



EDO Community Briefing Note:

Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026

2 October 2026

This briefing note provides legal information only and does not replace the need for professional legal advice in individual cases. While every effort has been made to ensure the information is accurate, EDO does not accept any responsibility for any loss or damage resulting from any error in this document or use of this work.

The Queensland Government is proposing to change the law to make it harder for people to object to mining projects.

You will have an opportunity to comment on the proposed changes. This briefing note outlines:

1. The key amendments proposed by the Bill and why you should be concerned:
 - a. restriction of objection rights
 - b. discretionary referral of objections to the Land Court
2. How you can have your say on the Bill and tips for making your submission
3. Frequently asked questions about the proposed amendments

A flowchart summarising the proposed amendments to the objection process is at [Annexure A](#).

Apply for legal assistance:

If you have any further questions and would like to apply for free legal assistance, please make an application via our website:

<https://www.edo.org.au/free-legal-advice/>

Executive Summary

On 15 September 2026, the Hon. Dale Last, Queensland Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, introduced the *Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026* (**the Bill**) into the Queensland Parliament.

The Bill proposes major amendments to the *Mineral Resources Act 1989* (Qld) (**MR Act**) and the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (Qld) (**EP Act**) relating to the mining objection process.

The Bill has been referred to the Primary Industries and Resources Committee for consideration.

Submissions on the Bill are currently open, closing at **10:00AM** on **Monday 12 October 2026**.

The Bill was introduced without any apparent consultation with communities, conservation organisations, First Nations people or public interest organisations.¹ The development and introduction of the Bill without prior notice to, and engagement with, First Nations rights holders in Queensland is contrary to Australia's international human rights obligations in the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People, in particular the right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent to participate in and make decisions about issues that impact them.

¹ Explanatory Notes, p 8 and Departmental Written Briefing p 8 state instead who was consulted with.

We have included some suggested recommendations to assist you in making your submission. More information about these recommendations is outlined in “How to have your say” below.

Primary Recommendation:

The Bill must be withdrawn on the basis that:

- independent merits review is an important safeguard for accountable decisions,
- Land Court hearings improve the evidence available to decision-makers,
- mining impacts do not stop at 125km,
- decisions about Queensland’s minerals resources are matters of broad public interest, and
- the proposed restrictions would make it harder for impacted people to defend their rights via an organisation.

Alternative Recommendations:

- The Land Court merits review process should be retained but should instead be a post-government decision appeal/review process, consistent with the merits appeal process under the *Gas and Petroleum (Safety and Production) Act 2004* (Qld).
- Open standing for objections to MLs and EAs for mining activities must be retained given both Queensland’s resources and the environment are matters of significant public interest. As part of this recommendation, objection rights for standard EAs relating to mining activities must be retained.
- If the proposed discretionary referral process is to be included, detailed statutory criteria are required for when an objection must be referred to the Land Court and there must be an obligation for the Minister/DETSI to provide a statement of reasons in circumstances where they decide not to refer, or only refer part of, an objection to the Land Court.
- The government should improve information sharing during the notification and objection process to ensure the community has all relevant information to make an informed submission and/or objection, and to facilitate meaningful consultation.
- The submission and objection processes for EAs should be kept separate to promote the best possible decisions and to promote any avoidance and/or narrowing of potential objections to a draft EA.

Key amendments

The Bill proposes two major changes:

1. restricting objection rights for mining lease (**ML**) and environmental authority (**EA**) applications, and
2. removing the automatic referral of objections to the Land Court, instead giving the decision-maker² the power to decide when an objection should be referred.

² The Minister for Natural Resources and Mines for ML applications and the Chief Executive, Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation (DETSI) for EA applications.

Restriction of Objection Rights

What is proposed?

The Bill proposes to restrict objection rights in three main ways, by limiting:

- what applications can be objected to
- who can object
- the grounds for objection

What you can object to

Generally, large resource activities,³ such as mining, will require site-specific EAs. Standard EAs are applications for EAs that comply with the standard conditions for the environmentally relevant activity and are considered “low risk”.⁴ More information about the types of EAs is [available here](#). Under the MR Act, standard EAs do not require notification unless they are for mining activities, such as exploration.⁵

The Bill proposes removing the notification and objection process entirely for standard or variation EA applications, with the objection process only retained for site-specific and amendment EA applications.⁶ In relation to amendment applications, the notification and objection process would only apply to major amendment applications, which are the equivalent of site-specific EA application.⁷ Importantly, the submission and objection process for EA applications would be merged under the Bill.

Who can object

Currently, any person (including an organisation) can object to an application for a ML under the MR Act⁸ and comment on an associated EA application for mining activities (standard or site-specific), and subsequently object to the relevant draft EA under the EP Act.⁹

The Bill proposes to restrict who can object to a ML or site-specific EA application to the relevant local government and people or organisations who:¹⁰

- own the subject land, land necessary to access the subject land, or adjoining land,
- provide infrastructure wholly or partly on the subject land,
- own or occupy land wholly or partly within the area of the proposed mining lease, or
- own or occupy land wholly or partly within 125km of the proposed mining lease area.

The 125km distance from the proposed ML boundary reflects the existing legislative approach under the *Strong and Sustainable Resources Communities Act 2017* (Qld) which uses the 125km

³ As defined in EP Act [s 107](#).

⁴ More information about the types of EAs is [available here](#). Examples of activities suitable for a standard EA are [available here](#).

⁵ EP Act [s 149](#).

⁶ MROLA Bill cl 6 proposed s 149.

⁷ Departmental Written Briefing, p 7.

⁸ *Mineral Resources Act 1989* (Qld) (**MR Act**) s 260.

⁹ *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (Qld) (**EP Act**) ss 160 and 182, noting a person must have made a submission to make an objection under s 182.

¹⁰ MROLA Bill cls 21 (proposed amendment to ss 180 and 183) and 41 (proposed amendment to s 260). The Bill does not restrict who can make a submission on a site-specific EA, but objections are restricted to “eligible entities”.

radius to identify nearby regional communities in relation to large resource projects.¹¹ However, this distance was considered in the context of prioritising a local workforce where available in place of 100% fly-in, fly-out, and has no bearing on the environmental or social impacts of the mining activities themselves. Further, no scientific basis for this distance has been provided in the context of potential impacts caused by the mining activities.

Grounds for objection

The Bill also proposes to limit the grounds of objections for MLs to the decision-making criteria, and excludes:¹²

- adverse environmental impacts,¹³ and
- “any good reasons shown to refuse” the ML.¹⁴

This amendment is particularly relevant in the context of the removal of objection rights for standard EA applications for mining activities, as it would prevent environmental impact grounds being raised.

Why should I be concerned?

Recently, the Queensland Government amended the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971* (Qld) to give the government wide powers to largely override any development assessment laws and compulsorily acquire land for any “State Strategic Project”, which could be a mining project.¹⁵

We note these new powers could make any revised mining objection process entirely redundant where the project has been declared to be a State Strategic Project and a modification order has been made to amend how the MR Act or EP Act applies to the mining project, for example by removing the notification requirement or changing the decision-making criteria.

This Bill alone would further erode public participation rights in environmental decision-making in Queensland. Taken together, these amendments show a clear trend of the government substantially undermining community rights and protections in Queensland.

Queensland’s resources and environment is of course a matter of public interest. The impacts of mining, particularly fossil fuel mining, are not limited to the area of the proposed ML or within an arbitrary 125km eligibility zone. Under the proposed amendments, even people and communities who are adversely affected by the mine, for example due to downstream impacts, cannot object if they do not fall within one of the above categories.

In addition to removing submission opportunities and restricting who can object and what issues they can raise in their objection, the Bill would also create financial risks for landholders who are entitled to object. It would be significantly more difficult for landholders to form or join an incorporated association to object to ML and EA applications to insulate them from personal cost risks; instead, they would bear those risks personally. This also means the landholders would need

¹¹ Departmental Written Briefing, p 3.

¹² MROLA Bill cls 21 proposed s 183(3)) and 41 (proposed s 260(4)).

¹³ MROLA Bill cl 43 proposed s 271(1). Compared with existing [s 269\(4\)](#) which is proposed to be removed.

¹⁴ See MR Act [s 294\(4\)\(l\)](#). Section 269 is proposed to be removed by the Bill.

¹⁵ Read our [Community Briefing Note](#) and [Submission](#) on the *State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026*, [recently passed](#) by the Queensland Legislative Assembly.

to shoulder not only legal and expert costs, but make a significant investment of time, energy and emotion by objecting in their own capacity.

Further, while the Bill appears to retain objection rights for landholders directly affected by the proposed ML, this does not mean those landholders would retain the right to have their objection heard by the Land Court. This is discussed in further detail below.

Discretionary Land Court Referrals

What is proposed?

Currently, any objection under the MR Act or EP Act must be referred to the Land Court for consideration under the Mining Objection Hearing process.¹⁶ This allows parties to submit expert evidence to support their objection grounds, test the adequacy of the proponent's environmental assessments and have the matter considered by an independent court.

The Bill proposes to remove this automatic referral process.

Instead, when determining applications, the Minister (for ML applications) and Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation (**DETSI**) (for site-specific EA applications), can decide whether to:¹⁷

- approve the application,
- refuse the application, or
- refer the application, or a specific matter stated by the Minister/DETSI, to the Land Court, provided an objection has been made.

These amendments allow the Minister and/or DETSI to determine what, if any, matters should be referred to the Land Court for determination.¹⁸ The Bill does not propose to include any criteria for when the Minister/DETSI must, or should, refer an objection, or specific matters raised in an objection. For example, there is no need to consider factors such as the size, scale or duration of the proposed mine, proximity to sensitive community receptors or environmentally significant areas, extent of community concern, or the range and scale of potential impacts. It is purely at the Minister's/DETSI's unqualified discretion.¹⁹

This means the Minister/DETSI may decide to refer only one ground in an objection, dictating what matters the Land Court can consider when hearing the matter and making its recommendation, or the Minister/DETSI may decide not to refer the objection at all.²⁰

You would not be able to seek review of the Minister/DETSI's decision not to refer an objection or to approve an application/s, unless the decision was not made in accordance with the law. Further, there is no obligation proposed in the Bill for the Minister or DETSI to publish their reasons as to why they do not consider the objection (or some grounds) needs to be referred to the Land Court.

¹⁶ MR Act s 265; EP Act s 185.

¹⁷ MROLA Bill cls 21 (proposed ss 185 and 186(1) 42 (removal of s 265) and 44 (proposed s 271A(1)).

¹⁸ MROLA Bill cls 21 (proposed s 186(1)(c)) and 44 (proposed s 271A(1)(c)).

¹⁹ Explanatory Notes, pp 4-5.

²⁰ MROLA Bill cls 21 (proposed s 186(1)(c) and 44 (proposed s 271A)).

Why should I be concerned?

This proposed amendment could, in effect, remove community merits review rights for mines in Queensland, by granting the Minister/DETSI unconstrained powers to decide when, if ever, objections should be referred to the Land Court and what the issues the Court can consider.

As such, an entitlement to make an objection under the Bill does not translate to an entitlement to have your objection heard in the Land Court. Even if you are a landholder or occupier who has retained your right to make an objection (for example, you own land within the proposed ML area or 125km radius), the Minister and/or DETSI may simply decide your objection does not “warrant hearing or independent review”.²¹

The lack of statutory criteria that apply to the Minister/DETSI’s consideration, and decision-making of this nature behind closed doors, risks arbitrary and inappropriate decisions, contrary to the public interest of all Queenslanders.

Further, while the Minister and DETSI, as public entities, are still required to give proper consideration to human rights of Queenslanders when making their decisions, there will be less scrutiny of their consideration than would occur under the independent Land Court processes.

How to have your say

Information about the Committee’s consideration of the Bill is [available here](#).

The written briefing on the Bill prepared by the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, Manufacturing and Regional and Rural Development is [available here](#).

Key dates to be aware of include:

- Submissions close → **Monday, 12 October 2026 at 10:00am**
- Public briefing → **Wednesday, 14 October 2026**
- Public hearing (Walkerston) → **Friday, 16 October 2026**
- Public hearing (Brisbane) → **Wednesday, 28 October 2026**
- Report due → **Friday, 6 November 2026**

While appearance as a witness at the public hearing is by invitation only, you can attend in person or watch the public hearing live at: [Committees Live Broadcasts](#)

Making your submission

We **strongly** recommend making a submission during the consultation process for the Bill, raising your concerns directly with the Committee.

It is important to make sure your submission complies with the guidelines provided by the Committee, namely that it includes:

- your full name as the author
- the level of approval if the submission is made on behalf of an organisation
- **two** of the following:
 - email address
 - phone number
 - mailing address

²¹ Explanatory Speech, p 2769.

We note the public briefing is scheduled to occur after submissions on the Bill close. You may wish to consider [contacting the Committee](#) to request an extension to lodge your submission until after the public briefing has occurred to enable you to make a more informed submission.

You may also consider writing to your local [Member for Parliament](#)²², raising your concerns about the Bill and requesting they vote against the Bill.

Read: Our factsheet on [Writing Effective Law Reform Submissions](#)

You should make it clear from the outset whether you object to the Bill and include suggestions about what changes you would like to see, for example, by making recommendations.

You may also wish to raise issues with the Bill process itself, such as lack of prior consultation or a short submission timeframe. We note when similar amendments were proposed by the LNP Government in 2014, a discussion paper was released prior to tabling the amendments.²³ This courtesy has not been afforded to Queenslanders on this subsequent iteration of the proposal.

You may also wish to outline why Queensland is unique or identify examples where the Land Court objection process yielded improved outcomes for the community and environment, such as stronger EA conditions.

EDO has outlined suggested recommendations that may be helpful to consider when preparing your submission.

Primary Recommendation

Primary recommendation: The Bill should be withdrawn.

EDO's primary position is that the current objection hearing process should be maintained and the Bill should be withdrawn on the basis that:

- independent merits review is an important safeguard for accountable decisions,
- Land Court hearings improve the evidence available to decision-makers,
- mining impacts do not stop at 125km,
- decisions about Queensland's minerals resources are matters of broad public interest, and
- the proposed restrictions would make it harder for impacted people to defend their rights via an organisation.

In addition to being home to five World Heritage properties and the world-renowned Great Barrier Reef, Queensland is the most biologically diverse state or territory in Australia.²⁴ Queensland also is most impacted by natural disasters, which is only going to be exacerbated by human-induced climate change. The Queensland Government misplaces reliance on comparisons with other jurisdictions²⁵ to justify the removal of community rights in environmental decision-making, at the cost to Queensland's unique environment and other dependent industries and communities.

²² You can find your electorate here: [Where is my electorate | ECO](#)

²³ See the 2014 Discussion Paper [here](#).

²⁴ See: <https://www.museum.qld.gov.au/learn-and-discover/queenslands-environments-and-biodiversity/>.

²⁵ Explanatory Notes, pp 8-9.

These rights have played an important role in protecting Queensland's environment. They were central to the legal process that helped protect World Heritage-listed K'gari (Fraser Island) from sand mining and the Great Barrier Reef from limestone mining in the 1970s.

Even in circumstances where the Land Court has ultimately recommended approval of ML/EA applications, there are many instances of improvements in the operational conditions to be applied, demonstrating the inherent value of the objection process. This was most recently outlined by Land Court President in relation to the Lake Vermont objection matter.²⁶

It is imperative the community retains the ability to object to mines that will affect the quality of life of all Queenslanders.

Alternative Recommendations

However, if the Government nonetheless continues to pursue amendments to the mining objection process, we make the following recommendations to improve the coherency and efficiency of the process.

Alternative recommendations if the Queensland Government continues to pursue amendments to the mining objection process under the MR Act and EP Act:

- The Land Court merits review process should be retained but should instead be a post-government decision appeal/review process, consistent with the merits appeal process under the *Gas and Petroleum (Safety and Production) Act 2004* (Qld).
- Open standing for objections to MLs and EAs for mining activities, including standard EAs, must be retained given both Queensland's resources and the environment are matters of significant public interest. As part of this recommendation, objection rights for standard EAs relating to mining activities must be retained.
- If the proposed discretionary referral process is to be included, detailed statutory criteria are required for when an objection must be referred to the Land Court and there must be an obligation for the Minister/DETSI to provide a statement of reasons in circumstances where they decide not to refer, or only refer part of, an objection to the Land Court.
- The government should improve information sharing during the notification and objection process to ensure the community has all relevant information to make an informed submission and/or objection, and to facilitate meaningful consultation.
- The submission and objection processes for EAs should be kept separate to promote the best possible decisions and to promote any avoidance and/or narrowing of potential objections to a draft EA.

²⁶ *Bowen Basin Coal Pty Ltd v Queensland Conservation Council Inc* [2026] [QLC 18](#), [155] “Having said that, **the reports provided to the Court are more comprehensive than those in the EIS. The experts have all suggested changes to the draft EA** which both BBC and DETSI have identified as practical and reasonable. Importantly, BBC embarked on an extensive and expensive analysis of its gas drainage system that **has resulted in a proposal that will significantly reduce fugitive emissions. None of these changes would have been made without the intervention of the Court process.**”

Post-decision Land Court appeals

Implementing a post-decision appeals process would ensure that decisions can be made within a timely manner and appellants are fully aware of the matters the decision-maker has considered in making their decision.

Furthermore, providing the Land Court with the ability to review the matter and determine the issues, as opposing to make a recommendation, ensures the judicial function of the Land Court is retained. This process would also align with:

- the appeals process for EAs under the EP Act relating to petroleum and gas projects under the *Petroleum and Gas (Safety and Production) Act 2004* (Qld) (**P&G Act**);
- town planning appeals for impact assessment development under the *Planning Act 2016* (Qld); and
- directly align and sit neatly with the Bill's proposed post-decision appeal rights for proponents.²⁷

We note neither the explanatory notes or Department written briefing paper raise or consider this alternative.

Open standing objection rights

In making this recommendation in your submission, it will be beneficial to tell your story outlining why open standing is, or has been, important for you or your community.

It is imperative that the public review rights and court intervention provide crucial independent scrutiny of proposals, provide for the submission of expert evidence and allow the proponent's claims and materials to be subject to rigorous testing.

The ability for the public to seek review and the courts to consider evidence routinely leads to better decisions and improved outcomes for communities and the environment. Under the proposed alternate framework, any person who made a submission would be eligible to appeal the decision, similar to the approach under the P&G Act and the Planning Act.

Statutory criteria for Land Court referrals

In making this recommendation in your submission, you could consider raising examples where the Land Court process resulted in an improved outcome, such as through receiving more comprehensive expert evidence or improved conditions on the ML/EA.

Statutory criteria outlining when objections should be referred to the Land Court for hearing would provide clarity and certainty for objectors and decision-makers alike.

As outlined in the Explanatory Notes, the discretionary power to decide whether to refer an objection departs from the fundamental legislative principle that power should be sufficiently defined where rights are dependent on that power. Incorporating statutory criteria and requiring the Minister/DETSI to outline why they decided not to refer the objection, or only refer part of the objection, will improve consistency with the fundamental legislative principles.

²⁷ Bill cl 23 (proposed amendments to s 198); Explanatory Notes p 25.

Improved information sharing

Often, the proponent has updated assessment materials and/or proposals that the community is otherwise unaware of. If the MR Act and EP Act are to be amended, the requirements regarding information sharing should be clarified and, where possible, improved to impose obligations on proponents and decision-makers to proactively share additional information with the community to facilitate meaningful engagement.

Retain separate submission and objection processes for EAs

Moving the objection process for EA applications to the submission stage, and consequently requiring concerned parties to object to an unseen draft EA, is counter-productive. It would not only remove the ability to make an informed objection after DETSI has considered and responded to submissions, but may also lead to inclusion of objection grounds that may be redundant once DETSI issues any draft EA. On the contrary, retaining the split process may lead to people either not making a later objection at all, or at least narrowing objection grounds in response to a draft EA.

Read: Our [submission to the Queensland Law Reform Commission on the ML objections review](#) for more information on these proposed alternative recommendations

Frequently asked questions

Q: Does the Bill affect gas or oil (petroleum) projects?

In short, no.

Applications for production leases relating to gas and petroleum projects, including coal seam gas, are regulated under the P&G Act. The Bill does not propose to amend this legislation.

While environmental authorities are required under the EP Act for gas and petroleum projects, the objection process proposed to be amended by the Bill has never applied to applications for EAs for these types of projects. Consequently, there is no proposed change in the notification and consultation opportunities for applications for EAs relating to gas and petroleum projects under the EP Act.

Q: Does this Bill interact with or affect the federal assessment process?

No, the state and federal assessment processes are different. The Queensland Government cannot make legislative changes that would affect the federal assessment process.

Any participation or review rights that are available under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (Cth), or other applicable federal legislation, will continue to be available if the Bill is passed.

NB: We are preparing updated resources outlining participation opportunities under the reformed EPBC Act. We recommend keeping an eye on [our website](#) for these resources.

Q: I've already made an objection, how would these amendments apply to it?

It depends on the type of application and where the objection process is up to.

If you have questions about the impacts to specific projects, please don't hesitate to make an application for assistance via our website: <https://www.edo.org.au/free-legal-advice/>

Stage of objection	What process applies?
Process under the EP Act: <i>Standard or variation applications for a mining activity relating to a Mining Lease</i>	
All stages (objection through to Land Court proceedings)	The referral is of no effect, the Land Court must remit the matter back to the decision-maker to be determined under the new process ²⁸
In effect, the MROLA Bill would remove the notification and objection processes entirely for Standard and Variation EA applications ²⁹	
Process under the EP Act: <i>Site-specific applications for a mining activity relating to a Mining Lease</i>	
Application made but objection yet not referred to the Land Court	Existing notification process would continue to apply, but new objection process would apply ³⁰
Objection made and referred to Land Court but no substantive orders	Referral has no effect and the new amendments would apply ³¹
Objection made and referred to Land Court with substantive orders made but no recommendation decision yet	Existing process would continue to apply ³²
Recommendation made by Land Court but no decision by decision-maker as to the application yet	Existing process would continue to apply ³³
Process under the MR Act:	
Application made but objection not yet referred to the Land Court	Existing notice requirements continue to apply but new process objection would apply ³⁴

²⁸ MROLA Bill cl 34, proposed s 864.

²⁹ See Explanatory Notes, p 2.

³⁰ MROLA Bill cl 34, proposed s 866.

³¹ MROLA Bill cl 34, proposed s 867.

³² MROLA Bill cl 34, proposed s 868.

³³ MROLA Bill cl 34, proposed s 869.

³⁴ MROLA Bill cl 56, proposed s 908.

Objection referred to the Land Court but no substantive orders	Existing referral would be set aside and new process would apply ³⁵
Objection made and referred to Land Court with substantive orders made but no recommendation decision yet	Existing process would continue to apply ³⁶
Recommendation made by Land Court but no decision by decision-maker as to the application yet	Existing process would continue to apply ³⁷

Q: Can I still object to a ML or EA application as part of an incorporated association?

Under the proposed amendments, an organisation would need to show it is itself an “eligible entity”,³⁸ meaning that it:³⁹

- owns the subject land, land necessary for access to the subject land, or adjoining land,
- provides infrastructure wholly or partially on the subject land, or
- owns or occupies land wholly or partly within the area of the proposed ML, or
- owns or occupies land wholly or partly within 125km of the area of the proposed ML.

Q: Who is an “occupier”?

Generally, an “occupier” is someone who has a legal right to occupy the land but is not necessarily the owner.⁴⁰

This legal right could be, for example, someone who has a lease over the land (other than a mining interest or similar tenement). Occupier also includes someone who has been given the right to occupy the place by the owner. “Occupy” is not a defined term under the MR Act and it’s not clear whether exclusive possession is required.

We recommend contacting us directly if you have questions about what may constitute an “occupier” under this legislation.

Q: How does the Bill impact Traditional Owners?

The Bill limits rights to object to owners or occupiers of land within a 125km maximum radius around a proposed ML area. This arbitrary limit ignores the reality of First Nations relationships to Country.

Any Traditional Owner group whose Country is impacted by an application for a ML or EA should be able to engage with decisions about whether the ML should be granted. This extends to:

³⁵ MROLA Bill cl 56, proposed s 909.

³⁶ MROLA Bill cl 56, proposed s 910.

³⁷ MROLA Bill cl 56, proposed s 911.

³⁸ MROLA Bill cl 41, proposed amendment to existing s 260 “Objection to application for grant of mining lease”.

³⁹ MROLA Bill cl 41(3)(6) proposed amendment to s 260(4).

⁴⁰ MR Act sch 2, see def of “occupier”.

- groups who may not yet, or may never, hold native title in the mine operation area, yet who are concerned to protect sites of significance cultural value in the area
- Traditional Owner groups whose Country beyond the 125km eligibility zone may be impacted: where songlines, dreaming tracks and cultural responsibilities are not defined by such arbitrary geographic limits, and where ground and surface water flows, for example, do not stop at a line on a map.

For native title holders engaged in future act processes under the *Native Title Act*, the proposed reforms fail to address, and may exacerbate, the current lack of integration between mining approval processes and the future act regime under the Native Title Act, risking delays and uncertainty for all parties.

If you are a Traditional Owner and have specific questions about the impact of the Bill on your rights to object to a ML or EA, please contact us directly.

Q: Is this Bill compatible with human rights?

In our view, the amendments proposed by the Bill are incompatible with the human rights of all Queenslanders.

The Bill would limit, without reasonable justification, fundamental human rights that are recognised and protected under the *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld) and international law.

If passed, the Bill would significantly affect the human rights of individuals and the community because:

- it would limit the rights of Queenslanders impacted by proposed mines to make submissions, have a say on projects, and participate in an independent merits review process, which unnecessarily limits the right to freedom of expression, the right to take part in public life and the right to a fair hearing and access to justice;⁴¹
- For Traditional Owners, existing limited avenues to participate in both the ML and EA application processes are eroded, and their right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent in projects that impact on their Country (including water) and Cultural Heritage during the EA application process is ignored. This is incompatible with First Nations peoples' distinct cultural rights under section 28 of the HRA.

Read: [Cultural Rights under the Queensland Human Rights Act](#)

[First Nations Rights in the Queensland Human Rights Act](#)

Q: What happens next?

Once the public submission period closes, the Committee will hold two public hearings (appearance is by invitation only) and prepare its report, due 6 November 2026. The Government will then consider the Committee's report.

There are three possible outcomes from this committee process:

1. The Bill is withdrawn or abandoned by the Government,

⁴¹ *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld).

2. The Bill is amended and there is further consultation, or
3. The Bill proceeds without further consultation, with or without amendments, and is debated and potentially passed by the Queensland Legislative Assembly.

There is no clear indication about the timeframe for this process beyond the Committee preparing its report.

As outlined above, we **strongly** recommend engaging with this Committee process and your local Member for Parliament to ensure your feedback is heard before the Bill is debated.

Q: What can I do if the Bill is passed?

If the Bill is passed, it becomes law and the amendments will take effect. However, even if this happens you can continue to advocate for improvements or to have objection rights reinstated.

You can do this by:

- lobbying your local [Member for Parliament](#) (MP)⁴² and request they advocate for reinstatement of these rights,
- [starting a petition](#) to apply pressure to reconsider this issue,
- engaging with other landholders in affected regions to inform them of the amendments and encourage them to engage with their local MP about this issue,
- reaching out to your local MP and other candidates at the next election about their stance on this issue and advocate for election commitments, and
- keeping an eye out for EDO resources or workshops in your region.

Evaluate this resource

EDO welcomes feedback on this legal resource. Your feedback will help us ensure we are providing useful legal information.

If you have any concerns or suggestions regarding this legal resource, please fill out the Legal Resources evaluation form by clicking [here](#) or scanning the QR code below:



⁴² You can find your electorate here: [Where is my electorate | ECO](#)

Annexure A: Proposed modifications objection process

