるものであるが、援助国と被援助国との間での真の対話の産物でないというところに問題はあるといえる。

人造りは、アセアン諸国とそのパートナーとの間の対話の産物である。したがって私は、今回のシンポジウムが、協力のパートナーとしての我々全員にとって、実際に意味ある実りを生み出すことにつながることを心から望むものである。

7.2. 国別報告 (ブルネイ)

「開発戦略及びプログラム」

外務省 ASEAN 国内事務局長

リム・ジョク・セン

開発者農業局長

ダニアル・ビン・ハジ・ハナフィア

1. ブルネイ王国の面積は 5,765 ㎞² で、そのうちの約 85% は森林地帯である。人口は 1984 年に 21 万 4,100 人で、今後年率 3.5% で増加していくと予想される。

1928 年に石油が発見されるまで、わが国の経済は基本的に農業経済であった。今では、農業は国内総生産の 1% を占めているに過ぎず、一方、石油部門が 71% を占めている。また我々の輸出収入の 99% は石油部門から上がっている。このようにわが国の天然資源は豊富で価値あるものではあるが、無限にあるわけではない。また、わが国の技術開発の水準は伸びてはいるものの、そのペースは十分に速いとはいえない。石油部門が支配的であるということが、ある意味ではわが国の経済・産業の基礎を広げる努力を制約する結果となり、わが国は GDP のレベルは高いにもかかわらず、本質的には開発途上国である。そして他の開発途上国が直面しているのと同じ社会・経済問題のほとんどを共有しているのである。

2. 最近、世界の経済状況及び石油市場の軟化のために、我々の経済も大きな影響を受け、その結果、実質 GDP が 1983-84 年期には衰退した。我々は石油部門以外の経済部門を発展させていかなければならない。そして次期開発計画においては、我々は国民の生活の質を改善するということに焦点を当てていきたいと考えている。また、同時に、経済の構造的な多様化、産業基盤の拡大を図るとともに、国内の食糧生産を自給体制に向けて増加させたいと考えている。
3. 短期的なわが国の開発計画目標は、以下のようなものである。i) 第 1 に、雇用の水準を高く保つこと、そのために雇用創出プロジェクトの実施を行うこと。ii) 農業及び工業の加速的な開発を行って、経済の多様化を図ること。iii) GDP の実質成長率を少なくとも年率 6% のレベルで保つこと。iv) 1 人当たりの国民所得を、少なくとも年率 4% のレベルで増加させること。以上が短期的な開発目標である。
4. 一方、長期的な開発目標としては、次のものがあげられる。i) すべての国民に平等の機会を与え、ブルネイ人があらゆる種類の経済活動に参加できるようにすること。したがって、1 つの経済活動に限られた個人や集団によって独占されるということがないようにしなければ

らない。ii) 幼稚園から大学レベルまでの国家の教育制度を開発し、中でも技術および職業訓練に力点を置くこと。iii) 文化、芸術、慣習を保存し、振興することによって、国家意識の形成を目指すこと。iv) 生活様式として、イスラム教を奨励すること。v) 国全体がバランスのとれた発展を遂げるように、地域開発の過程で格差を是正してゆくこと。vi) 規律のある、ダイナミックで責任感のある社会を育てること。vii) 財政金融政策などを通じて、適度なインフレ率を維持してゆくこと。viii) より包括的な医療制度を導入し、農村診療所などの医療措置を高めること。ix) 生活水準を改善し、投資を奨励するために必要なあらゆる公的な手段を整備すること。

5. ブルネイにおける人造りに関して特筆すべきことは、わが国は非常に若い国民を擁しており、人口の48%が19歳以下の若年層である。また1984年の労働力は8万2,000人と推定され、これが1989年には10万3,000人にのぼるものと見込まれている。労働力の規模が小さいわが国としては、その目標は技術及び労働力のノウハウを高めることにある。これは官民におけるそれぞれのプロセスを通して行うということである。ブルネイは、現在、企業内訓練(インハウス・トレーニング)又は公的な教育訓練を通じて、労働力の技能を強化することに着手している。現在ブルネイでは国家訓練計画によって、企業家及び管理職者のための産業訓練制度が実施されている。また、現在三菱との協力による機械工の技術向上及び訓練計画が行われている。

6. 開発のための技術を今後も強調していかなければならない。そして、国家の技術能力を改善することは我々の大きな責任であり、そのためにも、何らかの場、何らかのメカニズムを作つて、技術移転を助け、育てていかなければならない。

7. 現在、わが国は建国の努力を続けているが、その中で専門分野における技術協力や訓練を一層促進し、わが国の人材の技術的な能力を高めていかなければならない。そのために必要な制度的な枠組みを我々はつくりたいと思っており、また、途上国間技術協力(TCDC計画)に全面的に参加することができるようになるならば、積極的に取組んでいきたいと考えている。

7.3. 国別報告（フィジー）

「フィジーの政府職員における人造り計画と戦略」

人事院次官補

アビサヒメ・トゥドレウ

国立訓練委員会理事

ヘクター・レックス・ハッチ

1. はじめに

組織というものにおいては、その仕組みや目的いかにかわらず、技術や知識・経験という意味において人材を開発していくことは非常に重要な問題である。フィジーは途上国として、やはり的確な人材を効果的に育成してゆく必要がある。そして政府は雇用者として最大のものであるため、国家として人造り計画を持ち、人造りの現場において大きな役割を果たしている。中央政府は、適切な基準を作って公的サービスの効率と経済性を図ろうとしており、公務員の職についても、その職務のパターンの変化に合わせて、将来いろいろな必要性に応え、また責任が果たせるような人材を育成すべく努力をしている。

政府は、人造り計画の地方レベルへの拡大を推進しており、その他にも、政府職外のところで、適格な人材を動員した高令退職者の再雇用による人造りに力を入れ、国全体の発展計画を進めている。

2. 目的

フィジー政府の人造りの機構は、次のような基本的な目的を持っている。第1に、公的サービスの効率と経済性を上げることを目的として訓練を行うこと。第2に、適切な訓練を通じて、民間及び公共の部門でフィジー人が重要な地位を占めるようにできること。第3に、国としての成長と、自然退職などによる需要の変化に対して、公共及び民間の両部門でこれに応えていくこと。以上の3点が基本的な目的である。

3. 人造り計画における方法

(a) 国家マンパワー計画

1960年代における人造り計画は、実質的に国家の開発計画の一部として組み込まれて来ており、公式には1966/70の国家開発5ヶ年計画において初めて位置付けられている。

従って、公的サービス部門における人造り政策の実施に当たっては、多くの政府機関が関係している。そして、人事院がこれらの中央機関としての調整を行っている。

(b) 任用上の訓練（イン・サービス・トレーニング）

フィジーの政府職員に対する人造りに関する訓練では、(i)訓練コース、(ii)OJT、(iii)ジョブ・

ローテーション、(Ⅳ)職務の委譲、(Ⅴ)代理の任命、(Ⅵ)交換計画、(Ⅶ)その他、といった方法がとられており、各々について以下に述べる。

i) 訓練コース

訓練コース、すなわち各種の講座は、まずニーズを分析し、その評価結果に基づいて訓練プログラムを組織し、その人材のパフォーマンスの向上と、将来責任のある職につくために備える。対象となる公務員は国内の訓練機関で訓練を受けるか、または国内で不十分であるときには、オーストラリア、ニュージーランド、イギリス、アメリカ、インドなど海外に派遣される。

訓練コースは、公務員各人とその所属組織のニーズに合った形で計画される。国内の技術系研究センターでは、主に技術レベルでの訓練を行い、南太平洋大学では大学院のレベルでの教育を行っている。

また、フィジー政府の国立訓練センターでは、職業訓練の経験を持ち、海外で各分野の人造りのコースを受けてきたフィジー人の指導員が教育を行っている。その他に、トップ・レベルの訓練や人材開発プログラムも随時行われるが、この場合には、国外から専門家を招いてコースを運営している。

ii) O J T

O J Tは通常の組織のワーク・プログラムの中で継続的に、また長期間にわたって行われるプロセスである。監督者の立場にあるものは、スタッフの能力を向上させるよう、新しい技術を紹介したり、経験者から学ばせるといったことを行っている。

iii) ジョブ・ローテーション

政府職員においては、監督者は部下に対して新しい経験を受けさせるために、仕事のローテーションを行う。そして、新しい責任を果たすという機会を与えることにより、能力の多様性が増す。

IV) 職務の委譲

これは上司が仕事の一部を部下にやらせるものであり、職務を学ばせるという点で有用であると同時に、仕事を委譲された者は、一段階レベルの高い仕事の対処法を新たに学ぶことになる。そして、技能や知識を身につけ、実際に昇進につながるという形になっている。このような職務の委譲は、政府職員のすべてのレベルで行われており、セミフォーマルな形ではあるが、実際、非常に効果を上げている。

V) 代理の任命

この方法は、あるポストにある者が不在または長期欠席などの場合に、代理を立てるということで、実際にポストが補完されるだけでなく、良い訓練の機会となる。大体直属の部下が代理に任命され、その職を通じて、より高い責任を果たすことを学ぶ。

VI) 交換計画