Every human being has some claim of access to the resources necessary to develop himself or herself. This claim is not unqualified, but it is substantial, and its consequence is that rulers and individuals should be prepared to share access to these resources, which in a real sense are the property of humanity as a whole. More specifically, it is in the interest of any nation to take a non-unduly proprietorial attitude to the share of humanity’s resources within its geographical boundaries.

The overseas student program has brought a great many political, economic, educational and other benefits to Australia, particularly in the context of our relations with the countries of the Asian and Pacific region. Many of the benefits cannot be measured in monetary terms, but they are nonetheless very real and, collectively, show that the program has served Australia’s interests well.

Education, specialised training, research and technical assistance are closely linked and fundamentally contribute to the development process. They increase productivity, improve management and contribute to equality. Australia’s strength in some of these fields has already attracted considerable interest from developing countries outside the official program. The share of Australian aid flowing to education, training, research and technical assistance should be increased. Education should be regarded as an export industry in which institutions are encouraged to compete for students and funds. This would require a more positive attitude toward the acceptance of foreign students and the development of linkages between the various education and training systems in Australia and overseas. Scholarships and funds would be allocated to institutions that would contribute to the development of the overseas education and training system. The aim of this program should be not only to provide education to the students of Australia, but also to create an impetus for development in the country to which the students return.


The statements above, succinctly but accurately, reflect the essential essence of two foreign policy reports recently released by the Australian Government. They both focus on the important place that overseas students play in Australia’s international-educational exchanges and in regional economic aid and development programs. One is primarily an educational assessment in both social and economic cost benefit terms (Goldring Report) and the other (Jackson Report) involves inter alia, a business evaluation of Australia’s training and research contributions to the predominantly Asia and Pacific regions. The former tends towards a humanistic, holistic and educational approach and the latter favours a systems manpower analysis and efficiency approach towards somewhat similar problems.

The two documents, with major international implications for the future of Australian tertiary education, were released to the public in May 1984. Both were decided on the next development, as well as the likely future contributions of Australia as a major regional centre for advanced training and research. The Goldring Report recommended overseas students and the Jackson Report on overseas aid were published co-incidentally at a particularly sensitive time when formulating and proof reading immigration policies and community racial attitudes were all receiving increasing attention. The interlink of national policies, immigration procedures, economic and development priorities, not to mention cross-cultural, multicultural, polycultural and perhaps even global trends, has certainly contributed additional incentive to a variety of disparate fields already fuelled by a range of disparate academic and sectional interests. The selective inputs, as submissions to both Committees from many sections of the general public and from interested and ethnic organisations, as well as educational interests, have been considerable. Over four hundred written submissions were received by both Committees. The Jackson Committee on Australia’s Aid Program which took nearly two years to accomplish its tasks. The Goldring Committee on Overseas Students of High Calibre Policy (POSP) received some 280 written submissions and completed its work in about nine months, initially so that any recommended policy changes could be implemented well before the school year commencing in 1985. Unfortunately this was not feasible and likely changes can now only be implemented for the 1986 academic year.
The two reports, in some of their recommenda-
tions, conflict directly with each other. Accordingly
to the government will be faced with making a series
of choices between the merits of recommenda-
tions some of which will invariably cause dissen-
sion amongst various community and educational
groups, especially student organisations and
tertiary sector administrators. For Australian
tertiary educators and students the important
implications and undoubtedly, if their major rec-
ommendations are acted upon will have an influence
well into the next decade. This is precisely what the
Government expected when it first commissioned
the POSG study in September 1983. Its terms of
reference specifically required the Goldring Com-
mittee to consult on the aid program with the Jack-
son Committee on the Australian Government
sponsored students coming to Australia under
Australian Development Assistance Bureau
(ADA B) auspices. To which of the reports
will the Government pay the most attention,
sensitive issues such as fees for overseas students?

The conflict in the two reports is well highlighted
by one of the chairman Involved — Professor John
Goldring, Chairman of the Committee of Review
Private Overseas Student Policy. Goldring commenting
on some unfavourable comparisons made in the
Canberra Times (4 July 1984) on his committee's
report and that of the Jackson

Sir: — Your editorial on overseas students
(The Canberra Times, June 20), in support-
ing the recommendations of the Jackson
Committee on Overseas Aid Policy in respect
of the fees to be charged to overseas stu-
dents, takes a rather critical line. Such a
take-up was considered very carefully, but rejected, by the Commit-
tee of Review of Overseas Student Policy, at which I was Chairman.

Our terms of reference required us to consult with the Jackson Committee. Consultations
could not resolve the differences between us
over the question of "full-cost" recovery.

Those terms of reference precluded our committee
from making any recommenda-
tion which would increase public-sector out-
taxes. The Jackson Committee had made
such a recommendation in its report.

We were also required to recommend ways of encouraging
overseas students to study without reducing opportunities for Australian
students. Our recommendations attempt to reconcile
these three objectives.

Even if the whole of the present subsidy for overseas students were devoted to scholar-
ships for students overseas, our com-
mittee was convinced that a very substantial proportion of students at present
in Australia would be forced to return home, as the scholarship would be available
to less than half the present number of students.

It is clear that the reintroduction of tuition
fees for tertiary studies in Australia is politi-
cally unacceptable to any major party.

To dilute an education sector's standards of excellence to whether or not it is controlled
by market forces is unrealistic. The universi-
ties of most of the countries of continental
Europe are free, or charge only nominal fees, yet no reasonable person believes that
their standards are low. Academic excellence
does not need to be the result of the market forces.

Education, especially tertiary education, re-
sues special resources: highly trained and
specialised teachers; equipment; and build-
ings. These cannot be acquired overnight, nor can they easily be disposed of when
demand slackens.

Given the political impossibility of allowing market forces to dictate education policies completely, these
implications become very important, and one which the committee rejected, it
would be neither desirable nor practical to
introduce a market-based element into only
some areas of educational policy, as this
would cause a greater "distortions" than
are present now.

A further argument against adoption of a
policy based on the cost principle is that
this requires accurate calculation of both the costs and benefits involved.

Our report, "Mutual Advantages", decides con-
siderable attention to the problem of calculat-
ing the costs and benefits of the private-
overseas-student program. Such calcu-
lations are at best imprecise, and are
influenced by the basis upon which the cal-
culations are made. Like most accounting
concepts, they can be adapted to produce
a desired result. To date, no uniform method has been found which is acceptable to
any educational planning body in Australia.

The Jackson Report was commissioned by the Liberal-NCP Government to look into whether
there were ways of providing government aid regionally, fol-
loowing economic opportunities for Australian busi-
ess, not to reduce the problems of Third World;
aid and foreign policy interests of the government
of the day. Only after one-tenth of the entire Jack-
on Report focuses directly on Australian aid, through educational and training contributions,
with of course considerable implications for ter-
ary education institutions. But this section of the
report, on education, represents one of its major
contributions. For convenience, because the Gold-
ing Report focuses exclusively on overseas student, the
major sector, particularly tertiary training and the impact
of foreign student studies in Australia and their
likely contributions upon their returning home, it
will be considered in more detail after the Jackson

The Jackson Report

The imposition of full cost fees for overseas stu-
dents, that is moving up from the present one-third
charge — it was expected that the extra income generated, from the higher fee
charges, would pay for deliberately increasing overall the number of places available for a greater
number of foreign students. However, the increase
in fees would be on an incremental basis being gradually phased in so that overseas students
would only be paying the full cost of their Austra-
lian education by the mid 1980s. Accordingly, by
then it would be anticipated that some 10,000 over-
seas students would be supported by a hierarchi-
cal scholarship scheme scaled by the application
of a family means test. The Jackson Committee
was anxious that the present disguised financial
subsidy to overseas students be removed. By taking some two-thirds of the full costs of their Australian
education, should be more clearly identified. And, it
believed, should not be hidden as an educational subsidy because Australia currently does not receive
adequate international recognition for its present aid contribution to regional development.
The particular educational recommendations of the Jackson Committee are specified as follows:

1. The hidden subsidy to developing coun-
try students' education should be made explicit and confirmed as official develop-
ment assistance.
2. A liberal policy toward accepting foreign students should be adopted taking aca-
demic performance, cost-effectiveness and available places into consideration.
3. The overseas student charge should gradually be increased to full cost levels.
4. The fee charged should accrue to the institutions that the students attended in order to build up appropriate courses for such students and ensure there are adequate numbers of places available without cost to the tax-
payers, and encourage the development of "export" sector.
5. To improve the balance of student intake and offset rising charges an expanded scholarship scheme should be deve-
loped, within the existing aid budget constraints, on the following lines:
(a) The government-to-government scheme by which students are nom-
nated for scholarships should con-
(continues on p. 18)
...the indications are that compared to the United States and the main European nations, Australia attracts a relatively low number of foreign students. Moreover, in contrast to the situation in a number of countries, the proportion of foreign students in Australian tertiary institutions declined during the 1970s and there has been some recovery since 1980. The demand for education in Australia, particularly by students from the Asia region is likely to be quite large in the next 20 or so years.

One of the more interesting criticisms which the Jackson Report makes of Australian universities and their contribution to overseas aid and development, reflects on the quality and quantity of postgraduate training presently being offered. Overt bureaucratic administration of immigration procedures, indifferent admissions and selection procedures, and insufficient scholarship allocations may be harming the recruitment of high quality overseas students to Australia when compared to facilities available elsewhere.

Australia is missing out on some of the best overseas students because university and immigrant procedures are excessively bureaucratic and because its Ph.D. structure has failed to remain in touch with contemporary practices. Discouraging the entry of foreign students harms relations, deprives the community of the benefits to be gained from the natural and applied sciences first and the social sciences second!

Perhaps the Jackson Committee is unaware or unclear that some masters degrees or their equivalents vary considerably within Australia as between various institutions and not necessarily only those in universities in NSW. The Committee overlooked the importance of overseas students programs for overseas students. The Bachelor of Education degrees from Melbourne, La Trobe and Monash universities are considerably in their quality with each other as do the quality of the Masters of Educational Studies, Masters of Education or Masters of Arts in a number of universities. One of these Monash Masters degrees is certainly akin to the Bachelor of Education and Masters levels, within the Australian educational field do not easily differ- entiate - accordingly students expected to distinguish qualitatively between the postgraduate offerings of various institutions. Perhaps they are saving for future years, architecture, science and business studies has during the past decade led to a concentration of overseas students in the natural and applied sciences first and the social sciences second!

The Goldring Report

Australia's overseas student program has deve-lop ed over the past few years into a major export sector of education institutions into a major export sector to meet the large actual and potential demand for education in diverse areas and disciplines. However, the Jackson Committee noted, that some Australian universities (in NSW) had actually deve-loped graduate degree programs particularly at the diploma or masters level for overseas students in emigration (or imitation) of North American institutions. These programs contempl ated to the needs of the developing countries were sometimes not available for Australian students. However the Committee also warned that they did not always attract the best overseas students and the degrees earned had little more recognition than they would have if completed at universities at home... nor do they lead to doctoral degrees. Accordingly the best graduates from Asia prefer to go to the United States.

Australia would need to drastically reform its system of higher degree training if it hoped to compete with other countries particularly the United States and European countries and "developing" education institutions into a major export sector to meet the large actual and potential demand for education in diverse areas and disciplines. However, the Jackson Committee noted, that some Australian universities (in NSW) had actually deve-loped graduate degree programs particularly at the diploma or masters level for overseas students in emigration (or imitation) of North American institutions. These programs contemplated to the needs of the developing countries' students were sometimes not available for Australian students. However the Committee also warned that they did not always attract the best overseas students and the degrees earned had little more recognition than they would have if completed at universities at home... nor do they lead to doctoral degrees. Accordingly the best graduates from Asia prefer to go to the United States.

The Committee noted a variety of submissions made to it which drew attention to Australia's old fashioned system of postgraduate education. It suggested that doctoral studies included course work as well as thesis, or even entirely coursework programs had been introduced and worked success-fully for many years in other countries. These are described as programs designed to meet the demand for adequate training in disciplines that have expanded in knowledge in the past few decades. Australian doctorates are still largely modeled on the traditional British system of pure and often prolonged (5 or more years) research although some leading British universities have abandoned this approach...

...many overseas students want graduate course work to provide a breadth of outlook and analytical training, and to reinforce the formal training of their undergraduate stu-dies at home. They do not seek highly speci-alized research expertise. In addition, there has been criticism, especially from Asian countries, that takes to complete research degrees in Australia and of the regulations governing enrol-lment and examination for such degrees. These shortcomings are compared to the procedures of North American institutions.

The survey revealed that three-quarters of the overseas students in Australia were aged between 17 and 23 years, and a little over a third of them were women. About half came from Malaysia, with the next largest country groups coming from Hong Kong, Indonesia, Singapore and Fiji. Only a small proportion had parents who had reached a tertiary level of education. Three-quarters of them were married.

The survey revealed that overseas students in Australia were aged between 17 and 23 years, and a little over a third of them were women. About half came from Malaysia, with the next largest country groups coming from Hong Kong, Indonesia, Singapore and Fiji. Only a small proportion had parents who had reached a tertiary level of education. Three-quarters of them were married.

The survey revealed that overseas students in Australia were aged between 17 and 23 years, and a little over a third of them were women. About half came from Malaysia, with the next largest country groups coming from Hong Kong, Indonesia, Singapore and Fiji. Only a small proportion had parents who had reached a tertiary level of education. Three-quarters of them were married.

The survey revealed that overseas students in Australia were aged between 17 and 23 years, and a little over a third of them were women. About half came from Malaysia, with the next largest country groups coming from Hong Kong, Indonesia, Singapore and Fiji. Only a small proportion had parents who had reached a tertiary level of education. Three-quarters of them were married.

The survey revealed that overseas students in Australia were aged between 17 and 23 years, and a little over a third of them were women. About half came from Malaysia, with the next largest country groups coming from Hong Kong, Indonesia, Singapore and Fiji. Only a small proportion had parents who had reached a tertiary level of education. Three-quarters of them were married.
which were reflective of the various current difficulties, towards which the Goldring Committee directed its attention. It took account of the unseas being overcome by overseas students, academics and teachers, and by student associations, especially overseas student groups, towards the difficulties developing school staff, and satisfied the program for receiving, sustaining and training students from predominantly Asian countries without disclaiming its intentions.

Many complaints were made to the Goldring Committee that the increasing influx of overseas students, in a rise of 10% between 1982 and 1983, had strained the resources of some tertiary institutions. It was said that the presence of overseas students contributed directly to the displacement of otherwise qualified Australian students who reportedly were believed by some complaints to be unable to compete with or outshine applicants who had achieved better HSC results! The considerable build up in numbers of overseas secondary students certainly since 1982 has been and will be contributing to the increasing demand for tertiary places in 1985 and 1986 as these students complete their year 12 studies and successfully pass HSC examinations. This induced external pressure for a crucial time when the Australian Federal and State Governments are now being faced with catering to the demographic realities of many more Australian high school students available to proceed to further education — or an escalating throughput due to tertiary expansion in the past five or ten years ago.

Added to the general demographic factors are those specifically concerning government educational policy and Labor Party political promises which encourage university students to stay in school longer thus hopefully enabling them to go on to further and more advanced levels of education. In addition, there is that additional potential tertiary enrolment the so-called mature or young middle-aged persons (persuaded as delayed or late bloomers to enter university) there are the considerations from both the Australian Government’s viewpoint as the receiving host country as well as those of the sending or client governments. In respect of male and female Australian government sponsored overseas students, particularly those selected by the Overseas Student Charge (OSC), contradicts either Australian or State anti-discrimination legislation. Australian resident students are not advantaged simply because of their resident status, over and against those coming to Australia from overseas for the primary purpose of receiving an education or taking part in a training program. There is a single brief paragraph in the Goldring Report which draws attention to this matter. It is a sensitive topic and one which perhaps the Committee felt that judiciously there was little else to say on the matter at this particular time. In view of some pertinent court cases which have emerged during the past two years against foreign students, in litigation with universities, this view may be over-optimistic.

The Goldring Report briefly notes:

The Committee is satisfied that neither the Overseas Student Charge nor any of the proposals made in this report treat overseas students unfairly. There are no discriminatory concepts or policies which discriminate on grounds which are unlawful under the legislation of the Australian State. That legislation makes it unlawful to discriminate on grounds which include race, or sex, or national origin. The Committee has been careful to ensure that no provision of the proposals, as it has been, is to be unlawful, and has been careful in implementing the proposals it has made, to avoid discriminatory acts, or practices.

There is an overwhelming concentration of educational development aid in favour of males and obvious neglect or inability to cater for female students in Australia. There is the uncertainty as to whether the establishment of sub quotas is the uncertainty as to whether the establishment of sub quotas is the outcome of a specific challenge. It perhaps should be remembered, based on 1982 overseas student census, that virtually 50% of the total tertiary and post-secondary students come from Asia, some 5% from Oceans and 5% from the rest of the world. Of the total numbers 75% are of Chinese ethnic-racial origin, irrespective of whether from Malaysia, Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan or China proper i.e. PRC. So whatever legal challenge could be mounted — it is most likely would affect to some part of its case the basis of racial-ethnic discrimination.

In regard to sexual discrimination and Australian Government sponsored students and trainees from overseas, if one enquires as to the balance between awards made to males and females, there apparently is at first glance a gross disproportion of males to females, coming to Australia. There are perhaps a number of valid or plausible administrative, social, cultural and political and economic factors which may be in the so-called male or female applicant, and female applicant, and the percentages had moved slightly higher, being 10% in 1982, while in 1985, with the overwhelming concentration of educational development aid in favour of males and obvious neglect or inability to cater for female students in Australia, it is expected to be, this would mean that it could amount to 20% of the overall of sub quotas to 50% of the foreign students in Australia. If this was added, the estimated average annual subsistence expenditure, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that more than half of a families’ annual income would be expected to support their family, and in some of the foreign students in Australia, of the foreign students in Australia.

The financial attraction of studying in Australia has been enhanced in recent years by relative cost comparisons. The introduction of full fees by British in 1980 and also in some Canadian provinces and provinces of Papua New Guinea. The investment of overseas students, in all its dimensions, has been diversified some students to Australia especially those from Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia.

Apart from the capacity of students and their families to pay either proportionate or full costs for the financial costs of the overseas student programs to the Australian government, that is ultimately to the Australian taxpayer, as well as the income retained or, perhaps, need a careful reappraisal in the light of Australia’s signing and participation in international commitments. There is an increasing number of sexual discrimination clauses firmly rooted in the legal documents.

Increase: Personal Costs: Institutional Charges: National Income and Expenditure

The Committee was charged with investigating the financial costs of the overseas student programs to the Australian government, that is ultimately to the Australian taxpayer, as well as the income retained or, perhaps, need a careful reappraisal in the light of Australia’s signing and participation in international commitments. There is an increasing number of sexual discrimination clauses firmly rooted in the legal documents.
IAESR in undertaking its study considered a number of analytical models, systems of costing and discussed a variety of differing assumptions in order to make its report in the same year. Over $16 million was obtained in revenue from the OSC, and $105 million was spent by students variously for overseas travel expenses, predominantly accommodation, food, books and writing materials, travel expenses and even tourism to see Australia. The first report in chapter 6, Benefits and Costs, goes into some detail in an attempt to provide an adequate balance sheet of how what is obviously an imprisonment to see who is paying whom for what, not to mention why and how and where. If one crudely estimates the so-called full cost of educating all the overseas students, debiting various types of receipts, the balance is $70 million paid out by Australia. The Committee evidently experienced some difficulty in arriving at meaningful figures especially estimating those for full cost of educating the overseas student presence in the tertiary sector, as well as those costs to be attributed to secondary students. The tertiary cost per student calculation is based on a figure of $9,500 general recurrent cost plus $405 capital cost (universities) and $3,300 plus $368 respectively for CAE students. An amount of approximately $105 million was directly spent on goods and services by overseas students, predominantly accommodation, food, books and writing materials amounting to over $85 million. The report of IAESR was not evidently in full accord with the Goldring Committee's own evaluation of the cost benefits involved in subsidising some of the parts of the analysis provided by IAESR.

The IAESR suggested that $105 million (personal outlay by overseas students) would pay for only goods and services for overseas students. It further indicated that 'no value can be ascribed to it beyond any foreign exchange advantage equivalent for $1 million in tourist promotion savings'.

The Goldring Committee was unable to accept the proposition that out of $105 million spent by overseas students in Australia, less than 1% could be counted towards revenue and therefore offer compensation whereby the government would leverage $70 million. In partial rejection of its commissioned study by IAESR, the Goldring Committee stated:

The above notwithstanding, the Committee does not agree with the proposition advanced in the paper commissioned from the Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research (IAESR) in Melbourne (see Appendix H) that the $105m pays only for the goods and services consumed, and that no value can be ascribed to it beyond any foreign exchange advantage equivalent for $1m in tourist promotion savings. The Committee finds it difficult to indicate that it is beneficial to spend money on promoting tourism but that no value should be ascribed to the result of a programme of distortions in the Australian economy due to the pervasive nature of taxes, tariffs, quotas, etc. A student who buys $2000 worth of goods is contributing a share of that amount to consumption of those indirect taxes. Even when a student purchases a book, a computer or any other commodities, he or she is contributing to the income of the landlord who provides housing, and produces a net gain to revenue. It is also highly unlikely that there would not be some net revenue generated and that there would be no restriction or regulations would be involved, and educational institutions would have to compete in the market place for overseas students and the income they would bring. They might thus be obtained in such a way ultimately into the Government coffers. It is service industries of this sort which make up most of Australia's export industries. Even the notion of education as a valuable commodity, an investment for the future was considered in terms of the students own use and as a potential benefit to Australia. The marketing, merchandising and application of skills learnt in Australia, in an environment sensitive were considered by the Goldring Committee in somewhat similar terms (as did the Jackes Committee). The concept of education as a valuable commodity was considered to be a source of educational aid as part and parcel of trade and development.

The concept of the user-pays argument is that education is a valuable commodity which can be sold at substantially reduced price and generate employment for Australians. As the Australian economy gains through a lengthy period. It is service industries of this sort which make up most of Australia's export industries, like Australia, well endowed as it is with educational resources. Our educational sector should support industry and its product sold to anyone able and willing to pay. To other restrictions of regulations would be involved, and educational institutions would have to compete in the market place for overseas students and the income they would bring. They might thus be obtained in such a way to generate more consumer revenue as well as competitive to demand in consumer markets.

However, the Goldring Committee rejected this user pays marketing approach believing it too difficult to implement effectively. Ultimately this would have necessitated an entire restructuring of Australia's higher education system, so that it would reflect the entrepreneurial and business approach which characterises some aspects of current American university educational policy. A second competition market approach would have introduced a high factor of unpredictability into the numbers and resources equation of Australian universities. There could at times be large influxes of overseas students into certain campuses under a marketing approach. This might have upset any preordained planning and produce unacceptable balances between Australia and overseas students, and likely affect the numbers of overseas students if any costs were made effective. Partly in justification for its decision to recommend that some charges should be made, the Goldring Committee rejected the suggestion that any non-citizen has an automatic entitlement to a free education in Australia, and saw, in the continuation of a carefully calculated OSC, a more economical and diplomatic option rather than an outright full cost fee imposition. It recognised that there is no equivalence on the value of some of the assumptions underlying Australian policy, if any, that the amount which ultimately went into the OSC, or scholarships provided to them, and at the very least, earned their keep. Tertiary institutions are being asked to undertake this in their offer of scholarships and part time work to postgraduates. The Committee also acknowledged that they do constitute a source of skilled research labour which provides significant (unquantifiable) benefits to the Australian community and do at least pay their way.

The Committee also considered whether the government should proceed to a full cost recovery scheme, similar to that being effected currently in Britain, which says that the user pays. Here the notion of education as a valuable commodity, an investment for the future was considered in terms of students own use and as a potential benefit to Australia. The marketing, merchandising and application of skills learnt in Australia, in an entrepreneurial sense were considered by the Goldring Committee in somewhat similar terms (as did the Jackes Committee). The concept of education as a valuable commodity was considered to be a source of educational aid as part and parcel of trade and development.

The concept of the user-pays argument is that education is a valuable commodity which can be sold at substantially reduced price and generate employment for Australians. As the Australian economy gains through a lengthy period. It is service industries of this sort which make up most of Australia's export industries, like Australia, well endowed as it is with educational resources. Our educational sector should support industry and its product sold to anyone able and willing to pay. To other restrictions of regulations would be involved, and educational institutions would have to compete in the market place for overseas students and the income they would bring. They might thus be obtained in such a way to generate more consumer revenue as well as competitive to demand in consumer markets.

The Committee addressed itself to a variety of so-called unquantifiable benefits which it believed would accrue to Australia by having foreign students on its campuses, also warning that Australia has yet to consider the full implications of the variety of values and activities within her own population and there is little pockets of racism among others.

The more general of educational benefits came under the heading of an enrichment of the educational environment which it says could "challenge some of the assumptions underlying Australian cultural in a way which is stimulating to healthy intellectual growth". A topical and much more pungent retort to this somewhat open-ended approach is which characterises some aspects of current Australian university educational policy. A second competition market approach would have introduced a high factor of unpredictability into the numbers and resources equation of Australian universities. There could at times be large influxes of overseas students into certain campuses under a marketing approach. This might have upset any preordained planning and produce unacceptable balances between Australia and overseas students, and likely affect the numbers of overseas students if any costs were made effective. Partly in justification for its decision to recommend that some charges should be made, the Goldring Committee rejected the suggestion that any non-citizen has an automatic entitlement to a free education in Australia, and saw, in the continuation of a carefully calculated OSC, a more economical and diplomatic option rather than an outright full cost fee imposition. It recognised that there is no equivalence on the value of some of the assumptions underlying Australian policy, if any, that the amount which ultimately went into the OSC, or scholarships provided to them, and at the very least, earned their keep. Tertiary institutions are being asked to undertake this in their offer of scholarships and part time work to postgraduates. The Committee also acknowledged that they do constitute a source of skilled research labour which provides significant (unquantifiable) benefits to the Australian community and do at least pay their way. Therefore, in conclusion of a careful study, the Goldring Committee recommended that all foreign students be made to pay a fee.

Social and Cultural Benefits

The Committee addressed itself to a variety of so-called unquantifiable benefits which it believed would accrue to Australia by having foreign students on its campuses, also warning that Australia has yet to consider the full implications of the variety of values and activities within her own population and there is little pockets of racism among others.

The more general of educational benefits came under the heading of an enrichment of the educational environment which it says could challenge some of the assumptions underlying Australian cultural in a way which is stimulating to healthy intellectual growth. A topical and much more pungent retort to this somewhat open-ended approach is which characterises some aspects of current American university educational policy. A second competition market approach would have introduced a high factor of unpredictability into the numbers and resources equation of Australian universities. There could at times be large influxes of overseas students into certain campuses under a marketing approach. This might have upset any preordained planning and produce unacceptable balances between Australia and overseas students, and likely affect the numbers of overseas students if any costs were made effective. Partly in justification for its decision to recommend that some charges should be made, the Goldring Committee rejected the suggestion that any non-citizen has an automatic entitlement to a free education in Australia, and saw, in the continuation of a carefully calculated OSC, a more economical and diplomatic option rather than an outright full cost fee imposition. It recognised that there is no equivalence on the value of some of the assumptions underlying Australian policy, if any, that the amount which ultimately went into the OSC, or scholarships provided to them, and at the very least, earned their keep. Tertiary institutions are being asked to undertake this in their offer of scholarships and part time work to postgraduates. The Committee also acknowledged that they do constitute a source of skilled research labour which provides significant (unquantifiable) benefits to the Australian community and do at least pay their way.

Therefore, in conclusion of a careful study, the Goldring Committee recommended that all foreign students be made to pay a fee.
Approximately one in four students at Deakin, and at the residential college, is from overseas. This, I believe, is an unacceptably high proportion.

Every year thousands of HSC leavers are being denied places in Australian universities and colleges because few of places allocated to overseas students.

Australian applications for tertiary education are rapidly increasing each year. Does onlookers only one observer feel that young country cannot provide them with tertiary education and yet is willing to set aside one in four places to overseas students.

Asian students pay only $265 a year to attend Australian universities while the Government pays well over $3000 to educate an Australian student for one year. 'Asian students are paying millions of dollars each year to educate overseas students.

The Goldring Committee, whose report was released in May, have more up-to-date figures available for men. To the extent possible, overseas governments should be made aware of Australia's requirement for equal opportunities for women which are at least equal to those available for men. To the extent possible, overseas governments should be made aware of Australia's requirement for equal opportunities for women.

Perhaps the most cogent service the Goldring Report is to have faced head on the fact that, in the short run, Australia's financial capacity is limited to increase the number of overseas students without receiving special funding or alternatively imposing harsh draconian revenue raising measures. Its capacity in the immediate to the long term is constrained due to the demographic and social factors currently at work within Australia. It may face, in addition, the backlash on women, as well as heightened social and racial tensions in many of the regional student donor countries due to ethnic as well as demographic factors.

The Committee considers that, subject to considerations of distributional equity, the Goldring Report perhaps is less cautious, pertinently and adventurously stating:

The Committee considers that, subject to considerations of distributional equity, the Goldring Report perhaps is less cautious, pertinently and adventurously stating:

The Committee used interestingly a phrase distributional equity is to have faced head on the fact that, in the short run, Australia's financial capacity is limited to increase the number of overseas students without receiving special funding or alternatively imposing harsh draconian revenue raising measures. Its capacity in the immediate to the long term is constrained due to the demographic and social factors currently at work within Australia. It may face, in addition, the backlash on women, as well as heightened social and racial tensions in many of the regional student donor countries due to ethnic as well as demographic factors.

In attempting to set some priorities in determining distributional equity the Committee examined but rejected the use of particular global indexes to ascertain appropriate scales of per capita income or living standards and utilised economic data to apply a differential preference. It is not known if the interesting and useful Physical Quality of Life Index (POLI) from the World Resources Institute (Washington, DC, USA) was considered by the Committee. The POLI utilises a variety of social, educational, health, and medical data to provide a practical reference scale. This could be referred to as the pedagogical rabbit shoals, some clearly visible such as an increasing OCCI feature and those invisible obstacles marked by racism and exclusiveness — the Committee has cautiously advised the Government to pursue a five-fold specific program of development encompassed by the key concepts to:

- allocate more funds for education and research
- eliminate bureaucratic barriers placed in the way of overseas students seeking access to Australian educational institutions
- provide ... better information overseas about the nature and range of educational programs available in Australia, and increased efforts to ensure recognition of all Australian qualifications in the conditions of the countries of origin
- maintain ... the cost of education in Australia at a level which does not deter overseas students and the recovery of a cost relationship to the extent possible, thus the levitational skills of an experienced academicist, is required.
- provide ... proper support for overseas students in Australia.

Theoretical but Controversial Implications

Professor John Goldring in his letter to The Canberra Times (4 July 1984), in explanation regarding his Committee's recommendations, noted that:

Our report criticises the self centred attitude which has characterised the debate with respect to overseas students in the past. Australia must recognise its role as part of the world community while preserving the...
The Goldring Report, unlike the Jackson Report, did not necessarily see Australian tertiary (or even secondary) institutions as an educational farm or as an intellectual labour park to be exploited for a regular and expanding cash crop by selling, their pupils and training facilities to medically and technologically and talent starved Pacific and Asian countries.

As an indirect consequence of the two reports a flurry of commercial propositions were quickly generated. These included the concept of Australia extending specific training facilities, particularly English language courses, for overseas students on a calculated income production basis, as suggested by the Jackson Report. However, there was a tacit, curiously sanely suggested by an influential Australian spokesman for one of the major professions to which overseas students were, with few exceptions, almost totally and vigorously excluded. This proposal concerned the medical profession and the training institution in Australia of a corps of foreign doctors for service in their home countries. Dr Alister Brass, the editor of the Medical Journal of Australia, in the July 1984 issue, put forward the idea in an article entitled Medical manpower — a modest proposal. He envisaged a significant input of many Australian medical schools and a likely forthcoming glut of doctors spilling onto a overcrowded and demoralised profession. Rather than the fashionable closure of say four out of the ten medical schools in Australia, Dr Brass argued why not open up these training facilities to a specific group of overseas students who could well provide a useful option and boomerang the benefits back home directly upon completion of their Australian medical studies.

He notes, regarding the problem of over productive capacity in Australia:

"There is, however, an attractive and plausible solution, which will not only achieve the required cuts in medical manpower in Australia, but keep our teachers and all our medical schools fully employed — and make a transfonnation out of our current position in an easy way: put overseas students into our ten medical schools and cut the number by 20% (Report)."

There are, however, two specific conditions that must be met. Firstly, that the overseas students be assured a good education to the visiting Americans; and, secondly, that half of the places available in Australian Medical Schools should be open up to young Australians who are not necessarily going to obtain a third rate education in the rum belt diploma factories. The cost benefit aspects of the American importation scheme are succinctly put in the Goldring Report: "If we wish to open up to young Americans, who are now open to tertiary students is apparently not anathema to the non-Labor opposition. At the time of writing it appears that Cabinet may be asked to consider the recommendations contained in the two reports. The inter-departmental committee consisted of representatives from Foreign Affairs, Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Education and Youth Affairs, as well as Employment and Industrial Relations. The Prime Minister and Cabinet, because of the forth coming federal election and the instability of the inter-departmental committee to make any firm recommendations, but they do not appear as an aid charge. Unfortunately, while conceived of originally as a somewhat facetious idea, and one reflecting particular and parochial viewpoints, there are certainly some academics and businessmen, not, to mention public servants, who still see commercial merit in re-segregating overseas students in Australia and concentrating them in a major institution designed exclusively for their particular needs.

Conclusion

On receiving the reports of the Jackson and Goldring Committees, the Government of the day, after some deliberation, decided to introduce in June 1984 an interdepartmental committee to reconcile the different and often conflicting recommendations contained in the two reports. The inter-departmental committee consisted of representatives from Foreign Affairs, Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Education and Youth Affairs, as well as Employment and Industrial Relations, the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Because of the forthcoming federal election and the instability of the inter-departmental committee to make any firm recommendations, but they do not appear as an aid charge. Unfortunately, while conceived of originally as a somewhat facetious idea, and one reflecting particular and parochial viewpoints, there are certainly some academics and businessmen, not, to mention public servants, who still see commercial merit in re-segregating overseas students in Australia and concentrating them in a major institution designed exclusively for their particular needs.

The Jackson Report has found some general favour by the present federal parliamentary opposition. The imposition ultimately of full cost fees for overseas students is apparently not anathema to the non-Labor Opposition. At the time of writing the Labor Party has not made any major pronouncement on this matter and as previously it appears that Cabinet may be asked to arbitrate between the various options presented to it by the interdepartmental committee which has received the reviews without deciding upon specific courses of action. Perhaps at least there is one visible, important and tangible effect that both reviews have had on the decision making activities of the Government. This concerns the fact that the education budget will no longer appear, in the so-called hidden financial subsidy for private overseas students which as occurred in the past.

About two-thirds of the full costs of educating overseas students amounts to an ex gratia payment by the Australian taxpayer (without accounting for the amount brought in by the students as remittances from overseas students' remittances). For the budget year 1984-85 the cost of educating foreign students (primarily from developing countries) will be specifically designated as an aid charge through the Australian Development Assistance Bureau (ADAB) budget. For the year 1984-85 this previously hidden subsidy of some $956 million for tertiary students will appear as an aid charge. However, some $323 million dollars will be raised by the overseas student charge or so-called visa fee. In 1985 postgraduate students (M.A., Ph.D.) will pay $3,350 in fees, while $2,900 will be charged to undergraduates doing medicine, dentistry and veterinary science. All other undergraduates will pay $2,500 for their education fees. These figures, which will be applicable in January 1985, represent an increase of 15% on charges which were increased in 1983-84. The quota for new private overseas students entering Australia in 1985 will be 2,000 for secondary students and 1,500 for tertiary students.

This should accommodate in total some 12,000 tertiary students and 4,200 tertiary students in 1985.

Notes

Documentation for this review is based on four principal publications namely:


References

2. Goldring (Report) p. 94
3. Jackson (Report) p. 87
5. Jackson (Summary) p. 9
6. Jackson (Report) p. 89

Mexico and those in Europe, and even the one on the continent of Africa, if we could rescue whose American pupils was the excuse for the US military expenditure there a few months ago. do not? not necessarily see the greatest degree possible the interests of its principal publications namely:


References

2. Goldring (Report) p. 94
3. Jackson (Report) p. 87
5. Jackson (Summary) p. 9
6. Jackson (Report) p. 89
TABLE 1  
Australia: Private Overseas Students 
Tertiary and Post-Secondary 30 June, 1982*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank/Order</th>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage of all (Of all students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9492</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>949</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Enrolled in formal education programs

7. Jackson (Summary) p. 6.
15. Goldring (Report) p. 70.
25. Goldring (Summary) p. 11.
32. Ibid.
33. See Stewart E. Fraser, Background Notes on Overseas Students Enrolled in Tertiary Education Institutions — Australia, Submission to Committee of Review Private Overseas Student Policy, Canberra, 30 October 1983, pp. 56, 68a.