



Saturday, 2 September 2017 Parliament Session Report

Session 5, Quarter 3 of 2017
2 September 2017

Bills tabled:

Bill Name Proposer	Bill No	Division (Ayes/Noes)	Outcome
Discord Manual Driver Bill TalonPlays, Independent	17Q305.001	1/16	Rejected
Pangaea Railways Identification Bill Aldranster50, MP, RCP	17Q305.002	10/13	Rejected

Speaker of Parliament:

1. SilverWolv

Original report written by:
SilverWolv
Hinwapoon
2 September 2017

WolvHaven Minecraft Server:

Copyright © 2017 WolvHaven Minecraft Server All Rights Reserved.



17Q3-5.001

Bill Name:

Discord Manual Driver Bill

Tabled By:

TalonPlays, Independent

Debate:

1. I've been on the server for a decent bit now, and I love it. Something though, that I had to notice about the manual driving was how congested it could get. I know that from experience. One time I was tired of landscaping the mountain in Pangaea I was working on, and decided to drive m5. I said in chat "I'm gonna drive M5 if anyone wants it." Nobody said anything out of the chat order so I warped to the depot expecting everything would be fine – it wasn't. There were already 2 guys there, one of which was just sitting in the train. I got the idea to do this, but didn't publicize it much until one time I put it up on the forums. It came back to mind recently and I decided to put it up on parliament to see what the others had to say about it. [Opening Speech, TalonPlays, Independent]
2. Err for me i believe this bill if implemented, isnt gonna be used since according to my experience, i have never seen more than one person drive on the metro [_Noodur, MP, HGP]
3. It's been stated on numerous occasions that the WH discord has too many channels. Furthermore, the only time I've ever seen multiple people in a metro depot is when it's been prearranged. Perhaps a single channel for metro coordination would be reasonable, but one for every line is too much. [CackleFresh, MP, PFG]
4. This bill confuses me, it seems to have nothing to do with the speech. The bill proposes channels for metro lines for announcement to people using the manual lines but in speech complains about trains being stuck in the depot. It will be nearly impossible to discord while driving just noting you are driving already is kinda hard so that is not a good idea but then it also doesn't solve the issue in the speech that could only be solved by multiple tracks in depots which would be a good idea, but is not this bill. Vote no. the bill makes no sense doesn't work and doesn't represent the issue it says it represents [Autobus22, MP, HGP]



5. The bill spoils the privacy of the driver, since they may not want to talk to anyone. It is mentioned that voice channels would be used but the proposer has not thought of privacy issues the person may have at the moment [Aldranster50, MP, RCP]
6. Umm my apologies to the house, I would like to retract my call my apologies.[_Noodur, MP, HGP]
7. Id say this bill would be a good idea however like what aldranster50 was saying, it can somewhat violate the privacy of a driver. So unless this bill says that you don't have to talk to anyone, I vote no. [agaho_not_agario, Independent]
8. I will say that instead a discord group, create something like the /helpop command. For example, /request driver <message> [CM_CRAFT_YT, independent]
9. I'd like to apologize for wasting the house's time. Sorry to the people here. [_Noodur,MP,HGP]
10. I've seen multiple times multiple trains on the same line. The idea of organization is good, by voice calls even more. It is easier to say than to type when the train is driven and people that don't have driving license can use the channels to know where their train is. It could be useful to do it, but it would create too many channels and doing it on one would be chaotic. So to create another little discord server just for the trains vocal chat and written train requests could be the good idea [Julio974, Independent]
11. Some people's internet isn't that good, and having another window open in the pc makes the server for him/her more laggy. [CM_CRAFT_YT, Independent]

Division:

A Y E S	N O E S
1. Julio974	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hinwapoon 2. Sambrose 3. Rom5419 4. CM_CRAFT_YT 5. _Noodur 6. Autobus22 7. Aldranster50 8. Blalex 9. Cacklefresh

AYES: 1 NOES: 16

Motion is therefore resolved in the affirmative



Discord Manual Driver Bill

A

B I L L

TO

Create safety and more frequency on the manual lines of WolvHaven

Be it enacted by the president of the city-state 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. Purpose & Process

- a. Train drivers from all over WolvHaven would use a discord voice channel (See4) to manage frequency of train driving.
- b. As trains are departing and arriving at stations, they must announce in the discord chat what direction they are going in and what station they have just arrived at or currently departing.
 - i. Example: Going to Siloner, Arriving at Waterfront (said in voice channel “Drivers 7”)
 - ii. Going to La Resistance, Departing from Renaissance (said in voice channel “Drivers 1”)
 - iii. Arrived at City Hall - Switching Directions to Esplande (said in voice channel “Drivers 5”)

2. Starting a New Train

- a. If train drivers want to start a new line, they must go into the respective voice channel at least *3 minutes* in advance. Then they can say “I would like to start a new Line 5 train,” In the respective voice channel, Drivers 5
- b. Then any drivers either:
 - i. Ahead of them by less than 2 full stations
 - ii. Waiting in line
- c. must announce that they are in that state.



- d. There must be a gap of at *least* 2 stations, except for the Tram Lines, in which it must be at least 4 stations. A train cannot depart from:
 - i. Line 4, unless the most recent train has reached past Central Park
 - ii. Line 5, unless the most recent train has reached past Westferry
 - iii. etc.
- 3. Boarding Trains**
- a. If a user would like to board a manual train, they could also listen for an update on when the next train is coming
- 4. Voice Channel**
- a. There shall be a new voice channel titled “Drivers,” and then a number (to represent the line they are driving).
 - b. Those who do not have a license shall be muted
- 5. Short title**
- a. This act may be cited as the Manual Driver Act
- 6. Implementation**
- a. This act will go into effect immediately after it receives approval from the president.



17Q3-5.002

Bill Name:

Pangaea Railways Identification Bill

Tabled By:

Aldranster50, MP, RCP

Debate:

1. There have been recent issues where a building has been too close to a station, and no identity can be provided, so there needs to be information in order to find out The Key Aspects Of The Station/Railway, so there can be action taken if required. [Opening Speech, Aldranster50, MP, RCP]
2. Can't the railway station owners just tell the people who are in the way of a station/tracks/planned line/whatsoever this is such a simple solution but if this bill passes through the House of Representatives, senate and even the president it is still decent but my point is just that this has such a simple solution. [_Noodur, MP, HGP]
3. Unlike WH City or Gardellia, Pangaea is not particularly known for its railways I myself was not even aware that it HAD railways. Is it really so important to know who owns every section of track in Pangaea that the owners of unnamed tracks and stations could risk ban? I have a better and simpler solution. Rather than risking repercussions for building around an existing build, perhaps plan out the rails and contact the owners of the builds to confirm if they are okay with that thank you. [CackleFresh, MP, PFG]
4. The Democratiam party fully supports this bill. The reason is this bill provides a clear identification to the pangaea railways so honestly it's just here for the sake of no miscommunication [MC_Dunc, MP, DEM]
5. Responding to cacklefresh point, this bill aims for build owners to ask railway owners to remove stations, not the opposite. [Aldranster50, MP, RCP]
6. Although this party supports the bill, one would like to suggest an amendment. In the suggested punishments of the build the player who offended the rule may be imposed a one month ban that is a very serious punishment would that one month ban be too serious honestly such an offence really doesn't call for such a serious consequence instead of setting such a high limit for the ban period perhaps only an official or verbal warning would be more suitable? [Mc_Dunc, MP, DEM]



7. May I amend my bill. Instead a 1 month ban in all cases, it would range from a warning up to a ban of 1 month)as well as bans less than 1 month. Depending of how many tracks the person has built [Aldranster50, MP, RCP]
8. First off, I would like to mention the fact that Aldranster50 did not address to my concern in the bill, it clearly said that up to one month ban, so what Aldranster50 said just now is only amending it due to the severity of the offence but what i just stressed is that do such action lead to a ban punishment, can an official warning do the thing? After all, if one imposes a ban because of this, the player may not be able to access different world offences due to this bill honestly should not lead to a ban. Ban should be only at senate discretion. This is my suggestion [MC_Dunc, MP, DEM]
9. Bill contains issues - Would not function well as it is but the idea is good. This should go to the Senate to make finalised amendments to make it functional, but should by that still be approved here.[autobus22, MP, HGP]
10. Firstly I would like to apologise for my late appearance. Now, I have read through this bill suggested by Aldranster50 and I would like to express my concern for the absurdity for the punishments the honourable member is suggesting. Now remember this bill is only suggesting a new law which would only require the erection of a few signs, which states a bit of information regarding a station in Pangaea. Now, to common person the punishment for not obliging by such a law would be imagined to be quite lenient, such as a verbal warning which that in itself is almost harsh. But Aldranster50 is suggesting an enormous fine which could bankrupt people, or a ban which would usually be used if someone had committed a fairly serious crime, and I can't imagine that not placing a couple of signs equals such absurdly harsh punishment. [minebuider1223, MP, PM, PFG]
11. As mentioned by the honourable Prime Minister, these punishments are simply too harsh, but I would like to make a suggestion, that is to keep the fine, change bans to warnings, sometimes a simple verbal warning really does not have a strong effect on that very person so a fine imposed on them would create a larger impact. [MC_Dunc, MP, DEM]
12. The reason why I made the fine up to \$10000 because railways require tracks and other resources, which take time and the use might want to use /jobs inorder to make much off it, as well as that, there is a plugin which gives \$100 to players at random times. It states in the bill that it is 'Fine of up to \$10000', so the player may not be charged up to \$10000. [Aldranster50, MP, RCP]
13. Punishments here are ridiculous but I will vote yes, This will 100% go to senate as it doesn't function in its current form, the idea is good, voting yes and getting it into senate saves a lot of parliament time. Senate will, as always make amendments that make bill that are questionable the passed make it feasible so I suggest if you somewhat agree to the idea in this case to vote yes. [autobus22, MP HGP]



14. Aldranster50, the honorable prime minister and I have addressed that your ban suggestion is simply too harsh, why won't you make an address on that situation, are you simply admitting that fact that imposing a ban on these offenders are not over the line.
[MC_Dunc, MP, DEM]

Division:

A Y E S	N O E S
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Aldranster502. Autobus223. Julio9744. _Noodur5. Agaho_not_agario6. Mc_Dunc	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Hinwapoon2. Blalex3. Sambrose4. Minebuilder12235. Olovd6. CackleFresh7. OscarTheOscar_

AYES: 10 NOES: 13

Motion is therefore negated



Pangea Railways Identification Bill

A

B I L L

TO

Identify Owners Of Railways In Pangea

Be it enacted by the president of the city-state 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. Purpose

- a. This Is To Identify Who Owns The Railway, Built The Station & Where It Goes To.
- b. All Stations Shall Have The Following:
 - i. Name Of Railway
 - ii. Name Of Station
 - iii. Owner Of Railway (including any other co-owners/companies)
 - iv. Station Builder

2. Punishments

- a. If The Station Has No Identification, The Owner Of The Railway Will Be Found & Given:
 - i. Fine Of Up To \$10000
 - ii. Ban For Up To A Month
 - iii. Station Forcibly Removed
 - iv. Any Extra Punishments Decided By The Senate
 - v. Combination Of Any Depending On Building Plans
- b. If Having Identification, The Owner Of The Building Can:
 - i. Ask The Owner To Relocate/Remove The Station Within 2 Weeks, Unless The Owner Hasn't Been Online For More Than 12 Weeks, Which Means The Stations Will Be Forcibly Removed.
- c. If The Owner Hasn't Done Action During 2 Weeks:
 - i. Fine Of Up To \$10000
 - ii. Ban For Up To A Month
 - iii. Station Forcibly Removed
 - iv. Any Extra Punishments Decided By The Senate
 - v. Combination Of Any Depending Of Building
- d. If The Station Is Realised And The Player Hasn't Been Online For Longer Than 70 Days/10 Weeks When Issue Has Been Found, And Has Not Gone Online Since, The



Station Will Be Removed Or Taken Over By Another Railway, Which Need To Take Action About The Station.

- e. No Punishment Can Be Taken If The Building Starts Getting Built After The Station Has Been Constructed.

3. Short Title

- a. This Bill Shall Cited As Pangea Railways Identification Bill

4. Implementation

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