

---

## Saturday, 10 March 2018 Hansard

---

Session 6, Quarter 1 of 2018  
10 March 2018

---

### Bills tabled:

<b>Bill Name</b> Proposer	<b>Bill No</b>	<b>Stage of Consideration</b>	<b>Outcome</b> (Ayes/Noes)
<b>Single Layer Interjection Suggestions Bill</b> Autobus22, MP, HGP	18109	Second Reading	10/4

### Speaker of Parliament:

1. Grass\_Jelly
2. Hinwapoon

**Original report written by:**  
Hinwapoon  
SilverWolv  
SpacelInvader11  
**10 March 2018**

---

## 18109

---

### Bill Name:

Single Layer Interjection Suggestions Bill

### Tabled By:

Autobus22, HGP, MP

### Debate:

1. [SilverWolv, Independent] I believe the name single layer interjection is rather confusing. I think it should just be called a period of proposal or something. Don't want to make Parliament more confusing than it probably already is.
2. [autobus22, MP, HGP] I simply translated the Dutch name for this procedure. I apologise if it's too confusing. I propose to in parliament terms name it "interjection". There is currently no measure assigned with this name. I propose, rather ironically an amendment to this include this in the bill. Any objections?
3. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] Yes, just the term "interjection" is enough to describe this bill, but may the MP rephrase the bill's content for clarity? So, this bill enables one to interrupt debate without regards to bill amendments to propose alternatives in a nutshell, right?
4. [Autobus22, MP, HGP] Correct.
5. [SilverWolv, Independent] However in the bill's contents under clause 1a it says "(The speaker will ask if anyone wants to make a Single Layer Interjection and at least 10 seconds will be given for a player to jump up and make their Single Layer Interjection Suggestion.)" Hence I do not believe an interjection is the appropriate word for it, but rather a change of parliamentary procedure.
6. [autobus22, MP, HGP] Interjection was the best possible translation from its real life counterpart, if the member wants to suggest a different term to put in the amendment, please suggest a term so we can get this over with.
7. [Silverwolv, Independent] There does not need to be a term for this. I am only asking for this bill to have it renamed so that the executive branch does not get confused during

implementation. I would suggest the name of this bill be changed to Parliamentary Proceedings (Revision) Bill and that clause 1a be changed from “upon a proposed Amendment, People in Parliament will now be able to call a Single Layer Interjection.” to “The speaker will ask for further suggestions for amendments after an amendment was proposed.”

**8. Question put on the House and agreed on (Amendments from SilverWolv)**

9. [SilverWolv, Independent] Apart from that, I would like to mention my support for the bill.

Division:

A Y E S	N O E S
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Autobus22</b></li><li>2. Delfino88</li><li>3. McLarenMaster</li><li><b>4. ROM5419</b></li><li><b>5. Sambrose</b></li><li>6. SilverWolv</li><li>7. Spaceinvader11</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Hinwapoon</b></li><li><b>2. mopsistudios</b></li></ol>

**AYES: 10 NOES: 4**

**Motion is therefore resolved in the affirmative.**

Parliamentary Proceedings (Revision) Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Add additional legislation for parliament to make sure input can be given to bill amendments.

**B**e it enacted by the president of the federation of WolvHaven, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and Representatives, in this parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, as follows -

**1. Proposed changes:**

- a. The speaker will ask for further suggestions for amendments after an amendment was proposed.
  - i. This may only be done if the proposed Amendment is in (direct) conflict with an Amendment that is being made.
  - ii. This Amendment may be accepted by the bill proposer. If the bill proposer declines, the conflicting Amendments will head into a vote.
    1. When multiple persons attempt to Single Layer Interject at once,- A three (or more) way vote may be called, or there may be a vote first to see if any interjection is wished for at all,- to then after that vote on which interjection should be inserted.

**2. Reason(s):**

- a. It has come to light that recently that there (of course) isn't always agreement over Bill Amendments, resulting in bills sometimes re-appearing shortly after the session the original bill was proposed in with amendments that the original proposer wouldn't agree too, to then pass through parliament successfully. This new guideline would make sure the best possible Amendments would make it into a bill, when multiple suggestions for Amendments on the same subjects that contradict or conflict with each other are made,- saving a significant amount of time in the end, by not having to get essentially the same bill through parliament again.

**3. Short title**

- a. This act may be cited as the Single Layer Interjection Suggestions Bill, 2018

**4. Implementation**

- a. This act will go into effect immediately after it receives approval from the president.

---

## Motion: Statement on the Permanent residency bill

---

Rom5419, MP, NAT to move that the house take note of a short statement regarding the Permanent Residency Bill proposed by the National Front earlier.

### Debate:

1. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] Regarding the Permanent Residency bill proposed by the NAT earlier. since the elections are coming soon and the bill has yet to be finalised or voted on. and since this MP is on vacation right now. This MP officially declares a 2 week period from now for discussion outside of parliament with regards to the PR bill if no major disagreements are brought up and rectified, the bill will be voted on as-is next session. All discussions regarding the bill will be in discord #parliament; any contribution is greatly appreciated. let's help to reinforce and optimise our immigration security system together

---

## Motion: Debate on giving citizens access to /tpa

---

Delfino88, Independent to move that the house discuss and debate about the possibility of giving Citizens access to /tpa.

### Debate:

1. [Delfino88, Independent] At the moment the usage of /tpa is restricted only for a limited group of people and that may cause some (little) problems, Especially in Gardellia. Where cities, and players may find at a big distance each other. For this reason, I may propose 2 different things: The first is, /tpa for all Citizens+, but I think it's too dangerous because there's a reason if not everyone can use /tpa. The second is: a test, but it would be annoying and very useless.
2. [mopistudios, Independent] Thank you mr speaker. I would like to say to delfino that this has previously been discussed with the major opposing argument being that it is a privilege given to the vip rank. I think a system were it would work better, would be a system were tpa would cost a certain amount an idea previously tried to be introduced but then abandoned, would you think this is a good idea delfino.

3. [Delfino88, Independent] I agree with mopsi. But I have another thing to say. Since the usage of /tpa is very useful only in Gardellia. My idea was to implement /tpa only in that world. Obviously, /tpa is useful anywhere. But Gardellia is the place where it works better, because, as I said before, for the distances between the cities & players.
4. [SilverWolv, Independent] Thank you mr speaker. First of all, Gardellia mainlines exist for a reason. It is often faster to travel via rail versus basic flying. Implementing tpa for everyone would just remove the point of the railway and just leave it there for show. Next, if we were to implement it in Gardellia, we cannot ascertain that people will not find ways around it to abuse it. Who knows someone could go into Gardellia, send a request, and tell the person not to accept the request till the person is in somewhere within Pangaea for example and it would still go through, risking unfair mode of transport within survival. Furthermore, it also reduces the value of VIP and Architect. These ranks are only given to these people because they are trusted to not break the rules and/or not find loopholes to play the system. /tpa has always been an incentive for people to work towards for being awarded either of those two ranks. Plus, we also give players with these ranks to provide "Taxi" or tp services at their own discretion. Hence, I currently do not see the need for it. Because putting a price on TP may very well end up allowing only the rich to tpa/tpahere which is something that isn't too desirable.
5. [mopistudios, Independent] Thank you Mr Speaker, I would like to say to delfino that I completely disagree with his previous statement. Tpa in Gardellia is definitely not the only use case and not the most useful. what are mainlines for? it would be useful for lab or sandbox, but I question the ability to implement such, as the member stated earlier the possible abuses, If tpa where to cost something it might be able to be used a sort of tax, removing money from the economy. if the economy reset ever happens.
6. [Delfino88, Independent] I agree with SilverWolv and I acknowledge that there are many situation where /tpa usage may be dangerous. Also, I would like to point out that Gardellia Mainlines aren't everywhere. There are big/important places, that are off the system, and there's a final thing. I don't agree with the "incentive" thing. Architect rank, is a rank for players that want to build in the main WolvHaven. /tpa question is mainly for Citizens+. And from the point of view of Citizens. VIP rank is useless. Because most of them don't even know that it exists. In the website there's written "Vip rank will be given to players that deserve it" It doesn't specify anything. So, from the point of view of a quite-new player, it doesn't seem like an objective. Finally, I agree with Mopsi. /tpa would be useful in Lab and Sandbox. Especially in Sandbox. In most plot servers, /tpa is a command that every players can use.

7. [minebuilder1223, MP, PFG] Thank you mr speaker. I would like to point out that delfino only appears to have acknowledges these issues. Not provided any case for mitigating them. If he gives confidence that issues won't arise from this then we would have a point. But at this point he only appears to be saying "yes there will be quite a few issues but we need TPA" I say that if he wants to confidently make a case for this, he will have to show the chamber how he will tackle these issues
8. [mopistudios, Independent] Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like point out first of all that tpa would be more useful in laboratory than sandbox, just look at the map and how spread out it is. Secondly, I would like to say that VIP is a rank to be worked for with good behaviour but I see a lack of its actual use. If it is actually to be a reward, it needs to be used which from my perspective at least it is currently not being used
9. [hinwapoon, MP, NCP] Thank you Mr Speaker. I would like to remind the honourable member delfino. The member i stated said that 'and from the point of view of Citizens. VIP rank is useless.' This member does not represent all the players who are ranked citizen.
10. [Delfino88, Independent] Thank you Mr. Speaker. I know that I am not representing all Citizens members. But I know those things, because I am a Citizen for a long time, I said that "Vip" rank is useless because most Citizens don't know that exists. If you ask a Citizens what "Vip" rank is? He will probably answer something confusing. In this whole time I was in WH. I have only seen 2 VIP ranks players. So, if we want to make this a reality. We need to improve this. So citizens can have this "Incentive".
11. [SilverWolv, Independent] Thank you mr speaker. I dont think its a matter of us improving things so that citizens can have this "incentive". But rather, it is a matter of whether there are enough people deserving of the vip rank.
12. [hinwapoon, MP, NCP] Thank you Mr Speaker. In Delfino's statement said that, 'Because most Citizens don't know that exists 'Some citizens are newly joined and some even don't read the website probably so they don't even know that even exist', and the reason there aren't more VIPs is because people like you misbehave, make the executive council (or whatever) cannot trust. If you really want VIP that badly you can draft a bill for the next session and have it pass through parliament.
13. [Delfino88, Independent] Thank you Mr. speaker. I apologize for how all this ended up. My proposal was about /tpa command. And we all ended up discussing about VIP rank. As minebuilder said, We only acknowledged those issues And we didn't propose a way to solve them. I agree with mopsi. /tpa would be a great thing in Sandbox and Lab.

Especially for Citizens with Gardellia builds, but not only. Hence, the /tpa usage would be restricted to those world only, for those players. And /tpa from another worlds, forbidden. And, if we want to make /tpa more safe. We could include it in the Gardellia building rights test. I would like to finish this discussion now, and restart it later.

---

## Motion: Debate on internal server plagiarism

---

Mopistudios, Independent to move that parliament discuss and debate about internal server plagiarism

1. [mopistudios, Independent] It has been brought to my attention where people have been directly copy pasting builds from other people, and there is no law surrounding internal server copying. What is the house's opinion on this?
2. [\_AngelKevin\_, MP, PM, PFG] Thank You Mr Speaker. My view on this is that a law should be created to protect the originality of builds in the server. Recently, I have spotted a few players plagiarising other's or directly copying the builds and claim it as theirs and to add on, they also simply argue back or just simply act ignorant about it. Hence I feel like if a law is implemented, Players who plagiarised will be punished by the law as well as serving a justice to the person whose build got copied.
3. [minebuilder1223, MP, PFG] Thank you mr speaker. I find it amusing. That the person mostly responsible for a number of plagiarisms over the past few days seems to agree to this bill. Anyhow we will gloss over this. I believe that a copyright bill would serve well only if it's been formatted in a way that would work. It needs to be able to work well and not cause unnecessary blame. Therefore some thought would need to be put into this bill before being put forward to the chamber.
4. [SilverWolv, Independent] Thank you mr speaker. I would also like to point out. When one of the members tabled a copyright bill to parliament. It was the opposition that shot the bill down instantly, just a reminder.
5. [\_AngelKevin\_, MP, PM, PFG] To add on to my earlier comment; I feel that the offender of this law shall be punished by service hours. They must contribute to the society but also serves as a second chance. I am surprised to the fact that the opposition has shot down the bill as this benefits both opposition and the government. I question if the opposition opposed for the sake of being opposition or that they have a valid reason.

6. [mopsistudios, Independent] Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say if such a bill would be introduced, the wording would have to be very explicit as there would need to be distinction between a creative design and a generic design and even if one design is similar to another, innovation is another factor if one design looks similar but innovates on the other one would that be copied or inspired?
7. [\_AngelKevin\_, PM, PFG] I feel that this should be implemented as soon as possible as this plagiarism is ongoing. If we were to adjourn to 2 weeks later, saying bluntly shit may worsen. I request all ministers to reconsider about adjourning the debate
8. **Question put to the house and agreed on. (Adjourning the debate)**