

**Submission
No 717**

INQUIRY INTO COAL SEAM GAS

Name: Mr Yasir Hassan Assam

Date received: 14/09/2011

I am totally against Coal Seam Gas mining and wish to see it stop permanently for the following reasons:

- It will have long-lasting damaging effects on our water & land. You cannot eat or drink money.
- The full life-cycle GHG emissions from GSG are nearly as high, or perhaps even higher than from burning coal. ¹
- If we're serious about keeping global temperatures from rising above 2C above pre-industrialisation (and even 2C is seen as *very dangerous* by climate scientists) ² then we cannot exploit unconventional fossil fuels. As climate scientist James Hansen said, it's "game over" if we dig this stuff up and burn it. ³
- We are currently heading for a temperature rise of 4C ⁴ which would likely see the carrying capacity of the planet reduce to 1 billion people by 2100 (if that). ⁵ Such a scenario is horrific beyond imagination (the extra 6 billion+ people are not going to die quietly).
- We cannot be serious about tackling global warming (though ETS etc.) while simultaneously expanding unconventional fossil fuel production.
- We don't need it. We've managed fine without it. Keep it in the ground. It's the safe option.
- We should transition to 100% renewable energy as rapidly as possible. It can be done in 10 years relatively cheaply (for the price of a couple of cups of coffee a week per household). ⁶
- 100% renewable energy is much cheaper when you look at it over 50 years, and that's without even taking environmental damage into account.
- Stop short-term thinking. Start thinking long-term.

Gas mining companies are hell-bent extracting the maximum value out of this resource, come hell or high water. They are pathologically driven to maximise profits at any cost, even at the expense of

1 This paper <http://www.springerlink.com/content/e384226wr4160653/fulltext.pdf> talks about shale gas, but a co-author [said that the same would apply to CSG](#).

2 "2°C now represents a threshold, not between acceptable and dangerous climate change, but between dangerous and 'extremely dangerous'" - Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A 13 January 2011 vol. 369 no. 1934 20-44 - <http://rsta.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/369/1934/20.full>

3 http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/mailings/2011/20110603_SilenceIsDeadly.pdf and check out at the graph on http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/mailings/2011/20110902_WhiteHouseAndTarSands.pdf which shows how the emissions from just 50% unconventional fossil fuel reserves is greater than all the emissions humanity has produced so far.

4 <http://www.climateactiontracker.org/> shows that we're headed for a rise of somewhere between 2.6C to 4.0C. When it comes to managing risk, we need to look at the upper end of the likely range, not the mean.

5 Page 43 on <http://climatecongress.ku.dk/speakers/schellnhuber-plenaryspeaker-12march2009.pdf> (from talk given by one of the [world's leading climate scientists](#)). See also <http://news.scotsman.com/latestnews/Warming-will-39wipe-out-billions39.5867379.jp> where another scientist is quoted as saying that only around half a billion people will survive in a 4C world.

6 http://www.energy.unimelb.edu.au/uploads/ZCA2020_Stationary_Energy_Report_v1.pdf

the health & safety of their own children, who will surely suffer with the rest of us as the earth warms.

It is therefore up to law-makers and regulators to stop this avaricious industry from further destroying our land, water & climate.

Ask yourself this:

Do you want to live next to one of these mines?

Do you want your children to drink water from a bore near one?

Do you want your children to eat the food grown in farms contaminated by the zoo of chemicals dredged up by these mines?

Yasir Assam,