The Australia Institute
Research that matters.

Raising revenue right: Better tax ideas for the 48th Parliament

The next parliament can raise between $12 and $63 billion each year by cutting fossil fuel subsidies, ending the gas industry's free ride, reforming negative gearing and closing tax loopholes for superannuation and luxury utes. This would still see Australia's tax levels stay below the average for developed countries, but could fund over 70,000 extra jobs in health, education and other public services.

Discussion Paper

Greg Jericho

March 2025

Summary

Australia's 48th Parliament can tackle the nation's challenges on inequality, sustainability, health, education and other areas, but doing so will require more revenue. Fortunately, significant revenue can be raised, and in ways that will make Australia fairer and safer.

Recommendation	Revenue raised - Minimum	Revenue raised - Maximum	Other benefits
1. End fossil fuel subsidies	$1.7bn	$10.6bn	**Reduce** carbon emissions
2. End the gas industry's free ride	$4.1bn	$10.1bn	**Reduce** carbon emissions
3. Reform the Capital Gains Tax Discount and negative gearing	$1.8bn	$19.8bn	**Increase** housing affordability
4. Reform superannuation tax concessions	$2.3bn	$20.3bn	**Reduce** wealth inequality
5. Tax luxury utes, plastic and tax avoidance	Up to $1.9bn		**Increase** road safety **Increase** fairness **Reduce** carbon emissions **Reduce** plastic waste
Total	$11.8bn	$62.7bn	A **better** Australia

These sums are not unrealistic. Implementing all of them would still see Australia's tax levels well below the average for developed nations, and far behind Nordic countries. The ideas proposed here are not radical. They are already at the centre of policy debate. Some are supported by current members of parliament, while others have been major party policy. They are well-known by policy practitioners and are popular with voters.

An extra $11.8bn per year could fund over 70,000 extra jobs in education and health, delivering significantly better services to the community.

An extra $62.7bn per year could transform Australia for the better, without increasing the deficit by a dollar. Government payments could be increased above poverty line levels while also doubling spending on education, housing and the ABC.

Introduction

The 48th Parliament has the opportunity to tackle some of Australia's biggest problems – inequality, poverty, sustainability, health and education challenges.

Tackling these problems will take revenue. Fortunately, there is wide range of opportunities to raise more revenue in Australia, in ways that will also make the Australian community fairer and safer.

Australia is a low-tax country, raising just 30% in tax revenue as a share of the economy, well below the average of 34.9% across developed countries – a difference worth around $130bn – let alone the 42.6% in the Nordic countries of Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Finland.[1]

Countries that raise more tax and spend more on public services tend to have communities that are healthier, happier and have higher incomes. Tax is the price we pay to live in a good society. Currently Australia is underpaying and as a result the country has higher levels of poverty, and insufficient funding for education, healthcare and other services.

The revenue ideas presented here are not new. They are already at the centre of debate. Some are supported by current members of parliament,[2] others have been major party policy in the past. They are well understood by economists and policy practitioners, and many are popular with the Australian public.[3]

There are a range of other tax reforms Australia should make, such as re-introducing a carbon tax, inheritance taxes, and a tax on sugary drinks. Such reforms, worthy as they are, are not covered here as they are unlikely to find passage through the 48th Parliament. Support for them needs to be built over the longer term.

This paper presents basic high and low estimates of revenue that could be raised each year by reforms that are politically feasible and economically responsible. We also show how this revenue could be used to transform Australia for the better.

---

[1] Figures for 2023. OECD (2024) Data Explorer NAAG Chapter 6: Government.

[2] For example, see Rabe (2024) 'Crossbench MPs eye tax credit overhaul on major miners,' https://www.afr.com/politics/federal/crossbench-mps-eye-tax-credit-overhaul-on-major-miners-20241023-p5kkqv,

[3] See for example Australia Institute (2022) *Overwhelming Majority Support for Gov Intervention in Gas Price Crisis: Research*, https://australiainstitute.org.au/post/overwhelming-majority-support-for-gov-intervention-in-gas-price-crisis-research/; Everybody's Home (2024) *Three in five voters back investor tax break reform*, https://everybodyshome.com.au/three-in-five-voters-back-investor-tax-break-reform/;

End Fossil Fuel Subsidies

Government subsidies for coal, gas, diesel, and other fossil fuels not only reduce funding available for community services, but they make climate change worse. Winding back fossil fuel subsidies provided at the federal level each year makes both fiscal and environmental sense.

In 2023-24, the Federal Government provided $11.8 billion in fossil fuel subsidies, with increases forecast for future budget years.[4] All of these subsidies should be removed. This is in line with advice form the OECD for Australia to "reduce or eliminate fuel tax exemptions for heavy vehicles and machinery."[5]

The largest federal fossil fuel subsidy is the Fuel Tax Credit Scheme (FTCS), estimated to cost the budget $10.6 billion in 2025-26. While the FTCS should be wound back in its entirety, this may be politically difficult in the short-term. Proposals for modest reform and a change that would only affect large mining companies are also summarised in the table below:

Reform	Revenue	Description
End FTCS	$10.6bn	There is no policy reason to keep the FTCS and its abolition is in line with advice from the OECD.
End FTCS for trucks and apply lower rate to off-road vehicles and machinery.	$4.4bn	The Grattan Institute proposes an end to FTCS for large on-road vehicles and extending it at a lower rate to off-road vehicles. This would better reflect costs of both road damage and greenhouse emissions.[6]
Cap FTCS claims at $50 million per company	$1.7bn	The Climate Energy Finance think tank has proposed a cap on FTCS claims at $50 million per company. This would mean farmers, transport companies and smaller mining companies, would be unaffected while major mining companies like BHP, Rio Tinto and Glencore would pay more fuel tax.[7]

[4] Campbell et al (2024) *Fossil fuel subsidies in Australia 2024*, https://australiainstitute.org.au/report/fossil-fuel-subsidies-in-australia-2024/

[5] 9 OECD (2024) Achieving the transition to net zero in Australia, https://www.oecd.org/economy/achieving-the-transition-to-net-zero-in-australia-9a56c9d2-en.htm

[6] Terrill, Burfurd and Bradshaw (2023) Fuelling budget repair: How to reform fuel taxes for business, https://grattan.edu.au/report/fuelling-budget-repair/

[7] Pollard and Buckley (2023) *Fuel tax credit scheme and heavy haulage electric vehicle manufacturing in Australia*, https://climateenergyfinance.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Fuel-Tax-Credit-Scheme-and-Heavy-Haulage-Electric-Vehicle-Manufacturing-in-Australia.docx.pdf

End the Gas Industry’s Free Ride

Australia is one of the world’s largest exporters of liquified natural gas (LNG), but little public revenue is raised from the gas industry. Australia exports a similar volume of gas to Qatar, yet Qatar raises six times more revenue from its industry.[8] Reforming the royalty and tax systems could raise significant revenue for and assist with climate action.

REFORM THE PETROLEUM RESOURCE RENT TAX

No gas export project has ever paid the Petroleum Resources Rent Tax (PRRT).[9] Despite gas corporations earning tens of billions from LNG exports each year, PRRT rarely raises much more than $1 billion per year, all of which is paid by domestic-oriented oil and gas producers. Treasury has estimated the revenue that could be raised from various reforms, such as to transfer pricing (the price that companies “sell” the gas to themselves for tax purposes), and capping the PRRT deductions by gas companies each year. Three options are summarised in the table below:

Reform	Revenue	Description
Change to transfer pricing	$3.2 bn	A 2017 Treasury review of PRRT estimated that a change in transfer pricing methodology, from ‘residual pricing method’ to ‘netback’ pricing, would increase revenue by $68 billion over 13 years, on average $5.2 billion per year.[10]
Cap deductions at 80% per year	$0.5 bn	The Federal Government has already placed a limit on use of tax deductions, limiting the proportion of PRRT assessable income that can be offset by deductions to 90%. Lowering this cap to 80% would raise roughly an extra $500 million per year.
Cap deductions at 60% per year	$1.5 bn	Lowering the PRRT deduction cap to 60% would raise roughly an extra $1.5 billion per year.

[8] Verstegen, Ogge and Campbell (2024) *Australia’s great gas giveaway*, https://australiainstitute.org.au/report/australias-great-gas-giveaway/

[9] Treasury (2023) Budget Paper No.1 2023-24, p180, https://archive.budget.gov.au/2023-24/index.htm

[10] Treasury (2017) *Petroleum Resource Rent Tax Review: Final report,* https://treasury.gov.au/review/review-of-the-petroleum-resource-rent-tax/final-report

CHARGE ROYALTIES ON ALL GAS EXTRACTION

Unlike mining, no royalty is paid on most Australian gas exports. The PRRT was supposed to replace earlier royalty arrangements, but it has failed to deliver a return to the community. Some gas producers do pay a royalty and there is no reason that royalties could not be charged on all gas extraction.

Reform	Revenue	Description
Extend royalties to all gas extraction	$3.6 bn	Based on current royalties charged to gas exporters, extending similar arrangements to all gas extraction.[11]
Increase royalties by 50% and extend to all producers in Commonwealth Waters	$6.9 bn	As above but with the price of gas royalties increased by 50% to reflect the changed nature of the market with the introduction of LNG exports.

[11] Verstegen, Ogge and Campbell (2024) *Australia's great gas giveaway*

Reform the Capital Gains Tax Discount and Negative Gearing

Australia has a housing affordability crisis. For the first time since WWII a majority of Australians in their early 30s do not own their own home.[12] Two tax breaks enjoyed by residential property investors work to both reduce government revenue and exacerbate the housing crisis – the capital gains tax (CGT) discount and negative gearing.

Capital gain is the difference between how much an investor paid for an asset and how much they sell it for. Since 1999 capital gains have been given a 50% tax discount. For example, a property investor who sells a house for $500,000 more than they paid for it only pays tax on $250,000 – the other $250,000 is tax free.

Negative gearing is when a property investor deducts rental losses against other income, reducing their taxable income and the tax they ultimately pay.

The combination of the 50% CGT discount and negative gearing has tilted Australia's housing market away from homeowners and towards investors. As a result, house prices have increased at more than twice the rate of income over the past 25 years,[13] and home ownership rates have fallen from 71.4% of households in 1994-95 to 66.3% in 2020-21.[14]

Reform to negative gearing and the capital gains tax (CGT) discount would rebalance the housing market back to owner-occupiers. Below are four costed reforms to negative gearing and the CGT discount that would help make housing more affordable and raise revenue.

[12] Australia Institute of Health and Welfare (2025) https://www.housingdata.gov.au/

[13] Grudnoff & Jericho (2024) *Financial regulatory framework and home ownership*, https://australiainstitute.org.au/report/financial-regulatory-framework-and-home-ownership/

[14] ABS (2022) *Housing Occupancy and Costs: 2019-20*.

NEGATIVE GEARING

Reform	Revenue	Description
Remove negative gearing	$5.5bn	This removes negative gearing on all residential property. Housing deductions could still be used on rental income.
Remove negative gearing with grandfathering	$0.4bn	Rental property losses would no longer be deductable from other income, with exemptions for properties bought before a particular date.
Restrict negative gearing to 1 property	$0.9bn	Rental losses from one property would be deductible from other income, but not second or subsequent investment properties.
Restrict negative gearing to new properties	$5.4bn	Rental losses would only be deductible from other income for newly constructed homes, not for purchase of existing homes.

Source: PBO (2024) *Policy reform options for negative gearing and capital gains tax*

CAPITAL GAINS TAX DISCOUNT

Reform	Revenue	Description
Remove CGT discount	$14.3bn	Capital gains currently subject to the CGT discount are taxed as regular income.
Remove CGT discount on residential property	$5.9bn	Capital gains for residential property investments (not family home) taxed as regular income, while the discount would remain for other eligible assets.
Remove CGT discount on residential property with grandfathering	$1.8bn	Remove CGT discount on residential property bought after a particular date. This would raise little revenue in the short term as most of the residential property that is sold would still be subject to the discount. Revenue raised ramps up over time. $1.8 billion is the average of the years estimated by the Parliamentary Budget Office out to 2033-34.
CGT discount only for new properties after 3 years on residential property with grandfathering	$1.4bn	Remove CGT discount for residential properties unless the investor bought the property when it was newly constructed. Existing properties are grandfathered. The $1.4 billion figure is the average of the years estimated by the Parliamentary Budget Office out to 2033-34.

Source: Treasury (2024) *Tax expenditure and insights statement: 2024-25* & PBO (2024) *Policy reform options for negative gearing and capital gains tax*

Reform Superannuation Tax Concessions

Superannuation contributions and earnings are taxed at lower rates than other income. The original reason for this was to encourage people to save for retirement and reduce the cost of the age pension. However, these tax breaks now reduce income tax by around $60 billion per year, only slightly less than the cost of the age pension – $61.6 billion in 2024-25.[15] These concessions are overwhelmingly used by high-income individuals to avoid paying tax rather than to save for retirement. This serves no public policy purpose people with such high incomes generally do not qualify for the age pension.[16]

The two superannuation tax concessions that reduce government revenue the most are:

- The lower rate of tax charged on contributions, which is a flat 15% for most taxpayers. A 30% tax rate applies for individuals whose combined income and super contributions is more than $250,000 per year.[17]
- Earnings in the 'accumulation' phase are taxed at a flat rate of 15%.[18]

These two tax concessions cost the Commonwealth $56 billion in 2024-25, of which $20.3 billion (or more than a third) goes to the highest 10% of income earners. The entire bottom half of income earners, by contrast, receives just 13% ($7.4 billion).[19]

The Parliament should pass the Government's proposal to reduce the tax concession for earnings on super balances over $3 million. This involves increasing the tax rate from 15% to 30% for the earnings corresponding to the proportion of the balance above the $3 million threshold. This would remain a generous tax concession given the 30% rate is less than the

---

[15] Treasury (2024) *2024-25 Tax Expenditures and Insights Statement*, https://treasury.gov.au/publication/p2025-607085. Uses distribution of 2020-21 applied to estimate of 2024-25 total.

[16] Ngoc Le (2024) "Who benefits? The high cost of super tax concessions" https://australiainstitute.org.au/report/who-benefits/

[17] Australian Taxation Office (2024) *Division 293 tax on concessional contributions by high-income earners*, https://www.ato.gov.au/individuals-and-families/super-for-individuals-and-families/super/growing-and-keeping-track-of-your-super/caps-limits-and-tax-on-super-contributions/division-293-tax-on-concessional-contributions-by-high-income-earners.

[18] Australian Taxation Office (2023) *Tax on super benefits*, https://www.ato.gov.au/individuals-and-families/super-for-individuals-and-families/super/withdrawing-and-using-your-super/early-access-to-super/tax-on-super-benefits

[19] Treasury (2024) *2024-25 Tax Expenditures and Insights Statement*. Uses distribution of 2020-21 applied to estimate of 2024-25 total.

likely 45% marginal tax rate for these wealthy taxpayers. This measure would affect only around 80,000 people out of the 17 million holders of superannuation.[20]

Reform	Revenue	Description
Lower tax concession on earnings on super funds with balances above $3m	$2.3 bn	Estimates based on Treasury figures. It would not affect super earnings in the 'retirement' phase, which would remain tax free. [21]
Abolish super tax concession for the top 10% of income earners	$20.3 bn	These individuals reach a level of assets in retirement that means they do not qualify for the age pension and as such tax concessions serve no public good or policy purpose.[22]

[20] Australian Government (2023) *Budget 2023–24: Budget measures: Budget paper no. 2*, p 15, https://archive.budget.gov.au/2023-24/bp2/download/bp2_2023-24.pdf

[21] Australian Government (2023) *Budget 2023–24: Budget measures: Budget paper no. 2*, p 15.

[22] Treasury (2020) *Retirement Income Review – Final Report*, p 247.

Tax Harmful Things

Taxing harmful things is ‘economics 101’ and Australia does this with taxes on tobacco, alcohol and, formerly, with a price on carbon emissions. This basic economic logic should be extended to other things that most Australians would prefer less of, generating revenue and a range of social and environmental benefits.

Reform	Revenue	Description
End luxury tax exemption on utes	$0.25bn	Limiting the exemption to vehicles that are for commercial rather than personal use.
Plastic tax	$1.5bn	Taxing virgin (non-recycled) plastic packaging at the same rate as the EU tax.
End subsidy on tax avoidance	$0.13bn	Limiting the amount that could be claimed for managing tax affairs at $3,000.
Total	**$1.9bn**	

TAX BIG DUMB UTES

Utility vehicles (utes) are necessary to a range of occupations but their proliferation in Australian cities – particularly of large, luxury models – damages the environment and makes roads more dangerous. From 2001 to 2021, the number of cars grew by half, while the number of utes doubled.[23]

Growth in large, luxury ute numbers is encouraged by an exemption from Luxury Car Tax. This loophole benefits buyers of the most expensive utes, such as Ram and Chevrolet models, but does not affect drivers of Toyota Hilux, Mitsubishi Triton and similar utes most used by farmers and tradespeople.

Limiting this exemption to vehicles that are for commercial rather than personal use, **could raise up to $250 million per year**.[24] Other reforms that would raise revenue while increasing road safety and reducing emissions include reforming Fringe Benefits Tax so that exemptions require proof that vehicles are strictly used for business purposes, and improved pricing mechanisms for road damage and carbon emissions.

[23] Thrower (2024) *Luxury Car Tax and the ute loophole*, https://australiainstitute.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/P1708-Luxury-Car-Tax.pdf

[24] Thrower (2024) *Luxury Car Tax and the ute loophole*

PLASTIC TAX

By 2050, the amount of plastic consumed in Australia will more than double. Despite policies aimed at a 'circular economy', just 14% of plastic waste is kept out of landfill. Recycling plastic is expensive and hazardous, with little demand for recycled plastics.[25]

Taxes on plastic are being implemented in the European Union (EU) and If Australia had taxed virgin (non-recycled) plastic packaging at the EU rate (approximately $1,300 per tonne) this would have raised **$1.5 billion** in 2020-21.[26] This tax would raise less revenue if it included exemptions and would generate less revenue over time as consumers and businesses shift away from plastics, as this is the intended effect of the tax.

STOP SUBSIDISING TAX AVOIDANCE

Many Australians pay an accountant to help with their tax affairs. In 2021–22, over 98% of Australians spent less than $300 managing their tax affairs.[27] Meanwhile, a very wealthy few spend tens of thousands of dollars to reduce their taxable income and avoid paying tax.

In 2021-22 the 1,960 individuals who earned more than $180,000 but who reduced their taxable income to below the tax-free threshold of $18,200 spent on average $23,648 for managing their tax affairs, compared to the $690 average spent by the 772,544 individuals who remained within the top taxable income bracket.[28]

In 2017, the Labor party proposed **limiting the amount that could be claimed for managing tax affairs at $3,000**. This reform would allow high-income earners to still use the services of high-priced tax accountants and lawyers to reduce their taxable income, but they would no longer be also able to deduct the total cost of doing so.

For the 2019 election, the Parliamentary Budget Office calculated that this policy would raise about $120 to $130 million per year, including $130 million in 2022-23.[29] Given the budgetary cost of this tax deduction has only increased since 2019 and it continues to overwhelmingly benefit high income earners, the potential revenue raised by this policy is likely to be **at least $130 million per annum**.[30]

---

[25] Anderson and Gbor (2024) *Plastic waste in Australia*, https://australiainstitute.org.au/report/plastic-waste-in-australia/

[26] Anderson and Gbor (2024) *Plastic waste in Australia*

[27] Australian Taxation Office (2024) *Taxation statistics 2021, Individuals, Table 18*, https://www.ato.gov.au/about-ato/research-and-statistics/in-detail/taxation-statistics/taxation-statistics-2021-22

[28] Australian Taxation Office (2024) *Taxation statistics 2021, Individuals, Table 10*,

[29] Parliamentary Budget Office (2019) *Capping deductions for managing tax affairs at $3,000*, https://www.pbo.gov.au/elections/2019-general-election/2019-election-commitment-costings/capping-deductions-managing-tax-affairs-3000-per399

[30] The Treasury (2024) *2024-25 Tax Expenditures and Insights Statement*, https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2024-12/p2024-607085-teis_0.pdf

Conclusion

Australia is a low-taxing nation, raising around 5% less tax as a portion of GDP than the OECD average, meaning $130bn less in revenue each year. With less revenue comes less services, less infrastructure and lower levels of government support, which means that, for example, Australia has one of the highest levels of poverty among older people in the OECD.

This need not be the case.

This report has presented five policy areas where not only could more revenue be raised, but doing so would reduce inequality, lower emissions, improve housing affordability, make roads safer, reduce plastic waste, and create a fairer tax system.

None of these proposals are radical or outside the mainstream debate. And even at the highest estimate, the combined extra revenue raised of $62.7 billion would still leave Australia among one of the lowest taxing nations in the OECD, and still raising proportionately less tax than New Zealand, Canda, Japan and the United Kingdom.

Even the minimum increase of $11.8 billion from the proposals in this report would represent a significant increase in revenue that would be able to employ just over 70,000 extra full-time workers in education, health care and social assistance.

Table 1. Equivalent of $11.8bn in extra jobs in education, health care and social assistance

Sector	Current jobs	Jobs per $billon output	Extra spend	Extra jobs	Percent increase in jobs
Primary and secondary education services (incl pre-schools & special schools)	552,589	6,780	$2.8bn	18,654	3.4%
Technical, vocational and tertiary education services	234,836	4,083	$1.2bn	4,774	2.0%
Arts, sports, adult & other education services (incl community education)	91,516	7,986	$0.5bn	3,639	4.0%
Health care services	926,595	6,380	$4.6bn	29,435	3.2%
Residential care & social assistance services	564,480	5,067	$2.8bn	14,240	2.5%
Total	**2,370,016**		**$11.8bn**	**70,742**	**3.0%**

Source: Australian National Accounts: Input-Output Tables 2021-22, Tables 5 & 20, extra spend is weighted by the number of current jobs per sector

If $11.8 billion a year were raised through the proposals in this report, Australia could fund the proposals in Table 2:

Table 2: Policy changes that would cost the minimum

Program	Policy	Cost in 2024-25
JobSeeker	Increase by $100.50 to $489.50pw	$4.2bn
Age Pension	Increase by $26.50 to $550pw	$3.0bn
Disability Support Pension	Increase by $26.50 to $550pw	$1.0bn
Carer Payments	Increase by $26.50 to $550pw	$0.4bn
Govt school expenditure	Increase by 10%	$1.1bn
Higher education expenditure	Increase by 10%	$1.2bn
Vocational & other education expenditure	Increase by 10%	$0.3bn
Housing expenditure	Increase by 10%	$0.4bn
ABC & SBS operations	Increase by 10%	$0.1bn
Total		**$11.8bn**

Source: 2024-25 Budget Papers, PBO Build your own budget (costs based on change to underlying cash balance). Values may not add to the total due to rounding.

Raising JobSeeker, age pension and other government supports would significantly reduce poverty levels, and increase the ability of unemployed people to find work. The 10% increase in education spending would substantially benefit Australia's long-term productivity concerns, while also improving equality in the school system. The increased housing expenditure would also work with the current government's policies designed to increase housing supply – especially for those on low and middle incomes.

Such an agenda may appear bold but, as shown here, can be delivered with modest changes to well-known policy settings. With more courage and effort $62.7 billion could be raised, enabling government to truly transform Australia for the better, without increasing the deficit by a dollar.

To give a sense of how much revenue $62.7 billion represents (noting that this is less than half the amount that would see Australia at the average level of revenue of the OECD) an Australian government would be able to pursue to policies in Table 3 below, again without affecting the budget balance.

JobSeeker could be raised up to the poverty line, while the age pension and disability support pensions could be increased nearly 20%. The parenting payment for single persons could be increased to match the new level of JobSeeker, with the partnered rate increased to maintain the current ratio to single persons. In a stroke, the number of Australians living in poverty would be drastically lowered.

Government spending on public schools, higher education and vocational education services could be *doubled*. This would transform Australia's education system and do much to take advantage of the opportunities presented by the Trump administration's cuts to research and higher education in the United States.

But wait, there's more. Spending on public sector housing could be doubled, allowing for a return to the public housing rates delivered in the 1960s and 1970s, enabling government to offer housing to public sector workers – especially in regional areas. The operational budgets of the ABC and SBS could also be doubled. So could spending on aged care quality and on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health programs. And the amount spend on dental care could be quadrupled.

All of these policies in total would cost $62.7bn per year.

Table 3. Policy changes that would cost the maximum

Program	Policy	Cost in 2024-25
JobSeeker	Increase by $211 to $600pw	$8.9bn
Age Pension	Increase by $110.50 to $625pw	$11.6bn
Disability Support Pension	Increase by $110.50 to $625pw	$3.9bn
Carer Payments	Increase by $110.50 to $625pw	$1.4bn
Parenting payment – single	Increase by $110.50 to $600pw	$1.3bn
Parenting payment – partnered	Increase by $80 to $436.50pw	$0.2bn
Govt school expenditure	Double expenditure	$11.5bn
Higher education expenditure	Double expenditure	$11.5bn
Vocational & other education expenditure	Double expenditure	$2.5bn
Housing expenditure	Double expenditure	$4.4bn
ABC & SBS operations	Double expenditure	$1.5bn
Aged care quality	Double expenditure	$0.5bn
Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander health	Double expenditure	$1.3bn
Dental services	Increase by 500%	$2.0bn
Total		**$62.7bn**

Source: 2024-25 Budget Papers, PBO Build your own budget (costs based on change to underlying cash balance). Values may not add to the total due to rounding.

These policy alternatives present merely a sample of what could be undertaken should the government seize the opportunities to raise more revenue from highly profitable gas companies, property investors, the wealthiest Australians use of superannuation to avoid tax and those products that are damaging the environment.

Budgets are about choices and the proposals in this report present an opportunity to create a fairer, stronger and more sustainable Australia.