




Speech By  
**Hon. Amanda Stoker**

**MEMBER FOR OODGEROO**

---

Record of Proceedings, 3 March 2026

**FIGHTING ANTISEMITISM AND KEEPING GUNS OUT OF THE HANDS OF  
TERRORISTS AND CRIMINALS AMENDMENT BILL 2026**

 **Hon. AJ STOKER** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (7.37 pm): I reflect on the contribution of the member for Bundamba because it tells me two important things. First, his was so far from an accurate account of the government's policymaking process that it was both laughable and proof that our party room does not leak, that this team works together and that we listen to Queenslanders to get the policy right without all of the drama and intrigue those opposite seem to think is ordinary after so many years of chaos and crisis. It was such an exercise in creativity and imagination that perhaps the member for Bundamba should seek a book deal. I reckon his flair for fiction and enthusiastic storytelling, unmoored from reality, would see him create a best seller.

There have been many sensible and matter-of-fact contributions made by members on this side of the chamber and I do not intend to repeat them, other than to echo the wise contributions that have been made about the way this bill protects from violence faith leaders, whatever their religion, and allows worshipers of all kinds protection from violence and intimidation. I am grateful that, in dealing with the issue of firearms, the bill takes practical measures to keep them out of the hands of terrorists and criminals without demonising or punishing law-abiding and legitimate firearms users.

Instead, I will use part of my time to address some of the arguments Labor members have made in this debate. Labor members say that this bill outlaws phrases that should have a place in Queensland's civil discourse and that it represents an unreasonable incursion on free speech. Of course, I am quite surprised to see Labor's sudden interest in free speech as it is not something I have ever heard them express an interest in before. At both federal and state levels, I have only ever seen Labor encroach on the scope for individuals to engage in contrary thought. But hey, guys, welcome to the team! Perhaps I will send them all membership forms to join the Institute of Public Affairs, which has defended free speech so well for many years. It is a fine body and I think it would be good for them.

Free speech is very close to my heart. It is with that in mind that I note that, insofar as speech is affected by this bill, it is a very narrow change, targeting just two phrases in the legislation that are clear in their scope, abhorrent in their substance and, by now putting that into legislation, not open to expansion without scrutiny by this or any other future government. As an aside, it is pretty interesting to see the talking points of those opposite clearly instruct them to complain about the way this bill has been refined by amendments foreshadowed following the committee process. Last I checked, that is exactly what a good government does: they listen to the feedback of Queenslanders in a committee process. But I digress.

I think that, if more people knew what these phrases meant, we either would not be having this debate or we would pour scorn on those who are determined to use them. So, what does 'globalise the intifada' mean? It is the reference to both the First Intifada of 1987 to 1993 and the Second Intifada from 2000 to 2005 in which those who do not believe the Jewish people deserve to live in their ancestral

home, where they coexist with others of different ethnicities and faiths, engaged in violent attacks against the Jewish. I am not talking about a little protest here, especially in the Second Intifada. It was horrifically violent, characterised by suicide bombings and armed attacks of a military quality. It took a military response to bring it to an end, resulting in many deaths.

That phrase is a call to engage in that behaviour—suicide bombings, armed attacks—against Jewish people in Israel and all around the world, denying them sanctuary from the genocide of the 20th century in their ancestral home but also denying them that safety no matter where they live. To the Jewish people and, indeed, to many thinking people, this is just a trendy way to call for a global Jewish genocide. It is repugnant and it has no place in Australia.

I wish those opposite would not equivocate when it comes to the basic right of safety for Jewish people, indeed all people, to live in safety and freedom in this community. Jewish leaders have articulated clearly and calmly the way in which this phrase harms them. First, it is an incitement to violence. By portraying the intifada as a form of legitimate resistance, it encourages a culture of violence against Jews being acceptable. The framing normalises hostility and physical attacks on Jewish individuals and communities. It demonises Israel, fostering anti-Semitic sentiments by portraying Jews as oppressors and creating a dangerous environment for them globally. It normalises anti-Semitic rhetoric in mainstream discourse, leading to a wider acceptance of anti-Jewish attitudes. When we think of the broad arc of history, anti-Semitism has often been dressed up as a political movement, even starting out like the one we have heard protesting outside tonight. Those tactics are part of a longstanding pattern of scapegoating Jews in times of conflict or hardship. We have seen this story before, and it is a big source of anxiety for our Jewish community. They have seen how tolerating anti-Semitism ends, and we owe it to them and to our whole community not to repeat the errors of the past.

After the Holocaust the world said, 'Never again.' Never again really is now. Likewise, a call for the elimination of the Jewish people 'from the river to the sea' is at best a claim that Jewish people should not have the right to self-determination that is available to the rest of us and at worse a call for their removal by force from the region, including by genocide. This is not a mild or merely political phrase. It is repugnant normalising of the hate that runs so deep in violent parts of the world and that we must not normalise here.

Those opposite have tried to characterise the protection of our community from the hate and violence that these two phrases call for as some sort of a vague protection against subjective feelings, but in fact the drafting is quite different. It does not impose a subjective approach and it is not based on how one individual feels. It is anchored on an objective assessment of its effect on a reasonable person, measured at a high level of intensity. It has guardrails to ensure it does not stifle legitimate debate in the public interest or interfere with genuine religious, educational, historic or artistic purposes, although remind me not to book in for that art show.

Just about every member opposite has started their speech with an expression of regret and sadness about the terrorist attack in Bondi, but, in effect, every single one of them has followed it with a big 'but'. They say 'but'. Here is the real 'but': you cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot claim to stand against anti-Semitism while pandering to those who call for the elimination of the Jewish people whatever political narrative they try to dress it up in. You cannot claim to respect our Jewish Queenslanders who live in fear, reinforced even around a week ago as the Brisbane Synagogue was ram raided, while simultaneously indulging the ugliest elements of their local oppressors.

I am appalled by the rise in anti-Semitism in this country. We see it large when the horrors of Bondi bring it into relief, even for those who do not normally think about this subject. But I also see it every day in small ways. I have a friend, a strong and accomplished businesswoman—I will not name her—older than I am, but still healthy, smart, independent. When she and I met she lived alone, but confidently lived an active social life. However, in the time since 7 October I have seen the way that fear has crept into her every day. When hateful anti-Jewish expressions were graffitied on the footpath in Wynnum, as attacks on the street became more likely, as they culminated in Bondi and were followed by the ram raid, I have seen her anxiety become a prison and her life become confined. She should be enjoying the fun years of her retirement, but she is increasingly frightened, and she is not heard like some of the lobby groups in parliamentary committees or over the obnoxious shouting of those who normalise violence against people like her. She deserves better. She deserves a parliament that will protect her and reprimand those who call for the destruction of her and people like her. But all Queenslanders deserve better. If the mob out there can target Jews and justify it with a little moral relativism, they could come for you next. This is our chance to deliver on an important promise. Never again. I commend the bill.