# Can't have both net zero and big Australia

TERRY MCCRANN

THE utter, seemingly mandatory stupidity, deep into certifiable insanity, driving the Albanese-Bowen-Bandt government is captured in the intersection – catastrophic collision would be more accurate – of the return to the massive immigration Ponzi and the religious pursuit of net-zero.

You would have thought, you would have hoped, that in the context of some lingering link to fact-based analysis, and indeed the most basic reality, someone, anyone, would have told them – I'd accept, "merely suggested" – that the two were utterly incompatible.

That this "someone" would have said: Prime minister, you can have the one or the other – setting aside, that each is in its own right outright lunatic stupidity. But you simply cannot have both.

That's even in the fantasy world in which Greens leader Bandt and Labor's twerp-in-chief Bowen jointly reside. If you want to get to net zero by 2050, don't aim to double the population to 50 million by then. In case you haven't noticed, more humans mean more CO2 emissions. It's not just happenstance that the US emits more than Australia, to take just one example.

Equally, if you are insistent on the big Australia future, you cannot sensibly aim for net zero. It's hard enough, it's insane enough, "getting there", with 26 million Australians; to get there with 50 million is beyond even the impossible.

The reduction in per capita emissions required is beyond achievable, even with the return to an 18th century no-energy future that you, Bowen and Bandt, are determined to impose on Australia. Hey, by the bye, there's no way we are actually going to get to net zero by 2050 anyway.

Even if rather than bringing in more and more people, we sent half the current population "home".

And "embraced" that 18th century future of life that would be – increasingly, will be – nasty, brutal and short.

But let's not quibble over different flavours of lunacy. This is where the rubber hits the road. Running into Covid, it was becoming increasingly clear that the population Ponzi scheme of mass immigration had become, at best, a pointless merry-go-round. As someone pungently and accurately captured it: We had to bring in more and more migrants to build the infrastructure – from roads, to hospitals, schools and high-rise – to accommodate all the extra people.

I add: Do we really think the sunlit uplands of a 21st century Australia Felix future will comprise 20-lane double-deck freeways?

Even if some, many, of the vehicles on them are electric, even if mostly parked, waiting for a charge, when the sun comes up or the wind starts to blow?

We are enjoined to bring in 400,000 or more every year – that's, net; the actual number is far, far higher – to offset our ageing population.

It's as if a migrant, miraculously, never grows old. Again, in the quirky, old-fashioned place known as reality, they do, just like everybody else. So getting on the 400,000-a-year escalator now contains within it a necessity to get on an 800,000-a-year escalator in 20 or 25 years.

And then a 1.6 million-a-year escalator at some point after that, and so on, forever.

Furthermore, where are these people supposed to come from? Those to staff our hospitals, the nursing homes for that ageing domestic population?

Is there a factory out there that manufactures these people? No, we are quite happy to plunder other countries – from the developed to the developing. To take their essential, young workers to pamper our ageing baby boomers.

Talk about "white privilege" – this has to be the most egregious exercise on the planet. The breathtaking stupidity of it all is one thing.

One cannot but be in awe of the pompous all-unknowing, bottomless, incomprehension of a Bandt, of a Bowen.

But the added stinking hypocrisy takes it to new depths.