



Speech By  
**Hon. Daniel Purdie**

**MEMBER FOR NINDERRY**

---

Record of Proceedings, 5 March 2026

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

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (4.30 pm), in reply: I would like to thank all members who made a contribution to the debate on the Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Bill 2026. The bill is a necessary powerful response to the tragic Bondi Beach terrorist attack and the 15 innocent lives lost which has changed the national security landscape for our country.

The Crisafulli government is delivering strong, decisive action to combat anti-Semitism and hate and keep guns out of the hands of criminals and terrorists as we continue to make Queensland safer. Each of these challenges is addressed by the two main components of the bill: amendments to the Criminal Code, including strengthening responses to anti-Semitism; and the introduction of new offences and amendments to the Weapons Act that tackle illegal firearms and enhance the firearm prohibition order framework.

The committee, led by the member for Nicklin, received more than 400 submissions from Queenslanders offering a variety of viewpoints from individuals, community groups and organisations. One submission in particular struck me. It starts—

I lost my political career because I would not stand up and say I was pro-Palestine. I lost my political career due to antisemitism ...

Oct 7th happened and I instantly saw in my community of West End antisemitism rise to the surface. Not just in public but within my political party and local branch ...

At this time I was in the running to be pre-selected for the State election. I was seen as the winner before even getting to preselection based on my union backing, political mentor, support team and the work I had done for years leading to this in my community.

...

It was clear that that we were witnessing the start of open and accepted Jew hatred. Within our community we recognised similarities between now and the 1930s ...

Due to my post my political mentor told me either you are pro-palestine or I am ending my support of you and taking the Unions with me. My Jewish husband was sitting next to me and I calmly replied, "I am not pro-palestine and I am absolutely not pro-war but there is no way I could sleep at night knowing I had compromised on my values to win an election". She pulled all support that same day (we were already in pre-selection) and the runner up to me won and went on to win the seat in the state election.

I have witnessed and been subjected to antisemitism.

She goes on to say—

I commend the Government on their stance and reiterate the message that the Jewish community saw Bondi coming. We warned everyone and have been living in fear since Oct 7th. That feeling does not belong in Australia.

We need these laws. Its unfortunate but true. Radical hate for Jews and Israel will continue in violence and we must have stronger gun laws to combat this and criminalise speech that calls for the death and destruction of a people.

This submission alone is simply astonishing. While the submission is anonymous, it is evident that we are talking about the seat of South Brisbane. What does this say about the Labor membership, the party unit, her former mentor in South Brisbane and the Labor member for South Brisbane? In her contribution earlier, the member for South Brisbane failed to disclose her powerful backers and the reason she came to sit in this chamber. Did the member for South Brisbane only win preselection because she bowed to the disgraced former member for South Brisbane?

**Dr O'SHEA:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Martin): Pause the clock. Member for South Brisbane, you have a point of order?

**Dr O'SHEA:** I have. I take personal offence at these remarks and I ask the minister to withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, the member has taken personal offence and I ask that you withdraw.

**Mr PURDIE:** I withdraw. Is this the reason that the member for Cairns is still sitting in the Labor caucus, the same reason that that member got elected and the same reason that the opposition leader is refusing to act?

**Mr HEALY:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members! I am taking some advice. Minister, my concern is relevance. You are referring to an anonymous submission to the inquiry. Then you have said it is obviously about the member for South Brisbane. Can you substantiate that?

**Mr PURDIE:** It talks about the member's community of West End. I have withdrawn what I said and I will move on. The submission to the committee does pose the legitimate question: is it a broader prerequisite to be endorsed as a state MP in Queensland by the Australian Labor Party that you must hold anti-Semitic views?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No. Member, I ask that you withdraw that. That is unparliamentary.

**Mr PURDIE:** I withdraw.

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order relates to what the minister is referring to which was a submission that was provided to the committee. It is part of the committee report in relation to that. He is addressing matters with respect to the content of that as part of the compiled report in relation to the bill that is before the House. He is referencing that as part of his reply speech.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, Leader of the House. He did not say that.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister might be trying to be tricky and slippery and slick with his words—

**Dr ROWAN:** Point of order—

**Mr de BRENNI:** I am entitled to put my point of order, so just sit down!

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Direct your comments through the chair.

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members! The Manager of Opposition Business is still making his point of order.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. His remarks that seek to assert—

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Speaker gave leave to the Manager of Opposition Business to make a point of order. That does not give the Manager of Opposition Business the opportunity to use unparliamentary language and I ask that he withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I just came in as that was said and I also deem that to be unparliamentary. I ask you to withdraw.

**Mr de BRENNI:** I withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** You have a point of order?

**Mr de BRENNI:** My point of order is that the minister's remarks are deeply offensive. They are directly referring to members of the opposition. There is no other interpretation of that and I ask that he withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The point of order, as I heard it—I was watching the screen prior to coming in here. You cannot take personal offence as a collective. Minister, I am going to ask you to talk to the bill as we have it. Continue your contribution and I will be listening closely.

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is a matter of privilege. In relation to the remarks addressed by the Manager of Opposition Business directly across to me, instructing me to sit down, is disorderly. I take personal offence and I ask them to be withdrawn.

**Mr de BRENNI:** I withdraw.

**Mr PURDIE:** Turning to one of the matters consistently raised about the bill by those opposite, they claim the framework would allow the Attorney-General excessive scope to prohibit phrases. Let me be clear: the framework replicates that which Labor enacted to prohibit symbols when it was in power. It seems that the framework which Labor had no issue with when it was in government has now given it cause for concern. Unlike those opposite, we listen to Queenslanders. That is why, as I foreshadowed in my second reading speech, I intend to move amendments during consideration in detail which will remove the regulation-making power from the bill.

We are making this amendment to better protect Jewish Queenslanders. We are doing this because we know that those opposite simply do not share our concern when it comes to the safety of the Jewish community across this state. We only had to hear the words of the member for Mansfield last night to understand that Labor does not understand the crisis being faced by Jewish Queenslanders. Rather than considering how a failure of leadership in Canberra allowed historically high levels of anti-Semitism to flourish across Australia, the member for Mansfield would have us believe that Scott Morrison is to blame. We only need to consider the vile anti-Semitic posts exposed this week in parliament by the member for Cairns to see Labor's true position when it comes to supporting our Jewish community. In response to those posts the Queensland Jewish Board of Deputies was compelled to publicly comment on the actions of the member for Cairns. They said—

The Jewish community is deeply concerned to learn about social media posts made by Queensland Member of Parliament Michael Healy, which employ age-old anti-Semitic tropes and Holocaust inversion.

Comparing the Israel Defense Forces to murder squads and suggesting—

**Mr HEALY:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and ask that the member withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Was it a personal reflection?

**Mr HEALY:** I take personal offence and I would like him to withdraw.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister is reading directly from a statement that was put out by the Jewish Board of Deputies yesterday. There is no reflection on the member sitting there, and I put to you that the member is taking this a bit too far.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member still has a right to take personal offence. If he has taken personal offence, Minister, I will ask you to withdraw.

**Mr PURDIE:** I withdraw. Jewish Queenslanders simply do not feel safe. They do not feel protected. We are taking decisive action to enshrine the phrases in legislation because Labor simply cannot be trusted not to repeal the regulations and remove these prohibitions when they return to government. This justifies the amendments I am moving today to enshrine these prohibitions in legislation.

Those opposite can claim that the government is backing down, but the reality is something very different. We are taking strong and decisive action to protect our Queensland Jewish community. Meanwhile, what we have seen from the Leader of the Opposition is a failure of leadership. He has failed to take strong and decisive action against the member for Cairns. While the member remains a member of Labor's leadership team the question remains: is it a requirement to be a Labor member of parliament in Queensland that you have to have anti-Semitic views?

I will now address specific issues raised by members during the debate. First and foremost, I want to clarify the real record of those opposite when it comes to cracking down on criminals with guns. In his speech in this chamber on Tuesday night the shadow minister for police stated—

The Labor opposition will always back action that protects Queensland's multicultural communities and keeps guns out of the wrong hands.

The shadow attorney-general echoed that sentiment and said—

Labor will always back progress that keeps firearms out of the wrong hands.

I will not allow the history books to be rewritten. As I highlighted in my second reading speech, in 2019 the LNP opposition tabled a private member's bill moving to address a rise in four very serious

matters: the proliferation of stolen guns in our communities; drive-by shootings; blueprints for 3D printed guns; and the need for a firearm prohibition order—FPO—scheme. It is critically important that Queenslanders know this history. The former Labor government, including the now shadow police minister and shadow treasurer, failed to support these LNP reforms that would have helped to keep Queensland safer. On this side of the chamber we know that you cannot be tough on crime if you are soft on criminals with guns. Given their track record, it is a shame those opposite have no credibility.

In 2014 the Crisafulli LNP opposition tried to help government from opposition a second time by legislating tougher penalties for criminals with guns. As the shadow police minister I moved amendments to the 2024 Community Safety Bill addressing drive-by shootings, increased penalties for stolen firearms and the creation of a fit and proper FPO scheme. Once again those opposite did not support these endeavours. *Hansard* reflects a reality that is fundamentally opposed to what the member for Waterford stated in her speech on the second reading just a few nights ago. The lack of action and incompetence goes further, particularly with respect to Labor's botched firearm prohibition order scheme.

I will take this opportunity to correct the record on another matter raised by those opposite. On Tuesday evening, when speaking about a nationally consistent approach to guns, the member for Waterford said—

... we will not have a national approach to gun control because of the actions of this government.

...

This is a real missed opportunity for the government because it has not acted to ensure we have strong national gun reform.

It was in May 2015 that the Palaszczuk Labor government signed up to the National Organised Crime Response Plan. Item 2B of that national plan explicitly called on states to implement FPO schemes, including mechanisms to share information on high-risk individuals and to prohibit a person subject to an FPO in another jurisdiction from acquiring a firearms licence. Other states played their part. The Queensland Labor government did nothing. As stated previously, Labor had not enacted this initiative when we tabled our private member's bill. It was only in 2024, a full nine years later, that they finally introduced an FPO scheme. In typical Labor fashion they completely butchered it, depriving our police of a critical tool to help stop high-risk individuals from obtaining firearms. How can they sit here and say it is essential to follow the controversial national approach this time around, yet when it came to policy proposals that were no-brainers under their watch they dragged their feet for a decade? As we know, under Labor's watered-down scheme the police have not been able to issue one single FPO. That will soon change, because the Crisafulli government trusts the police and we are fixing Labor's botched laws.

Numerous speakers have also indicated that amendments in this bill in relation to guns do not go far enough. The reality is that this bill implements a wide range of measures that are designed to increase community safety. Following the passage of this bill, Queensland will have nation-leading penalties for firearms misuse. To state that we have not gone far enough is vague and factually incorrect. Those measures range from increasing the maximum penalty for stealing firearms to increasing the storage requirements for weapons.

The bill introduces new offences targeting gun crime and imposes the harshest penalties in Australia for weapons offences that, due to their inherent serious nature or their direct association with other offences, pose a high risk to community safety. These offences include: the unlawful possession, supply and manufacture of weapons, with all penalties increasing depending upon the category of firearm; shortening of weapons, increasing from four to 14 years imprisonment; modifying the construction of weapons, increasing from four to 15 years imprisonment; altering identification marks on weapons, increasing from four to 14 years imprisonment; and the unlawful trafficking of weapons, which now attracts a maximum penalty of life imprisonment.

The bill introduces a new offence to address the reckless discharge of a weapon towards buildings or vehicles, recognising the unacceptable risk this behaviour poses to community safety, which carries a severe penalty of 16 years imprisonment with an aggravated penalty of up to 20 years for incidents linked to organised crime, hate crimes or places of worship.

The bill addresses a concerning emerging trend involving the manufacture of 3D printed firearms by prohibiting the possession or distribution of blueprint material that is to be used in the manufacture of a firearm on a 3D printer or electronic milling machine. Importantly, the bill is balanced to ensure no law-abiding gun owner has their rights inappropriately curtailed due to the conduct of criminals. As

highlighted in the short title, this bill targets terrorists and criminals—those seeking to disrupt the safety and social cohesion of our state.

The bill strengthens licensing and suitability requirements to allow an unauthorised person to consider a broad range of relevant information in determining if a person is a fit and proper person for a weapons licence. This includes details of a relevant offence, which is defined in the bill as an offence under a law of Queensland or another jurisdiction that: involves the carriage, discharge, possession, storage or use of a weapon; involves the use or threatened use of violence; or involves the possession or distribution of blueprint material for the manufacture of a firearm on a 3D printer or an electronic milling machine.

This definition ensures that any offence involving weapons, violence or the unauthorised creation of firearms is taken into account when assessing an individual's suitability for a weapons licence. Importantly, the bill allows for the consideration of such offences even in cases where a court has ordered that no conviction be recorded or where the rehabilitation period for the conviction has expired. The inclusion of relevant offences in the assessment process ensures a measured evaluation of an applicant's suitability, with a focus on mitigating risks and prioritising public safety. This approach reflects the government's commitment to ensuring that weapons licences are only issued to individuals who meet the highest standards of responsibility and trustworthiness.

Numerous speakers have called for greater national consistency with gun control. This government recognises the importance of the National Firearms Agreement and acknowledges that there are key principles that must be followed to ensure that community safety and responsible firearm ownership is maintained. Each state and territory retains the ability to tailor its firearm regulations to address unique circumstances and community needs and safety. This ensures that firearm regulations in each state and territory remain effective, appropriate and responsive.

This government is committed to ensuring all Queenslanders can live free from hate and violence. To achieve this, the bill strengthens existing bans on hate symbols and introduces a new offence for publicly using certain prohibited expressions. The Crisafulli government listened to what Queenslanders had to say. It has always been our clear intention to prohibit only two phrases. We have never wavered from that intention. In fact, we have repeatedly stated that we do not propose to prohibit any other phrases. Despite this, many of those opposite repeatedly referred to the regulation-making power to prescribe prohibited expressions. As I foreshadowed in my second reading speech, I intend to move amendments during consideration in detail which will remove the regulation-making power. Should a future government wish to add or remove any expressions, they will need to do this via an amendment to the Criminal Code and subject to the full scrutiny of the parliament.

Many of those opposite have taken issue with the expressions that are proposed to be prescribed. The amendments I foreshadowed in my second reading speech will prescribe the expressions 'from the river to the sea' and 'globalise the intifada' in the Criminal Code. The government has not taken the decision to prohibit these expressions lightly. As stated in the explanatory notes to the amendments, these expressions have been identified by the government as representative of an ideology of extreme prejudice against Jewish people, and their inclusion as prohibited expressions is necessary to prevent their use to incite discrimination, hostility or violence against Jewish Queenslanders.

Several members have referred to the offence threshold for the prohibited expressions offence, and I reiterate again what I stated in my second reading speech. Under the new offence, the public use of the prohibited expression must, in the context, reasonably be expected to cause a member of the public to feel menaced, harassed or offended. This means the conduct must be capable of causing a significant emotional or psychological response such as causing someone to feel threatened, repeatedly targeted, significant anger, significant resentment, outrage, disgust or hatred. It would not be enough to simply cause slight offence or insult only. This is the view of the High Court.

The offence threshold is the first safeguard. As with the existing prohibited symbols offence, this offence is further balanced by a defence of reasonable excuse, recognising there may be legitimate purposes for using expressions, such as for genuine educational purposes or public interest reporting. As the member for Maiwar noted himself, there may well be occasions where reciting these expressions would not cause a member of the public to feel menaced, harassed or offended. That is the intended operation of the safeguards that are built into the offence. Let me be crystal clear. This is not about stifling free speech; it is about protecting our Queensland Jewish communities from the harm caused by hateful and extremist ideologies.

I note some concerns were raised during the debate in relation to capturing symbols used to identify terrorist organisations or state sponsors of terrorism listed by the Commonwealth government as prescribed organisations. We know a prescribed organisation may use a number of symbols for

identification purposes—some of which may be obscure—and a person may inadvertently display such a symbol with no knowledge as to its significance. We have specifically accounted for this in the bill. To avoid capturing this kind of unintentional conduct, the bill adds an additional safeguard. This is consistent with the Commonwealth offence which already applies in Queensland and criminalises this broad range of symbols. Also, the conduct must reasonably cause a member of the public to feel menaced, harassed or offended to be an offence.

I take this opportunity to thank the personnel who have worked in the development of this bill. In particular, I mention Cheryl Scanlon, Brian Connors, Andrea Joseph, Andrew Wilson, John Henderson, Michael Webb, Anna Papoutsakis, Ashleigh Veivers, Erin Gillam, Shayne Kromberg and Sandra Van Eyk. I also thank officers from the Department of Justice including: Deputy Director-General for Justice Policy and Reform, Tessa Piper; Assistant Director-General Leanne Robertson; Director Kathryn Allan; Principal Legal Officer Jamie Impson; and Senior Policy Officer Emma Francis. I commend the bill to the House.