



Issue Area	ALP Policy	Coalition Policy	Greens Policy
<b>Cost of Living</b>	<p>• <b>Relief Measures:</b> Labor’s top priority is easing cost-of-living pressures “<i>without adding pressure to inflation</i>” <a href="http://alp.org.au">alp.org.au</a>. In government they introduced <b>cheaper essentials</b> – e.g. tax cuts for workers, expanded childcare subsidies, lower PBS medicine costs, extended paid parental leave, energy rebates, and fee-free TAFE courses <a href="http://alp.org.au">alp.org.au</a>. These are aimed at helping household budgets while keeping inflation in check (the budget returned to surplus in 2023).</p> <p>• <b>Wages and Welfare:</b> Labor supports annual minimum wage rises at least in line with inflation and has boosted income support modestly (e.g. a \$40 fortnightly increase to JobSeeker). They argue their policies (like fee-free TAFE and energy relief) ease pressure on family finances <b>without</b> broad price controls.</p>	<p>• <b>Spending &amp; Inflation:</b> The Coalition blames Labor’s “reckless spending” for high inflation and interest rate hikes. They pledge to <b>cut government waste and spending</b> to help bring inflation down and “<i>get interest rates down</i>” <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. Relief, they argue, must come from responsible economic management – <b>not</b> large cash handouts that risk fueling inflation.</p> <p>• <b>Energy &amp; Prices:</b> To reduce bills, they propose a “balanced” energy plan including renewables <b>plus</b> more gas and new zero-emission <b>nuclear power</b> – claiming this mix will deliver cheaper power than Labor’s renewables-only approach <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. The Coalition also plans to crack down on corporate price-gouging: strengthening competition laws so supermarkets can be penalized or even broken up if they exploit consumers <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a></p> <p>• <b>Tax and Income:</b> They support tax relief like the Stage-3 income tax cuts (due 2024) as a way to help workers keep more money. They oppose Labor’s new superannuation tax on large balances, framing it as an unfair hit on retirees <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. Instead, they’d <b>protect savings</b> and incentivize work – e.g. let pensioners earn more without losing benefits <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a> – to relieve cost pressures on seniors.</p>	<p>• <b>Free Services over Cash Handouts:</b> The Greens argue that under both major parties, the cost of essentials has soared while “<i>1 in 3 big corporations pay no tax</i>” <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. Their approach is to directly lower household costs by making more services <b>free or cheap</b>. For example, they propose to <b>tax billionaires and corporate super-profits</b> and use that revenue to fund free dental and mental healthcare, free education, and cheap public transport <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a> <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a> – reducing what families pay out-of-pocket.</p> <p>• <b>Targeting Profiteering:</b> The Greens would <b>make price-gouging illegal</b> and break up monopolies in groceries, energy, banking and other sectors that drive up prices <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. They frequently point to supermarkets and gas companies enjoying record profits as Australians struggle. A Greens-backed regulatory regime would enforce fair pricing (e.g. via a new Supermarket Commissioner and tougher competition laws, an idea now echoed by the Coalition).</p> <p>• <b>Welfare and Wages:</b> The party also advocates raising the base rate of welfare payments above the poverty line (something Labor’s modest increases haven’t achieved) and lifting minimum wages to a liveable level. By boosting incomes at the low end and providing free public services (like child care, transport at 50¢ fares, etc. <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>), the</p>

			Greens claim they would alleviate cost-of-living pressures more directly than the majors' tax cuts for higher earners.
<b>Interest Rates</b>	<p>• <b>Keeping Rates in Check via Inflation Control:</b> Labor defers interest rate decisions to the independent RBA, but stresses its fiscal discipline is helping. PM Albanese notes that under Labor, inflation has fallen sharply (from ~6% to 2.4% in late 2024) which <i>“has seen interest rates now falling”</i> – after a painful series of 12 rate rises earlier <a href="https://pm.gov.au">pm.gov.au</a>. Labor highlights achieving a budget surplus to <b>take pressure off inflation</b> and argues that targeted cost-of-living measures (e.g. energy bill relief) were designed not to spike demand. In short, their policy is to get inflation down so that the RBA can start <b>cutting rates</b>, as has begun in early 2025.</p> <p>• <b>No Interference with RBA:</b> Labor implemented recommendations of the RBA Review – including a dual mandate (inflation AND full employment) and a more diverse board – but does not support politicizing rate decisions. They emphasize helping Australians through other means (like fee-free TAFE, childcare subsidies) while the RBA does its work on inflation.</p>	<p>• <b>Blaming Labor, Pledging Relief:</b> The Coalition frames the 12 interest rate rises since 2022 as the result of Labor “spending what it can’t afford” and driving up inflation. Dutton vows a Coalition government will <i>“rein in wasteful spending... creating an environment for much needed interest rate relief”</i> <a href="https://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. In their view, cutting government deficits and debt will reduce inflation faster and ease pressure on the RBA to keep rates high. They contrast this with Labor’s stimulus measures, which they claim overheated the economy.</p> <p>• <b>Home Buyer Support:</b> To address mortgage stress from high rates, the Coalition points to its policies like allowing first-home buyers to use superannuation for a house deposit (so buyers aren’t as exposed to interest costs) <a href="https://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. They also indicate they’d pressure banks to fully pass on any rate <b>cuts</b> (just as Labor pressured banks to pass on hikes) to ensure borrowers benefit quickly. Overall, the Coalition pitches itself as the party of <b>lower interest rates</b> through tighter fiscal policy and pro-growth reforms.</p>	<p>• <b>Critique of Rate Hikes:</b> The Greens argue that relying solely on interest rate hikes to curb inflation is unfair – it hurts mortgage holders and renters but doesn’t address many root causes of inflation. They note, for example, that corporate profiteering has been a big driver of price rises (pointing to banks, energy companies and others enjoying fat margins). Thus, the Greens call for alternative tools beyond RBA rate rises, such as temporary price controls on essential goods and services, or a excess profits tax to discourage price gouging <a href="https://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a></p> <p>• <b>RBA Reform and Debt Relief:</b> The Greens support the RBA's new focus on full employment and would go further to ensure the Bank prioritizes social outcomes (like not inducing a recession). They have floated ideas like government-backed relief for heavily indebted households or tougher regulation of bank interest rate spreads. In essence, Greens want inflation tackled via <b>supply-side and equity measures</b> (e.g. build more housing, rein in profiteers) rather than blunt demand suppression. They advocate for keeping interest rates as low as possible while using fiscal levers to manage inflation – the opposite emphasis of the Coalition.</p>

<b>Housing Affordability</b>	<p>• <b>National Housing Accord:</b> Labor has leaned on collaboration with states to boost housing supply. In 2022 they negotiated a National Housing Accord targeting 1 million new homes over 5 years, and in 2023 this was upped to <b>1.2 million homes from 2024-2029</b> with incentives for states that exceed building targets <a href="https://www.pm.gov.au">pm.gov.au</a>. A new \$3 billion “New Home Bonus” will reward states/territories for planning reforms and infrastructure that facilitate more housing construction. The idea is to increase supply (especially of affordable and well-located homes) to relieve pressure on prices.</p> <p>• <b>Housing Australia Future Fund (HAFF):</b> A signature policy – a \$10 billion investment fund whose returns (approx \$500m/yr) will finance social and affordable housing. After initial Senate hurdles, Labor passed this in 2023 with a pledge to build <b>30,000 new social and affordable dwellings in 5 years</b> <a href="https://www.greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. While critics (Greens, Coalition) note this is insufficient relative to need, it’s the first federal social housing investment of its kind in a decade. Labor also committed \$1 billion directly for public housing repairs and construction in 2024 as an immediate boost.</p> <p>• <b>First-Home Buyers:</b> Labor supports first-home buyer schemes like the <b>Help to Buy</b> shared equity program (where the government</p>	<p>• <b>“Supply-Side” Emphasis:</b> The Coalition’s mantra is <i>build more to ease prices</i>. They promise to “<b>boost housing supply</b>” by cutting red tape on new developments and investing in enabling infrastructure <a href="https://www.liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. For example, a Coalition government would offer incentives to states and councils to fast-track zoning changes, release federal land for housing, and fund local infrastructure (roads, water, sewerage) that unlocks new housing estates <a href="https://www.liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. The aim is to increase the volume of housing (particularly on city fringes and in regional centers) and thereby improve affordability for buyers.</p> <p>• <b>Foreign Investor Ban &amp; Local Buyers:</b> A recently announced policy is a <b>two-year ban on foreign investors and temporary residents purchasing existing homes</b> <a href="https://www.liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. This is meant to reduce competition for housing and cool demand. (Labor currently charges foreign buyers extra stamp duties; the Coalition would go further with a temporary ban.) The Coalition also pledges support for <b>first-home buyers</b> via its superannuation access policy: allowing first-time buyers to withdraw up to 40% of their super for a home deposit <a href="https://www.liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. They argue this helps young people overcome the deposit hurdle and enter the market sooner, building wealth through home equity. (Labor</p>	<p>• <b>Mass Public Housing Program:</b> The Greens assert that only government can deliver housing at the scale and price point needed to resolve the crisis. They propose a huge federal build of <b>public and affordable homes</b> – aiming for hundreds of thousands of new publicly owned dwellings over the next decade. Their platform calls for a <i>national housing developer</i> that would construct good-quality homes to be rented out cheaply or sold at cost to the public <a href="https://www.greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. This would include energy-efficient public housing, affordable rental units, and rent-to-buy schemes.</p> <p>• <b>End Housing Tax Perks:</b> A core Greens stance is to scrap what they term “<i>tax handouts for wealthy property investors</i>” – namely negative gearing and the capital gains tax discount. They point to Parliamentary Budget Office figures showing <b>\$176 billion</b> in investor tax concessions over 10 years <a href="https://www.greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. The Greens would phase out negative gearing for new investments and halve the CGT discount, redirecting the savings into affordable housing funds <a href="https://www.greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a> <a href="https://www.greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. This is a long-standing difference: Labor once considered limiting these tax breaks but has since ruled it out, whereas the Greens still champion it to dampen speculative demand.</p>

	<p>co-purchases up to 40% of a home, reducing the buyer's loan) and expanded the First Home Guarantee schemes to allow more people (including single parents and older single women) to buy with low deposits. These programs aim to improve ownership affordability, though Labor pointedly opposes the Coalition's plan to let buyers raid superannuation for housing (arguing that would push prices up and erode retirement savings).</p> <p>• <b>Investor Tax Settings:</b> Notably, Labor dropped its 2019 policy of limiting negative gearing and hasn't proposed any changes to capital gains tax discounts on property – a point of difference with the Greens. Instead, they focus on supply-side measures and direct assistance, rather than tax reform, to improve housing affordability.</p>	<p>counters it would drive up prices, but the Coalition insists any effect would be minor compared to overall supply issues.)</p> <p>• <b>No New Taxes on Housing:</b> The Coalition strongly opposes changes to negative gearing or capital gains tax, painting Labor (and Greens) proposals to alter them as attacks on mum-and-dad investors. They claim such moves would dry up investment in rental housing and make things worse. Instead, they prefer encouraging private investment (including institutional investment) in housing – for instance, by extending incentives for build-to-rent developments. They also promise to maintain schemes like the HomeBuilder grants or similar policies to stimulate new home construction for owner-occupiers.</p>	<p>• <b>Rental and Buyer Support:</b> (See next row for detailed rental policies.) For first-home buyers, the Greens prefer government-built affordable housing and shared equity models over the Coalition's super access plan. They'd also expand government grants for first-home purchases but tied to affordable price caps. Additionally, the Greens advocate stronger regulation of banks to ensure fair mortgage lending and have even suggested the idea of a cap on mortgage interest rates for owner-occupiers in extreme circumstances. Overall, their focus is on treating housing as a human right – massive public investment, restraining investor activity, and boosting tenant and buyer protections well beyond what the majors propose.</p>
--	---	---	---

<b>Rental Affordability</b>	<p>• <b>Rent Assistance Increase:</b> To help renters facing record-high rents, Labor’s 2023 budget raised Commonwealth Rent Assistance by 15% <a href="https://sophiescamps.com.au">sophiescamps.com.au</a> – the largest increase in the program for decades (though still modest in dollar terms, equating to an extra ~\$31 a fortnight for singles). This was designed to give low-income renters some relief. Labor has indicated it will continue to index and review Rent Assistance, but it has not agreed to the much larger boost (50%+) that welfare groups and the Greens advocate.</p> <p>• <b>“Making Renting Fairer” Reforms:</b> PM Albanese convened National Cabinet to get states onboard with a suite of renters’ rights measures. All states have now <b>limited rent increases to once per year</b> (stopping the previous two-or-more hikes annually some jurisdictions allowed) <a href="https://pm.gov.au">pm.gov.au</a>. Labor also pushed for bans on rent bidding (now widely adopted) and the phasing in of minimum rental standards for things like heating and insulation <a href="https://pm.gov.au">pm.gov.au</a>. They support ending “no fault” evictions (so tenants can’t be kicked out without a valid reason). Many of these changes are being legislated by state Labor governments, with federal Labor cheerleading</p>	<p>• <b>Market-Led Approach:</b> The Coalition emphasizes that the <b>only lasting solution to rental affordability is increasing the housing supply</b>. They argue Labor’s failure to contain inflation and interest rates has also driven rents up (higher interest = higher landlord costs passed to tenants). As such, a Coalition government would focus on policies to encourage building more rental properties – e.g. extending the National Rental Affordability Scheme or similar incentives for private developers to offer discounted rent units (the previous NRAS, introduced under Labor Rudd, was not renewed by the Abbott government). They have signaled support for <b>build-to-rent</b> developments, offering tax breaks to institutional investors (like super funds) to create more rental stock.</p> <p>• <b>Opposition to Rent Caps:</b> The Coalition is firmly against any form of rent freeze or cap, aligning with property industry views that it would worsen the rental shortage. They did not support the Greens’ push for a freeze and even worked with the Greens at one point to delay Labor’s Housing Fund in the Senate to highlight rental crisis (albeit for differing reasons) <a href="https://theguardian.com">theguardian.com</a>. Coalition-run states (and the NSW Libs in opposition) have also</p>	<p>• <b>Rent Freeze and Caps:</b> The Greens are outspoken about urgent intervention for renters. They want an <b>immediate two-year freeze on rent increases nationwide</b>, followed by permanent caps (for example, after the freeze, limit rent hikes to no more than 2% every 24 months, in line with some international models) <a href="https://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. While implementation would require state cooperation, the Greens propose using federal funding leverage: a \$2.5 billion per year incentive fund for states that legislate these rent caps and other tenant protections <a href="https://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. This demand for a freeze became a sticking point in 2023 when the Greens delayed Labor’s housing bill, though ultimately Labor only conceded the annual frequency limit, not a cap on amounts. The Greens maintain they’ll keep fighting for caps as many renters still face 20%+ rent surges even with annual limits.</p> <p>• <b>National Renters’ Rights:</b> In addition to price caps, the Greens have a detailed renters’ rights platform. They would establish a <b>National Renters Protection Authority</b> to enforce tenancy laws and advocate for renters <a href="https://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a> <a href="https://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. This body would investigate landlords/agents and issue <b>fines</b></p>

	<p>and sometimes tying funding incentives to adoption of these renter protections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No Federal Rent Cap:</b> Labor pointedly <b>rejected the Greens' call for a national rent freeze or cap</b>, arguing that constitutionally rent control is a state matter and warning that arbitrary caps could deter investment in new rentals. Instead, their approach is to boost supply (the Housing Accord and incentives for build-to-rent projects) and provide targeted subsidies (Rent Assistance) while encouraging states to strengthen tenant laws. Labor often notes that some states, like NSW, have not fully outlawed no-fault evictions (NSW Coalition resisted it), implying that practical renter protections are a better focus than price controls.</li> </ul>	<p>opposed caps. The Coalition warns that heavy-handed regulation will spook small landlords into selling, reducing rental supply. Instead, they promise a stable environment for mum-and-dad landlords: no new taxes or controls on rental property, and possibly some incentives (e.g. land tax concessions for landlords who offer long leases or keep rent increases modest).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rental Support:</b> In terms of direct support, the Coalition supported Labor's 15% Rent Assistance increase and would likely retain it. They have floated the idea of allowing <b>longer-term leases</b> (5-10 years) with fixed terms as a way to give tenants stability, but prefer this be achieved via market offering than mandates. They also suggest that helping renters become homeowners (via their first-home buyer policies) will free up rental properties and ease pressure in the long run.</li> </ul>	<p><b>(up to \$15k for landlords, \$78k for real estate agencies)</b> who breach fair renting standards <a href="https://www.greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. The Greens also push for <b>standard 5-year leases</b> as the norm, automatic lease renewals (ending no-grounds evictions), and minimum standards for rentals (so every rental is safe, insulated, with heating/cooling, etc.) <a href="https://www.greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. Essentially, a massive strengthening of tenant rights nationally, far beyond the incremental changes Labor has championed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rental Assistance and Public Housing:</b> The Greens supported the 15% Rent Assistance rise but labeled it insufficient. They advocate <b>doubling</b> Rent Assistance at least, but more importantly, they argue boosting supply of non-profit housing (public or community housing) will provide affordable rentals insulated from market pressures. Their housing plan includes funding to build 1 million public/subsidized rentals, directly tackling affordability. They also call for Airbnb and vacant property regulations to return more homes to the long-term rental market.</li> </ul>
<b>Foreign Policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Alliances and Diplomacy:</b> Labor in government has largely continued Australia's alliance-based foreign policy – strongly supporting the US alliance and partnerships like AUKUS (which will see Australia acquire nuclear-powered submarines jointly with the US/UK). FM Penny Wong has also focused on re-engaging with regional neighbors and multilateral institutions. Labor pitches a more <i>“diplomatic” and listening</i> approach than the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Security First, More Hawkish Tone:</b> The Coalition's outlook is more traditionally hawkish. They strongly support AUKUS and closer US ties – in fact Peter Dutton has suggested <b>expediting</b> AUKUS submarine deliveries and even mooted joint patrols or basing arrangements with the US (something Labor has been more cautious about). The Coalition castigated Labor for the Jerusalem policy reversal, accusing them of not standing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Independent &amp; Peace-Focused:</b> The Greens advocate a foreign policy that is less militarized and less aligned with great-power strategies. They opposed AUKUS from the start – warning against Australia “lining up for a war with China” – and would <b>cancel the nuclear submarine deal</b> to invest that money in climate action and social needs. They want Australia to be a neutral broker in international conflicts, championing <b>peace, disarmament,</b></li> </ul>



previous government: e.g. they repaired relations with France (after the submarine saga) and improved dialogue with China while maintaining strategic vigilance. In the Pacific, Wong told island nations “*we have heard you*” on climate change and promised a “different Australian government” that takes their concerns seriously [theguardian.com](https://www.theguardian.com). This has been a key contrast: Labor frames climate action and increased Pacific aid as core to foreign policy, to rebuild Australia’s image in the region.

• **Global Engagement:** The Albanese government has increased humanitarian and development aid (after Coalition cuts), especially to Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and launched a new Pacific Engagement Visa to allow more Pacific migration. On the world stage, Labor emphasizes a commitment to the international rules-based order – supporting Ukraine against Russia’s invasion, sanctions on Russia and Iran, and campaigning for human rights seats at the UN. However, it also charted an independent course on some issues: for instance, Labor reversed the Morrison-era recognition of West Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, returning to a position of not pre-empting final status [liberal.org.au](https://www.liberal.org.au). (The Coalition criticized this as weakening support for Israel.) Labor maintains support for a two-state solution and has been increasingly vocal on Palestinian humanitarian issues, though still clearly supportive of Israel’s right to exist and defend itself.

fully with Israel [liberal.org.au](https://www.liberal.org.au), and generally positions itself as the stauncher ally of countries like Israel and Ukraine. A Coalition government would likely align even more closely with the US on strategic competition with China: expect a louder stance on freedom of navigation in the South China Sea, and perhaps willingness to conduct more explicit military cooperation with Taiwan (e.g. training or contingency planning), which Labor avoids discussing publicly.

• **Pacific and Region:** The previous Coalition government faced criticism after China struck a security pact with Solomon Islands. In opposition they’ve accused Labor of not doing enough, though in reality both parties now largely agree on Pacific engagement – the difference may be style (the Coalition might put more emphasis on hard security and less on climate in dealings with the Pacific). Dutton has floated ideas like Australia funding joint Pacific regional security forces. The Coalition also tends to be more skeptical of China’s intentions; for example, they condemned Labor’s decision to allow a Chinese surveillance ship to dock in Australia for a joint military exercise observation (which was per protocol). They emphasize “**standing up to bullies**” and would likely increase defence cooperation with Japan, India and others in the Quad to counterbalance China.

• **Trade and Immigration Stance:** On trade, the Coalition in government had set up most of the free trade agreements that Labor is now

**and human rights.** For instance, Greens policy calls for signing the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and removing the US Marines rotation from Darwin. They seek an Australia that says *no* to nuclear weapons and war preparations, distinguishing themselves sharply from both Labor and Coalition on defense alignments [greens.org.au](https://www.greens.org.au).

• **Climate and Human Rights Leadership:** In contrast to the Coalition, the Greens put climate action at the center of foreign policy – urging vastly increased climate aid to our Pacific neighbors and Southeast Asia, and treating climate change as the greatest regional security threat. They also push for Australia to take principled stands on human rights even if it irks allies: e.g. Greens MPs have been highly critical of Israel’s actions in occupied Palestinian territories (using terms like apartheid and calling for sanctions, where the majors would not go that far). They demanded Australia support a UN investigation into Israel/Gaza and advocated strongly for accepting more refugees from conflict zones like Syria, Afghanistan, and recently Gaza.

• **Refugee Policy Abroad & Aid:** The Greens link foreign policy with their refugee stance – calling for regional cooperation that *respects* asylum seekers’ rights, rather than deterrence. They’d end offshore processing and work with countries like Indonesia and Malaysia on humane solutions, increasing Australia’s intake (see **Immigration** below) [greens.org.au](https://www.greens.org.au)



	<p>• <b>Trade and Regional Strategy:</b> Labor has pursued trade diversification – mending trade relations with China sufficiently to resume Australian exports like barley and wine, while also finalizing trade deals with the UK and India that the previous government initiated. It unveiled a Southeast Asia Economic Strategy to 2040, signaling a boost in trade, investment and development with ASEAN countries. Overall, Labor’s foreign policy is characterized by similar strategic alliances as the Coalition but with <i>more emphasis on climate, aid, and regional diplomacy</i> (e.g. Albanese’s personal outreach in the Pacific and attendance at important regional summits, which his predecessor sometimes skipped).</p>	<p>implementing; they would continue pursuing free trade but perhaps be more willing to offend China if values are at stake (Labor prefers dialogue to resolve trade disputes). In terms of foreign relations nuance, the Coalition has a faction that is wary of the UN and global compacts (e.g. some Liberals opposed the Global Compact on Migration, or want to pull funding from UN bodies seen as anti-Israel). A Dutton government might withdraw from or defund certain international initiatives that they view as against Australia’s interests. However, broadly, there’s bipartisanship on many foreign policy fundamentals (US alliance, Five Eyes intelligence, support for Ukraine, Pacific step-up) – the differences are often in <b>rhetoric and priorities</b> (e.g. climate vs security in the Pacific; nuance on Middle East policy; tone towards China).</p>	<p><a href="https://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. They also support dramatically increasing foreign aid to meet the UN target of 0.7% GNI (Australia is around 0.2–0.3% now), focusing on poverty alleviation, health, and education in our region. In summary, Greens foreign policy is about <b>demilitarization, global justice, and climate cooperation</b>, marking a major point of difference with the big parties’ more traditional realpolitik.</p>
Healthcare	<p>• <b>Medicare Strengthening:</b> Labor positions itself as the defender of Medicare. In government they <b>invested record funds into Medicare</b> – including a \$5.7 billion boost to make GP visits cheaper or free for some 11 million Australians <a href="https://alp.org.au">alp.org.au</a>. This policy tripled the bulk-billing incentive paid to GPs (so that doctors have a stronger incentive to bulk-bill pensioners, healthcare card holders and children). Labor touts this as reinvigorating bulk billing after years of Medicare rebate freezes under the Coalition.</p> <p>• <b>Cheaper Medicines:</b> A key Labor policy delivered was cutting the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme <b>co-payment from \$42.50 to \$30</b> (and to \$7 for concession) per script, and</p>	<p>• <b>Private Sector &amp; Medicare:</b> The Coalition says it is committed to Medicare but accuses Labor of mismanagement leading to doctor shortages and longer wait times <a href="https://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. Dutton has highlighted his record as a former Health Minister, pointing out the Coalition “<i>increased hospital funding by 65% and delivered record bulk billing</i>” during their term <a href="https://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a> <a href="https://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. In 2025, the Coalition promises to <b>restore Medicare-funded psychology sessions</b> to 20 annually (Labor had cut back to 10) <a href="https://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>, and invest ~\$400m to train more GPs (especially in rural areas) <a href="https://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. They position themselves as the party listening to GPs and health professionals rather than</p>	<p>• <b>Medicare-for-All (And Then Some):</b> The Greens want to greatly <b>expand Medicare</b> to cover dental care and mental health care as a priority <a href="https://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. Their policy “Medicare for All” means you could go to a dentist or psychologist with your Medicare card and pay nothing – effectively treating oral and mental health as integral to health care. This is a signature difference: neither major party will commit to universal dental care due to cost (~\$10bn/yr), but the Greens would fund it by taxing the wealthy. They also want more allied health (like physio) covered.</p> <p>• <b>Free, Accessible Healthcare:</b> The Greens oppose the privatization or outsourcing of</p>

from 2024 allowing 60-day prescriptions (two months' medicine for the price of one) [alp.org.au](http://alp.org.au). This effectively halves pharmacy costs for many patients with chronic conditions. While pharmacies objected, Labor frames it as significant cost-of-living relief and healthcare improvement. They also added more drugs to the PBS (e.g. life-saving cancer drugs) and claim faster listing times than before.

• **Expansion & Reform:** Labor's health policy also includes trialing Medicare coverage of **urgent care clinics** (to take pressure off hospital EDs) and funding new cancer and cardiac centers. They have a long-term vision of including **some** dental care in Medicare (starting with a kids' Medicare dental trial and expanded seniors' dental services via the states) but have not gone as far as the Greens' universal dental plan. Mental health: Labor chose to follow expert advice by *ending* the pandemic-era increase of Medicare psychologist sessions from 10 back down to 10 (the Coalition is attacking this). Instead Labor is funding more local mental health clinics. In public hospitals, Labor is providing additional funding to states to clear elective surgery backlogs and for projects like upgrading ERs and maternity wards. They highlight aged care reforms (mandating 24/7 nurses and better food standards) as part of health policy too. Overall, Labor's focus is **incremental improvements** to Medicare – more funding, slight broadening (e.g. trials for mental health and dental), and keeping

“bureaucrats” [liberal.org.au](http://liberal.org.au).

• **Choice and Funding:** The Coalition places value on the private health system too – they support private health insurance (and would resist any Labor attempt to reduce the rebate). They are likely to encourage people back to GPs by perhaps raising rebates or further incentivizing bulk billing, but also by **reducing red tape** for practices. A big theme is cutting “waste” in health administration: they claim Labor's new regional health bureaucracy isn't helping patients, and vow to redirect funds to frontline services [liberal.org.au](http://liberal.org.au). Expect a Coalition government to consult closely with the AMA and doctors' groups – their policy hints at a Medicare Taskforce to fix accessibility.

• **Preventative and Specialty Care:** In recent statements, the Coalition promised targeted health investments: e.g. more support for **women's health** issues (funding for endometriosis and menopause care) and for **cancer research/treatment** (like a \$150m package for new cancer drugs and trials) – areas they feel Labor has overlooked. They also want to bolster mental health support (more Headspace youth centers, suicide prevention programs). While both parties support costly new medicines, the Coalition is keen to remind voters of any drug listings Labor “deferred” for budget reasons. They also criticized Labor's 60-day dispensing policy, aligning with pharmacies who say it threatens their viability – the Coalition might roll that back

health services. They'd boost funding to public hospitals to end bed shortages and ramping, and ensure every Australian has timely access to care. They propose **free GP visits for all** (eliminating gap fees by increasing Medicare rebates substantially) and removing cost barriers to treatments. This extends to abolishing IVF out-of-pocket costs, providing free abortion services nationwide, and expanding the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme to cover a wider range of contraceptives and essential medications at no cost. Essentially, the Greens model is a fully public-funded health system where ability to pay never limits care [greens.org.au](http://greens.org.au)

• **Preventative and Community Health:** Greens policy puts strong emphasis on preventive care – funding health promotion, nutrition, exercise programs, and school nurses, etc. They also champion mental health, proposing to restore and go beyond 20 Medicare-funded therapy sessions and massively invest in community mental health centers. Another focus is **health equity**: more funding for Indigenous-controlled health services, rural health workforce incentives, and tailoring services for LGBTQ+ health needs. To pay for all this, the Greens detailed new taxes (covered in Tax Policy) – they argue Australia, as a wealthy country, can afford **world-class public health** if billionaires and big corporations pay their fair share [greens.org.au](http://greens.org.au).

	healthcare affordable in the face of rising costs.	or increase pharmacy dispensing fees to compensate. In summary, Coalition policy is to maintain Medicare funding growth, <b>leverage private sector capacity</b> , and target funding to areas of most demand (like mental health and rural health), while attacking Labor for any GP access problems.	
<b>Education &amp; Training</b>	<p>• <b>Early Childhood:</b> Labor implemented its <b>Cheaper Child Care</b> reforms in July 2023, increasing the child care subsidy up to 90% for the lowest-income families and lifting the subsidy for virtually all families earning under \$530k <a href="http://alp.org.au">alp.org.au</a>. This significantly cut daycare costs, effectively giving many families thousands of dollars in relief and encouraging workforce participation (especially for second-income earners). Labor is also rolling out universal preschool for 4-year-olds (“Pre-Kindergarten Year”) in partnership with states, aiming for 30 hours a week of free pre-school by 2025. Early education is cast as both cost-of-living help and an investment in children’s development.</p> <p>• <b>Schools:</b> The ALP is committed to needs-based school funding (the Gonski principle). They accuse the former Coalition government of leaving public schools underfunded. Labor’s target is to get public schools to 100% of the Schooling Resource Standard by 2028 (with negotiations underway with states to increase federal funding share). They’ve also invested in improving teaching quality and student outcomes – e.g.</p>	<p>• <b>Early Education and Childcare:</b> The Coalition supported increasing childcare subsidies in government (and had a smaller increase in 2021), and broadly agrees with more affordable childcare. However, they criticize Labor’s scheme if it appears to inflate fees. A Coalition government might introduce tighter regulation on childcare fee increases or allow more in-home care options (like rebates for nannies) to increase flexibility for families. They also advocate for parents who choose to care at home – possibly via family tax benefits or supporting playgroups – rather than focusing solely on formal childcare.</p> <p>• <b>School Choice and Basics:</b> The Coalition is a strong proponent of parental choice in schooling. They pledge to continue full funding and indexation for independent and Catholic schools, and to work towards public schools being properly funded as well (noting that Coalition federal budgets did increase total school funding, albeit with debates on distribution). A distinctive emphasis is on <b>quality</b>: they often campaign on improving academic results – arguing for a back-to-basics approach (phonics,</p>	<p>• <b>Universal Free Education:</b> The Greens propose <b>fully free education from early childhood through TAFE/uni</b>. They would make child care <b>free</b> (covering the gap that even Labor’s subsidy leaves) and guarantee universal preschool access. In schools, they demand the Commonwealth fund 100% of the public Schooling Resource Standard (instead of the ~20% federal contribution now) to ensure public schools are properly resourced <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a> <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. They also call for winding back public funding to very wealthy private schools (those that already have resources well above the standard) and redirecting funds to where need is greatest. Each public school would get an \$800 per student annual payment for supplies under Greens policy <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>, to eliminate out-of-pocket textbook/uniform costs for parents.</p> <p>• <b>TAFE and Skills:</b> Like Labor, the Greens champion TAFE, but they would go further: free TAFE for all courses and greatly expanded capacity. They see TAFE not just for young people but also for workers transitioning from fossil fuel industries – a large</p>

scholarships to attract top students into teaching, funding for teacher professional development, and measures to lift literacy and numeracy (without the culture-war rhetoric the Coalition sometimes uses). Labor generally supports the current curriculum (which they updated in 2022 to include more on Indigenous history and coding etc.) and is implementing a new National Inclusive Education Plan to better support students with disabilities.

- **TAFE & Skills:** A flagship Labor policy is **fee-free TAFE**. In 2023 they funded 180,000 fee-free TAFE places (in fields like aged care, IT, construction) and in the 2024 Budget committed to 300,000 more over several years [alp.org.au](https://www.alp.org.au). This is to tackle skills shortages and encourage Australians into trades and vocational training. They also created Jobs and Skills Australia, a workforce planning agency to align training with industry needs. Apprentices get support through revived programs (wage subsidies for businesses, and completion bonuses). Labor's approach is collaboration – they held a Jobs and Skills Summit and are working with unions and employers on a new National Skills Agreement to boost investment in training.

- **Higher Education:** Labor initiated a **Universities Accord** process – a major review of the university sector. While final recommendations are due mid-2025, Labor has indicated priorities like: expanding access (especially for Indigenous, rural, and low-SES students), reversing the Coalition's Job-Ready

times-tables), stricter school discipline and values, and better teacher training in core subjects. They have signaled support for raising entry standards for teaching degrees and fast-tracking out-of-field teachers to retrain in areas like maths. They would likely push for more transparent school performance data and may revisit proposals for independent public schools or greater principal autonomy, which Labor is less keen on.

- **Universities and TAFE:** The Coalition's 2020 Job-Ready Graduates scheme (which cut fees for "job-relevant" courses like STEM and hiked fees for humanities) would probably be defended or tweaked rather than dumped. They have been critical of any move to forgive HECS debt or make uni free, framing those as unnecessary subsidies for people who will earn more. Instead, the Coalition tends to focus on **vocational training**: expect incentives for employers to take on apprentices (they had programs like apprentice wage subsidies, apprenticeship commencements bonuses, etc., some of which Labor continued). They might also expand industry-led training programs and private training providers' role, accusing Labor of being too TAFE-centric. On universities, a Coalition government could impose stronger accountability for research funding (Stewart: in the past they've vetoed grants in arts fields deemed frivolous). They also floated the idea of **free speech codes** for campuses and would likely keep a closer eye on universities' ties with foreign governments (China's

government-funded reskilling program as part of climate transition. They also propose a **guaranteed job or training place** for any young person not in employment or education, effectively to eliminate youth unemployment. This might mean significantly increasing apprenticeships with the public sector and government projects (e.g. apprentices for building public housing or renewable energy infrastructure).

- **Higher Education:** The Greens policy is to **abolish university tuition fees and cancel existing student debt** [greens.org.au](https://www.greens.org.au). They argue if university was free for the current Prime Minister (as it was in the 1970s-80s), it should be free for students today. They'd fund universities directly so they don't need to charge fees. They also want to boost research funding (moving away from an over-reliance on corporate partnerships) and increase pay/job security for academic staff. Additionally, the Greens focus on equity in higher ed – setting targets and funding for First Nations students, those from rural areas, and other underrepresented groups to enroll and complete degrees. In essence, the Greens see education as a public good that should be provided free at all levels, with the cost covered by progressive taxation (especially taxing billionaires, per their platform).

	<p>Graduates changes that inflated humanities fees, better funding for research, and possibly creating new regional university centers. They've already committed to lifting the cap on Commonwealth-supported places in areas of skill need (like nursing, teaching, engineering). They also want to improve job security for academics and research funding. However, Labor does not support free university for all (unlike Greens) – students will still pay via HECS, though Labor may reduce HECS indexation or forgive some debt for certain degrees if recommended by the Accord.</p>	<p>influence on campuses was a concern they voiced). In summary, Coalition education policy centers on traditional academic standards in schools, <b>choice and competition</b>, and steering students into jobs via vocational training and “job-ready” higher education, rather than offering universal free education.</p>	
<b>Jobs &amp; Skills</b>	<p>• <b>Job Creation Record:</b> Labor points to the strong labor market on its watch – unemployment around 3.7% and <b>over 1 million jobs created</b> since they took office in 2022 (helped by post-Covid recovery) <a href="https://pm.gov.au">pm.gov.au</a>. They aim to maintain low unemployment (essentially full employment) and have set up institutions like Jobs and Skills Australia to plan for workforce needs. Albanese's slogan “getting wages moving” translated into supporting a higher minimum wage (which the Fair Work Commission delivered – a 5.2% rise in 2022 and further 7% in 2023 for the lowest paid, aligning with inflation). Labor has facilitated this by making supportive submissions to the independent wage umpire, a shift from the previous government's approach.</p> <p>• <b>Industrial Relations:</b> A major point of difference: Labor passed laws to enable <b>multi-employer bargaining</b> for workers in</p>	<p>• <b>Economic Growth for Jobs:</b> The Coalition's core message on jobs is that a strong economy led by the private sector will create employment, not government intervention. They credit policies like lower taxes and deregulation for the pre-pandemic job growth and would return to that approach. Specifically, they propose to <b>cut red tape and energy costs for businesses</b> so they can hire more <a href="https://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. For example, they argue Labor's industrial relations changes are “anti-business” and pledge to reverse or soften them – reinstating the Australian Building and Construction Commission (which Labor abolished) to police construction unions, scrapping multi-employer bargaining for small businesses, and abandoning “same job same pay” which they say penalizes labour hire flexibility. These differences will be a big battleground: Coalition will claim Labor's IR laws are leading to higher strikes and will deter</p>	<p>• <b>Full Employment Guarantee:</b> The Greens take a more interventionist stance – some members talk about a <b>job guarantee</b> where the government would directly offer employment (at a living wage) to anyone who can't find work in the private sector. These jobs could be in community projects, environmental conservation, public services, etc. While not official policy in those terms, the Greens emphasize that in a wealthy society, everyone who wants a job should have one, and if not, income support should be ample (they advocate a livable income for those who can't work).</p> <p>• <b>Worker's Rights and Wages:</b> The Greens strongly backed Labor's recent IR reforms and often argue they should go further (e.g. they support industry-wide collective bargaining rights for unions, beyond what Labor's law allows). They want to strengthen unions' power to organize and strike, viewing robust unions</p>



low-paid sectors, making it easier for groups of workplaces to negotiate together for better pay. They also are moving on “same job, same pay” laws to ensure labour-hire workers are paid the same as direct employees. These reforms are designed to boost wages and job security after a decade of wage stagnation [alp.org.au](http://alp.org.au). The Coalition opposed these changes, so Labor will campaign on having *raised wages* (e.g. for aged care workers with a 15% pay increase funded, and overall wage growth now outpacing inflation).

• **Skilled Migration & Training:** Labor views skilled migration as complementary to training Australians. They raised the permanent migration cap to 195k in 2022-23 to address acute shortages, but are now moderating it (slightly down to 190k) and focusing on clearing visa backlogs and stopping exploitation of temporary migrants. Concurrently, through fee-free TAFE and apprenticeships, they’re training tens of thousands in trades like construction, care, and technology. Labor is also investing in higher education for skills – e.g. more nurses and teachers through funded uni places. A signature initiative is the National Reconstruction Fund (NRF) – a \$15 billion investment vehicle to grow industries (manufacturing, clean energy, medical tech, etc.) which is tied to local job creation. The idea is to diversify the economy and create secure, high-skill jobs (e.g. electric vehicle manufacturing).

employment.

• **Tax Incentives & Small Business:** Expect the Coalition to offer tax incentives to boost jobs – possibly resurrecting something like the JobMaker hiring credit for youth, or tax breaks for businesses that invest in new hiring or training. They have announced plans like a 20% instant asset write-off bonus for small businesses that Labor adopted, and would likely continue generous depreciation rules to encourage expansion. Small businesses are framed as job engines, so the Coalition promises to simplify compliance (like BAS, licensing etc.) and to **reduce regulatory fees**. In their budget reply, they proposed an energy cost rebate for small firms to ease pressures (Labor partly matched this). They also want to **increase older worker participation** – raising the amount age pensioners can earn (which Labor did temporarily) permanently so businesses can tap into experienced workers [liberal.org.au](http://liberal.org.au).

• **Skills & Immigration:** The Coalition has signaled a more restrictive approach to skilled immigration compared to Labor. Dutton announced he would **cut the permanent migration intake by 25%** (to 140k/year) until housing supply catches up [theguardian.com](http://theguardian.com). This marks a difference: Coalition argues bringing in fewer migrants in the short term will relieve job market pressure (they often cite migrants competing for housing and services, though businesses worry about skill shortages). At the same time, they promise to

as key to higher wages [greens.org.au](http://greens.org.au). They also call for raising the national minimum wage to at least 60% of the median wage and legislating pay increases in sectors dominated by women (like early childhood education and aged care) to close the gender pay gap. Additionally, they propose a **30-hour work week** (equivalent to a 4-day week) as a long-term goal, without loss of pay – sharing productivity gains in the form of time.

• **Climate Jobs & Transition:** A cornerstone of Greens jobs policy is the creation of **hundreds of thousands of jobs in climate action** – from renewable energy construction to ecosystem restoration. They often cite a figure that a transition to 100% renewables could create 50,000+ jobs, and a mass public housing build would employ tens of thousands in construction. Their plan includes a publicly owned renewable energy company that would hire and train workers, and a transition authority to ensure coal communities get new jobs as mines and plants close. They also champion projects like high-speed rail as both climate-friendly and employment-rich. These are government-led investments that contrast with the Coalition’s market-led focus.

• **Migration and Exploitation:** The Greens support skilled migration but want to **end exploitation of migrant workers** – for instance by abolishing the sub-class 482 temporary work visa in favor of permanent residency for needed workers, so they have full rights. They have zero tolerance for

	<p>• <b>Job Security &amp; Conditions:</b> Labor's broader employment policy includes converting more insecure jobs to permanent (limiting rolling short-term contracts in the public service, for example), making wage theft a crime, and increasing the income of gig economy workers by empowering the Fair Work Commission to set standards for gig companies. They contrast their approach as being "<i>on the side of workers</i>" and unions, versus the previous government which they characterise as deliberately keeping wages low.</p>	<p>train Australians: continuing apprenticeship incentive programs they started in government (like wage subsidies for new apprentices, particularly in regional areas or trades). A new idea floated is trade training in schools – encouraging more high school students into vocational education. The Coalition also tends to support <b>work for the dole</b> and strict mutual obligations to push unemployed people into jobs, whereas Labor has been trialing reforms in that area. In summary, Coalition jobs policy banks on private sector-led growth, lower taxes, and a trim migration + pro-business industrial framework to stimulate hiring.</p>	<p>workplaces underpaying or mistreating migrants (calling for harsher penalties and more inspectors). They also push for lifting the humanitarian intake (which creates jobs in resettlement services) and giving refugees the right to work immediately. Essentially, the Greens see migration as positive but object to using temporary migrants as "cheap labour". In their ideal scenario, Australian-trained workers fill jobs where possible (hence free education/training), and migrants who are needed are given secure status and fair conditions.</p>
<p><b>Environment &amp; Climate</b></p>	<p>• <b>Climate Targets &amp; Strategy:</b> Labor has legislated Australia's first economy-wide climate targets – a 43% reduction in emissions by 2030 (on 2005 levels) and net zero by 2050 <a href="http://alp.org.au">alp.org.au</a>. While more ambitious than the Coalition's old 26–28% 2030 goal, it's far below what the Greens (and climate scientists) urge. Labor defends 43% as "achievable and credible," and is implementing policies to meet it: chiefly the <b>Safeguard Mechanism reform</b> that requires the 215 biggest industrial emitters to cut or offset their emissions by ~5% each year. They also have a target of 82% renewable electricity by 2030 and are investing heavily to upgrade the power grid (the \$20b Rewiring the Nation plan) to accommodate new solar and wind.</p> <p>• <b>Renewable Energy and Transition:</b> The Albanese government has green-lit numerous renewable projects, revived the Clean Energy</p>	<p>• <b>Slower Climate Action, Pro-Nuclear Pivot:</b> The Coalition accepts net zero by 2050 (in line with most developed nations) but is critical of Labor's 43% by 2030 target as too aggressive if achieved via what they call "taxes on industry." They voted against the Climate Bill in 2022 and haven't set a new 2030 target – implying they'd aim to meet or modestly beat the former 26-28% goal instead. The big change in Coalition climate policy is a push for <b>nuclear energy</b>. Dutton argues that small modular reactors can replace coal plants and provide reliable, emissions-free power cheaper than over-investing in renewables and storage <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a> <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. They propose lifting the current ban on nuclear tech to at least start the planning process <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. (Labor attacks this as costly and slow, noting no reactor would be operating before 2030, and remains firmly opposed to domestic nuclear power.)</p>	<p>• <b>Ambitious Cuts, No New Coal or Gas:</b> Climate is the Greens' top issue. They argue Labor's 43% target is inadequate; the Greens want <b>75% emissions reduction by 2030</b> and <b>net zero by 2035</b>, to align with climate science. Crucially, they say <i>no new coal, oil or gas</i> projects can proceed – Australia must stop expanding fossil fuel extraction immediately <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. In negotiations, the Greens tried to force Labor to agree to a blanket ban on new projects; they didn't get that, but they claim credit for measures that make it harder (a pollution cap in law, etc. <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>). In any power-sharing situation, the Greens would demand a prohibition on new coal and gas as a condition. They also advocate phasing out existing coal and gas faster – for example, no coal power by 2030 and a transition plan for coal mining communities to shift to other industries.</p>



Finance Corp funding, and introduced incentives like the National Electric Vehicle Strategy (including fuel efficiency standards to bring more EV models in). They also support developing new industries like green hydrogen and critical minerals (for batteries) – often citing that climate action is an economic opportunity for new jobs. However, Labor’s stance is that gas (and some oil/coal) will play a role in the transition: they have not banned new fossil fuel projects. This is a contentious point – e.g., Labor approved new gas fields like Scarborough and coal mine extensions, arguing each is assessed on merits and that gas is needed for energy security in the near term. They prefer emissions from any new projects be offset to net zero.

• **Environmental Protection:** Beyond climate, Labor is undertaking a reform of federal environmental laws (EPBC Act) to create a new Environmental Protection Agency and set national standards, as recommended by the Samuel review. They’ve committed to conserving 30% of Australia’s land and oceans by 2030, are phasing out live sheep exports, and have put nearly \$1.2b into Great Barrier Reef protection. Labor also announced the end of native forest logging on Commonwealth land (and applauded Victorian Labor and WA Labor decisions to end logging in state forests). They contrast this with the Coalition’s record of waiving environmental requirements and fighting UNESCO over Reef “in danger” status. Still, activists criticize Labor for approving coal

• **Fossil Fuels and Energy Prices:** The Coalition criticizes Labor’s willingness to impose caps or intervention (like the temporary coal and gas price cap in 2022). They prefer incentivizing **more gas supply** – reopening exploration and fast-tracking production – to bring energy prices down and ensure reliability [liberal.org.au](https://www.liberal.org.au). They also champion carbon capture and storage (CCS) for fossil fuel plants, which Labor has been lukewarm on. On new coal and gas projects, a Coalition government would almost certainly approve them more freely than Labor, and scrap any effective bans (Labor’s Safeguard mechanism deal with Greens introduced a hard cap that could prevent some new projects – the Coalition decried this as “anti-industry” and would remove such caps). Essentially, the Coalition’s climate posture is **technology-neutral**: let renewables grow but also use gas, coal, **and nuclear**, without punitive emissions rules. They claim this approach could still meet emissions goals but with less economic disruption, though critics doubt the credibility of the reductions.

• **Environment:** Historically, Coalition governments have favored development over new environmental protections. They often seek to streamline approvals (calling green tape a hindrance). The Dutton-led Coalition has not outlined a detailed environmental policy yet, but one can infer they would be cautious on reforms that restrict miners or farmers. They opposed Labor’s move to end

• **100% Renewables & Exports Transition:** The Greens plan calls for an electricity grid running on 100% renewable energy by 2030 (Labor’s goal is 82%). They’d invest heavily in solar, wind, batteries, pumped hydro, and **publicly owned** renewable generation to drive this transition. They oppose taxpayer funds going to fossil or CCS projects, instead directing them to clean technology and energy efficiency. They also talk about transforming Australia from a fossil fuel exporting nation to a *renewable superpower* – exporting green hydrogen or ammonia, critical minerals, etc., rather than coal and LNG. This includes assisting workers to retrain and relocate if needed, with guaranteed jobs in new industries.

• **Environmental Protection & Biodiversity:** The Greens are strong on protecting forests, rivers, and wildlife. They want to immediately end all native forest logging nationwide (they were thrilled by VIC and WA decisions and urge other states to follow). They oppose new large dams or water projects that threaten ecosystems (e.g., they opposed the Coalition’s proposed dams in Qld and NSW). They would strengthen the EPBC Act far beyond Labor’s changes – introducing an independent EPA with powers to veto harmful projects, critical habitat protections that can’t be overridden, and stringent climate tests for any development. They also advocate for animal rights (banning live exports, ending factory farming of pigs and hens, etc.) which Labor

	seam gas and slow progress on threatened species – areas where Greens press harder.	native logging federally (Nationals in particular back the timber industry). They also tend to downplay climate links to issues like the Great Barrier Reef (securing funding for the Reef but rejecting UNESCO's warnings). On water, the Nationals have resisted fully delivering the Murray-Darling Basin environmental flows. In short, the Coalition prioritizes economic uses of land and water, with environmental measures often coming as reactions to public pressure rather than proactive initiatives.	has only selectively acted on. In sum, the Greens are the party of <b>climate emergency action</b> and ecological preservation, willing to confront powerful mining interests and redesign the economy around green principles – a stance unmatched by the others.
<b>Infrastructure &amp; Investment</b>	<p>• <b>Nation-Building Projects:</b> Labor is investing in infrastructure with an emphasis on productivity and sustainability. They are supporting public transport projects (e.g. rail upgrades, metro lines in major cities, the Brisbane Olympics infrastructure, and planning High Speed Rail starting with Sydney-Newcastle). Roads are not ignored – projects like outback highway upgrades, the Pacific and Bruce Highway improvements, etc., have funding – but Labor did undertake a comprehensive review in 2023 of the existing project pipeline. This review cut or delayed many Coalition-announced projects that were deemed unviable or unfunded, in order to focus on priority projects <a href="https://www.aapnews.aap.com.au">aapnews.aap.com.au</a>. Labor argues this makes the infrastructure spend more efficient, whereas the opposition accuses them of cutting projects for the regions.</p> <p>• <b>Renewables and Climate Infrastructure:</b> A distinguishing feature of Labor's infrastructure agenda is investment in <b>energy infrastructure</b></p>	<p>• <b>Traditional Infrastructure Blitz:</b> The Coalition has criticized Labor's infrastructure review, saying it cut \$50-100 billion in projects that communities were counting on <a href="https://www.aapnews.aap.com.au">aapnews.aap.com.au</a>. A Coalition government would aim to <b>restore many road and dam projects</b> Labor paused. For instance, they'd likely revive plans for the East-West Link in Melbourne (a tolled road project Labor opposes), more funding for commuter car parks and highway duplications in growth corridors, and dams/irrigation in NSW and Qld (the Nationals champion projects like the Dungowan Dam and Urannah Dam). They view these construction projects as vital for regional development and water security, and also as job creators.</p> <p>• <b>Decentralisation and Regional Growth:</b> The Nationals in particular push for investments outside capital cities – e.g. upgrading regional airports, building new freight intermodals and finishing Inland Rail properly. The Coalition could also revisit a</p>	<p>• <b>Sustainable &amp; Public Infrastructure:</b> The Greens oppose building new fossil-fuel-related infrastructure or unnecessary mega-highways. They would redirect funds towards <b>public transport, renewable energy, and social infrastructure</b>. For example, they want federal money for urban passenger rail and high-speed rail rather than urban motorways. They have long campaigned for an <i>East Coast High Speed Rail</i> connecting Melbourne, Canberra, Sydney, and Brisbane – and would likely make support of any government conditional on concrete progress on this project (beyond the authority Labor established). They also advocate for vastly increased investment in walking and cycling infrastructure in cities to reduce car dependency.</p> <p>• <b>No New Dams/Coal Ports:</b> Greens would block environmentally damaging schemes like new large dams on wild rivers, or new coal export terminals (they strongly opposed, for instance, the Adani mine's rail line and port</p>

– the Rewiring the Nation program to build new transmission lines, and funding renewable energy zones, big batteries and pumped hydro. This is seen as critical to meet climate targets and reduce power prices. They are also investing in EV charging networks and other climate-resilient infrastructure (like disaster-resistant infrastructure after floods/fires). The Coalition’s plans are more tilted to traditional transport and dams by comparison.

• **Industry and Regional Investment:**

Through the \$15 billion National Reconstruction Fund (NRF), Labor will co-invest in manufacturing capabilities (e.g. renewables manufacturing, value-adding in agriculture, medical manufacturing). This is paired with regional investment plans – e.g. the Middle Arm industrial hub in NT (controversial for involving gas processing), and diversification projects in coal regions (Hunter, Illawarra, CQ) using the \$1bn Transition Authority funds. Labor has also continued the Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF) to fund projects up north, but with more focus on clean energy and less on coal ports. They often highlight NBN investments too – they’re expanding full-fibre broadband to more suburbs after the Coalition’s mixed-model rollout. So Labor’s approach is **active government investment** in modernizing infrastructure and industry, with an eye on long-term productivity, not just immediate stimulus.

decentralisation agenda: incentives to move government agencies to regional towns and investments in those communities’ infrastructure. They often mention mobile blackspot funding and rural broadband improvements (the Coalition subsidized mobile towers and satellites for remote areas). Labor has continued some of that, but the Coalition would emphasize it more.

• **Private Investment Leverage:** The Coalition tends to leverage private sector and state funds through matching schemes. They might expand the use of Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) for big projects and asset recycling programs (where states get federal bonuses for privatizing and reinvesting in infrastructure). On energy infrastructure, instead of government directly financing transmission as Labor does, the Coalition might rely on regulatory incentives for the private sector or not prioritize it as much (especially given their interest in on-site generation like SMRs). In tech, the Coalition might pursue 5G rollout incentives or smart infrastructure funds (building on their City Deals program). Overall, expect a Coalition government to promise an **infrastructure boom**, especially in roads, ports, water projects, and regional development initiatives that they say Labor has neglected – returning to a spend profile similar to the prior government’s big-ticket announcements (albeit some were unfulfilled).

expansion). They instead propose investments in water efficiency, sustainable agriculture infrastructure, and restoration of ecosystems (e.g. funding mass tree planting, Indigenous ranger programs, etc., as “natural infrastructure”).

• **Community & Social Infrastructure:** A portion of Greens infrastructure focus is on things like **schools, hospitals, public housing** – essentially infrastructure that also has social benefits. They argue that funding 1 million public homes, upgrading all public schools, and building community renewable energy microgrids would yield more public good than toll roads or sports stadiums. They also call for better digital infrastructure equitably distributed (they were critical of the NBN’s shortcomings and would support full fiber rollout to all premises). To pay for infrastructure, the Greens would stop spending on projects they deem wasteful or harmful (they often cite the billions saved by not building submarines or scrapping fossil fuel subsidies) and borrow at low interest for nation-building projects if needed, noting that the economic return and societal value justify it.

<p><b>Tax Policy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Income Taxes:</b> Labor will <b>implement the Stage-3 income tax cuts from mid-2024</b>, which significantly flatten the tax scale (creating a 30% rate for incomes \$45k–\$200k). Despite internal debate, Labor honoured this bipartisan legislated cut, so from 2025 both middle and high earners will see tax reductions. They emphasize delivering “a <i>tax cut for every taxpayer</i>” <a href="http://alp.org.au">alp.org.au</a> as part of cost-of-living relief. However, unlike the Coalition, Labor expresses concern that the highest-income earners benefit most – but they ruled out any changes to Stage-3 in this term to maintain voter trust.</li> <li>• <b>Business Taxes:</b> Labor’s approach has been moderate continuity. The corporate tax rate remains 25% for small companies and 30% for large – no raises. Instead, Labor closed some loopholes: they legislated a global minimum tax of 15% for multinationals, tightened rules on deducting interest to shift profits overseas, and modestly increased PRRT (petroleum resource rent tax) collections from offshore gas <a href="http://budget.gov.au">budget.gov.au</a>. These are targeted measures yielding extra revenue without altering headline rates. Labor also introduced a tax on <i>large</i> superannuation balances: from 2025-26, super account earnings above \$3 million will be taxed at 30% (up from 15%) <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>. They argue this affects fewer than 1% of people and makes the system fairer; the Coalition brands it a broken promise.</li> <li>• <b>GST and Others:</b> Labor has no plans to change the GST (no rate or base changes).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lower Tax Philosophy:</b> The Coalition’s stance is that Australians are overtaxed and that tax cuts boost economic activity. They champion the Stage-3 tax cuts as a signature policy – flattening the tax brackets and eliminating the 37% bracket altogether. They have committed to <i>no new taxes</i> and to reversing Labor’s “sneaky taxes” like the superannuation changes if possible. For example, Dutton has signalled he’d scrap Labor’s higher tax on large super balances, keeping the 15% flat rate for all super to honor what he calls a “no new taxes on super” promise <a href="http://liberal.org.au">liberal.org.au</a>.</li> <li>• <b>Future Tax Cuts:</b> While no detailed plan is released, traditionally the Coalition seeks further tax reduction when fiscally feasible. This could include bringing forward another round of income tax relief for middle incomes or reducing taxes on small business (they might look at further cuts to the 25% company tax threshold or increased thresholds). Under Howard/Costello, and Abbott/Turnbull, there were attempts to lower the big business corporate tax rate – something Dutton’s team might revisit for competitiveness, though Senate math is usually challenging. The Coalition will also likely campaign on reinstating lapsed offsets (like the Low and Middle Income Tax Offset which expired) or similar relief targeted at working families.</li> <li>• <b>No “Taxes by Stealth”:</b> Dutton has accused Labor of raising taxes by stealth via bracket creep (fiscal drag) and not indexing things like</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Tax the Rich, Fund Services:</b> The Greens openly advocate <b>higher taxes on the very wealthy and big corporations</b> <a href="http://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. They propose a suite of taxes: a <b>wealth tax</b> on billionaires (for example, 6% annually on wealth over \$1bn), a <b>super-profits tax</b> on corporations (perhaps a 40% tax on profits above a “normal” return, targeting banks, mining companies, etc.), and returning the corporate tax rate for large companies to 30% (the Coalition had wanted it down to 25%). They vehemently oppose the Stage-3 income tax cuts – calling for them to be repealed or wound back as they overwhelmingly benefit high earners. In the current parliament, the Greens tried to amend legislation to stop Stage-3 but Labor and Coalition together ensured it passed. This remains a <b>sharp difference</b>: post-2025, Greens would push any minority government to scrap those tax cuts and use the ~\$254 billion (over 10 years) for public services.</li> <li>• <b>Clamping Down on Tax Dodgers:</b> The Greens want to end the situation where many large companies pay no tax. They’d tighten anti-avoidance laws, perhaps mandate a minimum tax for big firms regardless of deductions (similar to the global minimum). They also support raising royalties or resource rent taxes on mining and gas (criticizing Labor for only modest PRRT changes). The Greens highlight fossil fuel subsidies (like fuel tax credits for mining trucks) as <b>tax expenditures to eliminate</b> – saving tens of billions that can</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---	--	---

	<p>They are eyeing the integrity of the tax system – e.g. funding the ATO to pursue tax evasion. In terms of incentives, Labor continued small business instant asset write-offs and introduced some temporary credits (e.g. a 20% bonus deduction for investments in digital technology or energy efficiency for SMEs). They generally avoid broad new taxes (learning from 2019's rejected franking credits and negative gearing plans). Notably, Labor has shelved any ideas of an inheritance tax or wealth tax – those are off the table for both major parties. They prefer multinational tax reform done in OECD partnership rather than unilateral big taxes on billionaires (which the Greens push).</p>	<p>fuel excise (though in fact excise is indexed). The Coalition could offer to <b>restore indexation</b> in areas or cut “hidden” taxes (for instance, halting any increase in tobacco excise beyond scheduled, or reducing beer excise for brewers as they've advocated). They firmly oppose ideas like a windfall profits tax on banks or miners, which they label as class warfare (whereas the Greens support those). The Coalition tends to favour <b>broad-base, low-rate</b> taxes and often reviews the tax mix to spur investment – e.g. they might consider new investment allowances or extending full expensing to encourage business growth. Importantly, any ALP consideration of changes to capital gains or negative gearing (even though ALP says they won't) would be seized by the Coalition to claim “Labor will raise your taxes on your home/investments,” reinforcing their image as the lower-tax party.</p>	<p>be redirected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Wealth Redistribution:</b> Unlike the majors, the Greens consider taxes on assets: they support limiting <b>negative gearing</b> to one investment property per person (eventually phasing it out) and removing the 50% capital gains discount for investments held over a year <a href="https://greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a>. They'd also tax family trusts at a minimum rate to stop high-income earners from income-splitting to lower brackets. Their philosophy is that those with the most can and should pay more, to ensure everyone has basics like housing, health, education. They often cite that Australia's tax-to-GDP ratio is lower than many OECD countries – implying there's room to tax more and still be a prosperous economy. Of course, both Labor and Coalition reject many of these ideas, making <b>tax policy a major fault line</b> especially if Greens hold balance of power.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other Key Issues</b> (<i>Social Policy, Defence, Immigration, etc.</i>)</p>	<p><b>Indigenous:</b> Labor fully endorsed the Uluru Statement, including establishing an <b>Indigenous Voice to Parliament</b>. Albanese put the Voice referendum to Australians in 2023, and while it failed, Labor remains committed to reconciliation – continuing practical initiatives on health, education, and justice for First Nations peoples. They may pursue non-constitutional avenues for Indigenous advisory bodies and have allocated funding for local truth-telling and Treaty processes (especially supporting states that are moving on Treaty).</p>	<p><b>Indigenous:</b> The Coalition (Liberals and Nationals) officially campaigned <b>against the Voice</b> referendum in 2023, arguing it would be divisive and not deliver practical outcomes. They instead advocate for “practical reconciliation” – boosting Indigenous employment, policing in remote communities, and improving services – without constitutional change. Post-referendum, they support symbolic recognition of First Peoples in the Constitution's preamble (a form of words acknowledging Indigenous Australians, which Labor says is not enough). They are skeptical</p>	<p><b>Indigenous:</b> The Greens strongly support <b>Voice, Treaty, Truth</b> – all elements of the Uluru Statement. They backed the Yes case for the Voice but often stated it should be just a first step. Post-referendum, they are urging the government to start <b>Treaty and Truth-telling</b> processes immediately, both nationally and by supporting state treaties. They want a national Truth and Justice Commission to address historical and ongoing injustices against First Nations people. The Greens also campaign on Indigenous rights issues like stopping Aboriginal deaths in custody (they demand all</p>



**Defence:** Labor is carrying out the big Defence Strategic Review plans – focusing on deterrence with long-range strike capabilities, cyber, and the AUKUS partnership. They are proceeding with **AUKUS nuclear submarines** (acquiring US/UK subs over the next two decades) and investing in missiles and northern base upgrades. Labor increased defence spending to around 2.1% of GDP and, despite reallocating some funds within the defence budget, has kept overall spending growth. They balance this by emphasizing self-reliance and regional diplomacy as well. Labor is also establishing a Defense Capability Assurance fund to oversee those huge AUKUS expenditures so they don't blow out.

**Immigration:** The Albanese government raised the permanent **migration intake to ~195,000** per year (up from 160k), aiming to bring in more skilled workers to fill jobs. They also created new visa categories (like the Pacific Engagement visa) and cleared a massive backlog of visa applications. Importantly, Labor fulfilled a promise to **abolish Temporary Protection Visas**, granting permanent status to ~19,000 refugees who'd been in limbo [greens.org.au](https://www.greens.org.au). However, Labor maintained **strong border policies**: continuing boat turn-backs and offshore processing (though nearly all remaining offshore refugees were moved to other countries or Australia under Labor, effectively emptying Nauru). They support expanded humanitarian intakes (27,000 per year, plus

of Treaties at the national level, and some Coalition figures oppose even state treaty processes, while others say it's up to states.

**Defence:** The Coalition portrays itself as tougher on defence. They initiated AUKUS and if returned to government would ensure it continues apace or even faster – possibly pushing to acquire off-the-shelf submarines earlier. They criticized Labor for cancelling or scaling back certain defence projects (like some armoured vehicles), suggesting a Coalition government might restore those or increase defence funding further. Some in the Coalition propose **expanding defence spend to 2.5–3% of GDP** over time. They also promote the idea of an Australian **domestic nuclear industry** to support both submarines and potentially energy – a long-term vision distinctly different from Labor's no-nuclear stance. In terms of alliance, the Coalition may explore hosting allied forces more regularly in Australia and integrating more with US missile defense programs.

**Immigration:** The Coalition under Dutton took a harder turn on immigration levels, pledging a **25% cut to the permanent intake** (from 195k down to 140k for at least the first two years) to *"take pressure off housing and infrastructure"* [theguardian.com](https://www.theguardian.com). They argue Labor's high intake contributed to the housing crisis. In government the Coalition had generally supported skilled migration but kept the official cap around 160k; now they signal even lower numbers until housing supply catches up. They

339 recommendations of the Royal Commission be implemented) and protecting cultural heritage (strengthening laws after Juukan Gorge's destruction). They stand with Indigenous activists on cases like opposing the Santos gas drilling in the Tiwi Sea and the Adani mine on Wangan and Jagalingou land.

**Defence:** The Greens are pacifist-inclined and would **cut defence spending** substantially. They oppose acquiring nuclear submarines (and would cancel AUKUS subs contracts), as well as expensive weapons like long-range strike missiles that Labor and Coalition agree on. They instead advocate using those billions for climate action and health. They do support funding defence personnel properly and focusing on actual **defence** (territorial integrity, disaster response) rather than power projection. The Greens call for Australia to sign the Nuclear Weapon Ban Treaty and remove any extended nuclear deterrence policies. They'd also prohibit any future foreign bases or nuclear facilities. This is a **major contrast**: on defence, Greens policy is basically to unwind the militarization consensus of the majors and invest in human security (climate, pandemics) over military hardware.

**Immigration:** The Greens want a **far more humane immigration system** [greens.org.au](https://www.greens.org.au). They would immediately **end offshore detention** and **boat turn-backs**, which they view as cruel and illegal. As an alternative, they advocate increasing safe pathways: for example, upping the

	<p>extra for crises like Afghanistan and Ukraine) but not as high as Greens want. In summary, Labor's immigration stance is pro-migration for skills and family reunion, more humane to refugees in backlog, but still with deterrence to unauthorized boat arrivals.</p>	<p>remain uncompromising on border security: they would keep offshore detention as a deterrent (they've criticized Labor for quietly letting detention empty and for a failed High Court challenge leading to detainees release). Dutton has also suggested re-introducing temporary protection visas if asylum seeker boat arrivals ever resumed, and even floated capping certain visa categories (like partner visas) to reduce overall immigration – a stance Labor calls extreme. Overall, expect the Coalition to emphasize controlled migration and stringent vetting, prioritizing those with job offers and reducing "net migration" significantly compared to Labor's settings.</p>	<p>humanitarian intake to <b>50,000 refugees per year</b> <a href="https://www.greens.org.au">greens.org.au</a> and creating regional processing programs so people can apply without getting on boats. They demand the remaining asylum seekers in PNG/Nauru be brought to Australia (Labor has been gradually moving most to NZ or Canada). The Greens would also abolish Temporary Protection Visas <i>and</i> grant permanent visas to the refugees still on Nauru/PNG or in Australia on bridging visas – effectively ending 20+ years of offshore deterrence policy. In addition, they'd make family reunions easier (lower visa fees, faster processing) and have more humane treatment of immigrants generally (e.g. ending lengthy detention, closing detention centers in favor of case management in the community). While they support skilled migration, they insist those workers have full rights and a path to citizenship; and they oppose using migration as a way to avoid training local workers or underpaying people.</p>
--	---	---	---