

---

# Saturday, 23 September 2017 Parliament Session Report

---

Session 7, Quarter 3 of 2017  
23 September 2017

---

## Bills tabled:

<b>Bill Name</b> Proposer	<b>Bill No</b>	<b>Division</b> (Ayes/Noes)	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>Parliament Term Revision Bill</b> WolvHaven Senate	17Q307.001	14/0	Passed
<b>Gardellia Abandoned Claims Bill</b> Endermat96, Senator, NAT	17Q307.002	6/4	Passed
<b>5thHaven Green-Spaces (Revised) Bill</b> Autobus22, MP, HGP	17Q307.003	5/10	Rejected
<b>Gardellia Green Belt &amp; Town Development Restriction Bill</b> Minebuilder1223, MP, PFG	17Q307.004	10/0	Passed
<b>BERT to Metro Conversion Bill</b> Davey925, Independent	17Q307.005	0/12	Rejected
<b>Easier Driver Access Bill</b> Davey925, Independent	17Q307.006	0/11	Rejected
<b>Stalingrad Tram Fare Payment Bill</b> Davey925, Independent	17Q307.007	0/9	Rejected

## Speaker of Parliament:

1. Ninjabob1797

**Original report written by:**

Hinwapoon

Ninjabob1797

SilverWolv

**23 September 2017**

---

## 17Q3-7.001

---

### Bill Name:

Parliament Term Revision Bill

### Tabled By:

WolvHaven Senate

### Debate:

1. No opening speech [Opening Speech]
2. I move that the parliamentary term be extended to 6 months, as 4 General Elections a year is too much. Also I will be unable to oversee the next scheduled General Election. If the term was to be kept at 3 months, as seen in the previous parliament, we can note that bad things happen when I am not around, it will also give the parties more time to implement policies. Therefore i move that the terms be extended to 6 months [SilverWolv, Independent]
3. I fully support the motion to extend Parliamentary terms to 6 months, as I believe it is crucial to how parliament functions. I believe that currently, governments do not have enough time to carry out election promises before another election begins. This affects how effectively government can work. Since they have to achieve the passing of new laws within shorter space of time. Which then hinders the ability to focus on certain bills. In addition, I feel that it would increase the democratic will of the people by extending the parliament months, since it means that elections are less frequent. Therefore more importance is carried with them when they do occur and more people will be motivated to vote, since the government they vote for will be in power for longer. [minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG]
4. The Democratiam party fully supports this bill as one thinks that the 3 month parliamentary term is too short for bills to be fully devised before taken to the parliament. sorry I would like to correct. The 3 month term is too short. If the term is extended to 6 months it will allow bills to be more carefully planned and not proposed abruptly after a denial of a former bill thus it will reduce the workload of the senate to overview general elections after all, a 3 month term is honestly unrealistic [Mc\_Dunc, MP, DEM]
5. First of all, I am somewhat in support of this bill but to do have some question for my right honourable friend. Firstly, six months is a lot of time, certain groups of members don't stay active for this long, meaning overtime the amount of representative parliament may shift. If the terms are too long, do you feel like this concern is viable and what would

- you do handle this concern. I further for the aforementioned ideas, further support the bill [autobus22, MP, HGP]
6. Anyways, I would like to direct your attention to section 1c of this bill and remind all of you, that it exists. [y0urs\_Tr1y, Independent]
  7. A snap election could solve concerns in regards to a dysfunctional parliament or a horrid coalition but it doesn't really solve the worries in regards to general shifting representatives. I would like to propose to make it 3 times a year instead of 4 or 2 to give a better median between the current frequency compared to the concerns I mentioned, I would like to suggest a response. [Autobus22, MP, HGP]
  8. Carry on first. [SilverWolv, Independent]
  9. I request a response to my arguments I made for a plausible amendment from the president, I did not request the bill to be amended at this point. Would I be able to get a response from the right honourable president. [Autobus22, MP, HGP]
  10. May I just remind my honourable friend that it's his responsibility to ensure his representatives are responsible enough to appear before this chamber every 2 weeks. if he can't have that due to the idea of a "shifting" of representatives. Then I don't see why people should vote for his party. [SilverWolv, Independent]
  11. Right honourable friend, you have misinterpreted what I intended to say, the concern is with part of the active community members changing, not the parties not being able to represent anymore, creating a mismatch in representation. [Autobus22, MP, HGP]
  12. New election equals new representatives. I don't see the problem of the leader of the opposition. [y0urs\_Tr1y, Independent]
  13. My concern is 6 months might be (slightly) too long to let people vote for their parliamentary representatives, due to the constant shifting in the community and it's members. I agree, as aforementioned, 3 months is too short but I feel based on that argument 6 months might be too long. [Autobus22, MP, HGP]
  14. I think it is clearly evident that my dear opposition leader, does not understand section 1c in the slightest and recommend he read it again until he does. [y0urs\_Tr1y, Independent]
  15. My right honourable friend, please note section 1c does not cover this concern, it would only cover concerns for dysfunctional parliamentary coalitions and issues with the PM or parties involved in parliament and in no way would function realistically in this raise of misrepresentation [Autobus22, MP, HGP]
  16. If the current parliament cannot effectively represent the people, wouldn't it mean that its approval would be low in the first place? If so it perfectly gives the senate the power to call a snap election. I hope my dear honourable friend understands that [SilverWolv, Independent]
  17. Since the April 2017 elections, i have to say i don't believe that the demographics of WolvHaven have changed enough to justify the leader of the opposition's arguments [minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG]

18. I would like to remind my right honourable friend that in 3 months the difference between the picture of parliament changed completely past 2 elections. There was based on actions in parliament, a serious shift in who and what parties people wanted to see in parliament. Please next time clarify the full purpose of 1c as it currently in my interpretation did not fit this purpose. I therefore retract my suggestion.[Autobus22, MP, HGP]
19. I was talking about representation of demographics outside of the parliament chamber. Which you clearly specified when we started this discussion over changing representation. [minebuilder1223, MP, PFG]
20. About article 1c if say for instance the demographics suddenly shifts in parliament nowhere near the 3 month term then people have to wait for the halfway point or a new election. But the voting people out side of parliament make up of MPs in the first place so if they change their minds after the point of article 1c [Number\_101, Independent]

Division:

A Y E S	N O E S
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Hinwapoon</b></li> <li>2. Rom5419</li> <li>3. <b>_Noodur</b></li> <li>4. yOurs_Truly</li> <li>5. SilverWolv</li> <li>6. Davey925</li> <li>7. <b>MC_Dunc</b></li> <li>8. <b>Minebuilder1223</b></li> <li>9. <b>CackleFresh</b></li> </ol>	

**AYES: 14 NOES: 0**

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

Parliament Term Revision Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Extend parliament terms to 6 months

**B**e 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. Proposed changes**

- a. Parliament terms are to be extended to 6 months instead of the current 3
- b. A general election is to be held 6 to 7 calendar months after the previous general election
- c. The senate may call for a snap election after 3 months if approval of the current parliament is low

**2. Reasons for changes**

- a. 4 General Elections in a year is too often
- b. General Elections require a lot of effort to organise
- c. Provide elected representatives a longer period to propose and implement policies

**3. Short Title**

- a. This act may be cited as the Parliament Term Revision Act 2017

**4. Implementation**

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

---

## 17Q3-7.002

---

### Bill Name:

Gardellia Abandoned Claims Bill

### Tabled By:

Endermat96, Senator, NAT

### Debate:

1. This bill aims to set up a basis on abandoned Gardellia towns. Thinking of the future to keep WolvHaven pure, when one day most or even all the stations/ areas would be claimed. With minimal space the aim would be to weed out small towns deserted by their owners to rot while wasting space.[Opening Speech]
2. I would like to direct a few enquiries to Rom. First, why does the Gardellian Council have ruling power for cases relating abandoned land? Second, for a 6 months period, I think it is too long? [MC\_Dunc, MP, DEM]
3. I must say I do have a few concerns with this bill. The way that Gardellia towns are considered abandoned in my opinion is too lenient. It specifies that a town owner must have been offline from the server for at least 6 months before a town is considered abandoned. But town owners could easily be online on different parts of the server and still leave their towns abandoned. It also specified that it's only until 10-12 months that a town is considered abandoned based on lack of development. This means that it could take up to a year before an abandoned town is removed from the Gardellia World which in my opinion is way too long. I also believe that the acceptable reasons for the abandonment are too harsh such as hospitalisation and so on. In my belief, as long as the owners can clarify they will return to their towns and that they have a trial period to rebegin construction then it can be acceptable. [minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG]
4. Firstly, in reply to MC\_Dunc, the Gardellian Council also has power and interest over the Gardellia World. They could have a say on their own land management. Second, the current suggested terms are just a worst case scenario. Very lenient, based on the limit of what representative Endermat96 has consider to be acceptable. May I suggest that the Prime Minister give his opinion on what 'grace period' is most acceptable? Also it says that ANY VALID REASONS are allowed for exceptions to be made. Including 'my PC broke' and such. Not necessarily has to be that extreme.[ROM5419, Independent]

---

### WolvHaven Minecraft Server:

Copyright © 2017 WolvHaven Minecraft Server All Rights Reserved.

5. I would like to raise a follow up enquiry to rom.How would the senate monitor the decisions of the Gardellia Council to prevent the misuse of powers by the Gardellia council for some individuals own benefits? [Mc\_Dunc, MP, DEM]
6. Land management, including claiming and un-claiming, is still a server-intensive thing. As such, with the predicted volatile nature of the Gardellia Council, of course we expect misuse to happen. That's when the senate comes in. After all, the council still has to answer to the senate right? And it's the job of admins and such to manage all the land claims. Which means the senate is still the bottleneck here. In the event the Gardellia Council fails to deliver a rational response. Desertion un-claims would still be processed akin to this two-house parliament system. [ROM5419, Independent]
7. I would like to enquire ROM5419, does this means the decision made by the Gardellia Council will be assessed by the senate? How will the Senate prevent elaborate plans by some Gardellia Council members to take a certain piece of land.[Mc\_Dunc, MP, DEM]
8. In regards to the prime minister earlier concerns I would like to propose an amendment. Having the claimant be offline for 6 months is too long, reasonable reasons as described further on can easily be made within 3 months. [Autobus22, MP, HGP]
9. To MC\_Dunc: First, yes. Second, is there an assumption that the opinions of all Gardellia Council members will not be scrutinised that much? Of course we know about town alliances and conspiracies and such. However, the big aggressive or assimilatory towns would have their ideas be investigated further to see if there is any possible implicit motive behind their vote. The procedure on this is to be determined later. But you can be sure that the towns closest to the abandoned claim in question will not get all the say in this. About autobus22's proposed amendment, I could accept that, a lot can possibly happen in 3 months anyway, just look at each parliament period between General Elections [ROM5419, Independent]

Division:

A Y E S	N O E S
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hinwapoon</li> <li>2. _Noodur</li> <li>3. SilverWolv</li> <li>4. ROM5419</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minebuilder1223</li> <li>2. Autobus22</li> </ol>

**AYES: 6 NOES: 4**

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

## Gardellia Abandoned Claims Bill

A

# B I L L

TO

Set up a system to regulate Abandoned Gardellia claims

**B**e 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. There are a few Gardellia claims abandoned by their owners, however in the future this number could grow.
- b. Several abandoned claims from the Calais De Royal period have been found
- c. Abandoned claims are a waste of space and will become a concern when space in Gardellia runs low

### 2. Criteria for a claim to be considered abandoned

- a. The area's claimant must be offline for-
  - i. At least 6 months
  - ii. At least 3 months if there are little or no visible edits made
- b. The claim has had no visible updates for 10 to 12 calendar months
- c. The area's claimant has been permanently banned without chance for appeal from the server
- d. An exception will be made-
  - i. for valid reasons such as
    1. Hospitalisation
    2. Examinations
    3. Vacations in advance
  - ii. For claims with a town/city radius of over 250m
- e. The claim must be reported to or witnessed by a member of staff
- f. The area's claimant has indicated no interest of retaining his/her claim

### 3. Notifying the claimant

- a. The area's claimant will be given 30 days notice via-
  - i. Discord
  - ii. In-game mail
  - iii. A sign (if there is no method of identification and lack of blocklog data)
- b. The area's claimant will be required to respond regarding their interest in retaining their claim.
  - i. A lack of response will be taken as uninterested

#### **4. Options for abandoned claims**

- a. The final decision for an abandoned claim may be made by-
  - i. The Gardellian Council
  - ii. The WolvHaven Senate
- b. Senate decisions overrule the decisions made by the Gardellian Council
- c. Once a claim has been declared abandoned it may-
  - i. Be given to another player
  - ii. Have the area returned to its natural state
  - iii. Have action delayed until further notice

#### **5. Short title**

- a. This act may be cited as the Gardellia Abandoned Claims Act, 2017

#### **6. Implementation**

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

---

## 17Q3-7.003

---

### Bill Name:

5th Haven Green-Spaces (Revised) Bill

### Tabled By:

Autobus22, MP, HGP

### Debate:

1. The importance of regulated greenspaces in 5th Haven in regards to the environment, social environment and city design is an important issue. There were vital concerns with the functionality of this bill with projects and parks/areas fitting in with environment in a non creatively inhibiting way. loosening the definition for basic green spaces and though strongly advices not mandatory and further increasing the distance for the normal park from buildings, and loosening the requirements on district parks to effectively cater to the concerns with the bill in the last parliamentary session. [Opening Speech]
2. I would like to ask the honourable leader of the opposition why this bill has magically reappeared from parliament, almost come back from the dead. We have already specified why the bill is not required now and since the 5th Haven committee bill has been passed. The necessary for this bill is even less than last time. Since these issues can be discussed there, rather than here in parliament if that bill is enacted. [minebuilder1223. MP, Prime Minister, PFG]
3. The argument why it would not be required now is that it may be overwritten later. I do not feel this is an argument not to get the bill passed based on its reasonings, rather it shows it may adjust further at a later stage to fit opinions and needs on fifth haven. The 5th haven committee bill has not yet been enacted by the president and is not a valid argument by that. I have tried to amend the bill to follow up on the concerns (large amendments) of concerns as expressed by various MP's [autobus22, MP, HGP]
4. First off, I would like to mention, honourable autobus22. If you don't know autobus22, I would like to mention that, the 5H Committee bill is pending to be passed. After a few amendments being discussed, hinting that the bill would be passed. One knows that you party is Honest and Green Party. But such bill with such detailed description of how green spaces should be implemented, should be honestly leaved with the new 5h committee which will soon be a thing. Also in your bills, you only used wordings like strongly advised, that means your bill serves as a suggestion. You don't have a very strong regulated rule in green space allocation. Also, the 5h planned world isn't really a

large world if you have to direct a district solely for parks, it would waste the land use, unless your district is extremely small, 4096 square block is a large plot of land. Lastly, why would this be a green space bill. Should this be noted by a park or recreational bill? Since I don't see a very strong of green, when comparing to prime minster's green belt bill. [MC\_Dunc, MP, DEM]

5. So I would like to remind duncan that 4096 seems like a lot but is only the equivalent of 64\*64 blocks, which is less than a single city plot in the current world. Fifth haven may not be huge but it IS larger. The bill only requires district parks for large districts made up of multiple sub-districts, not on isolated small districts, and the bill requires parks and district parks and strongly advises on green spaces based on the fact. (As noted) In some areas it may or may not be feasible to enact such guidelines. This would create an estimation of 2-3 district parks of at least the size of 1 current WH city plot, aka. tiny, looking at the geography of the world and a few other small parks. Additionally whether 5th haven council passes or not does not matter, till enacted by the president, it is the parliament's job, which is the current [autobus22, MP, HGP]
6. I would like to raise a fact that. if you need to space a park every three hundred blocks, it would cause a serious planning issue to that piece of land. Also, if you don't know, 5H will have a lot of infrastructure related builds, i.e. port, airports, what will you do for these? Have you mentioned these extensively in your bill? No. Also point 1.a.i., 150 blocks for a green space? That just absurd honestly. If this bill is passed, our 5H would will be littered. With parks. Honestly. A green space should not exist in every single district, like let me propose an extreme case, would you place a park in an industrial district. Filled with heavy load of factories, simply no, just no. [MC\_Dunc, MP, DEM]
7. I would like the ask the honourable leader of the opposition what he actually intends to happen if the bill is passed? where in the rulebook will it be included? [minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG]
8. Firstly to respond to my honourable friend duncan, all of your concerns in regards to industry airport and such are covered by 1a. Add the following guidelines for green-spaces in Fifth Haven:(These guidelines do not apply in Industry Parks or the Airport or major event area's where they would be impossible to achieve.) Your concern for park distance is ~300m away from a building, meaning a range of 600, not 300 blocks, as 300 blocks away would create a circle of 600 around the building. Parks are essential to realistic and proper district planning. I allowed more than enough freedom as the concerns were raised especially with basic green-spaces, the minimum size to fulfill parks, and the sparse need for district parks, and the full contents of part 1a. To address all your concerns effectively, so far all your concerns were solved with the bill. I would like to remind my honourable friend you are required to read the bill up front. Now for the prime minister, it would be included in the fifth haven building regulations and/or rules [autobus22, MP, HGP]

9. Honorable auto, your bill is utterly useless. why? why does the parliament need to regulate how districts are planned how land use are planned now? why? 5h is still in a premature phase at this stage you are already placing details so detailed your bill is ambitious but it wouldn't work. why? land use is scarce with your limitations the problem would intensify also how would you ensure green spaces won't be dumped everywhere in the district greenery is important but you only regulated how much is it needed at least. You did not regulate how much at most, if you don't make a cap, greenery will go out of hand in our future city. [Mc\_Dunc, MP, DEM]
10. I was asking about how the bill be enacted now, since the 5H regulations are still quite a while away. Therefore what on earth are you planning to do with the bill between now and then if it is enacted. Because i feel like if it is laying redundant for too long, it will be forgotten about and the 5H building regulations will be formed regardless of it being there or not and they will be formed regardless of what the bill says. Therefore i think this bill remains to be a waste of time and entirely unnecessary. [minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG]
11. I would like to remind the prime minister that this is the president's responsibility, not mine. I would like to remind Mc\_Dunc city design is the responsibility of the people building, We have experienced architects and staff in that the cohesion of the city is their responsibility an overdose of parks with that is unlikely. I'd like to remind my honourable friend the total area of park required would come down to 2 thirds of the area of the central park on the current world that includes all parks on more than double the space I can simply not imagine this minimum amount would cause an overload. Please be more critical of your questions and concerns next time. 5th Haven stuff has to be regulated before it starts regardless, there is no difference between now or later and as noted before keeping the bill secured is the president's responsibility by that I have dismissed all concerns. [autobus22, MP, HGP]
12. So now you are saying that this bill is only an advisory to the president and serves no concrete purpose. In that case, you could have just said everything in the bill to him. Without wasting an ungodly amount of parliament time with this bill. The president may take into account what the bill says in the regulations for 5th Haven, or he may just ignore them completely and the result of this votes gives him an opinion from the rest of Wolvhaven on this bill and currently, that opinion is not looking good. [minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG]

Division:

A Y E S	N O E S
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Autobus22</b></li><li>2. <b>_Noodur</b></li><li>3. <b>Number_101</b></li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>SilverWolv</b></li><li>2. <b>Hinwapoon</b></li><li>3. <b>Mc_Dunc</b></li><li>4. <b>Minebuilder1223</b></li><li>5. <b>CackleFresh</b></li><li>6. <b>y0urs_Tru1y</b></li></ol>

**AYES: 5 NOES: 10****Motion is therefore negated.**

5th Haven Green-Spaces (Revised) Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Implement basic systems and guidelines for greenspaces and parks in fifth haven.

**B**e 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. New guidelines:**

- a. Add the following guidelines for greenspaces in Fifth Haven:  
(These guidelines do not apply in Industry Parks or the Airport or major event area's where they would be impossible to achieve.)
  - i. It is strongly advised that within ~150 blocks (to all sides) from a building there should be a greenspace. (A small or larger piece of greenery with at least a few tree's and a bench to sit on.) (This rule may be satisfied by a Park or District Park as well.) Greenery on buildings or rooftops may satisfy this as well. (This rule may be ignored if it is impossible to satisfy or for special projects with inhibits in reasonable terms the existance of a park in this locationary distance.) (So long some form of greenery is present, this could also be accounted for by a square or playground)
  - ii. Any Building must be at most ~300 blocks away from a small park of at least 512 Sq. m (With one side being at least 16 blocks.) (These must contain multiple tree's and the general contents of a small park, This rule may be satisfied by a District Park as well.
  - iii. Any "District" (As to be defined as a major area possibly including several Sub-Districts, Loose sub-districts that are isolated do not have to follow this rule) must have at least one District Park. A district park is a major park with space for possible small events. For instance (But not limited/required to specifically have): A play ground, a Dog walking area and public sporting places, like a Bar training set, a set of training items, Jeu de Boule Squares, an open soccer field, open access water playground of pool etc. etc. And must be at least 4096 Sq. Blocks (With all sides being at least 32 blocks.)

**2. Reason(s):**

- a. This bill benefits the image and look of the city, The Environment and Social Living conditions.

**3. Short title**

- a. This act may be cited as the 5th Haven Green-Spaces (Revised) Act, 2017

**4. Implementation**

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

---

## 17Q3-7.004

---

**Bill Name:**

Gardellia Green Belt & Town Development Restriction Bill

**Tabled By:**

Minebuilder1223, MP, Prime Minister, PFG

**Debate:**

1. Recently in Gardellia, we have seen a number of towns that have grown to quite enormous sizes in comparison to the smaller towns in their vicinity. The size of these towns has become increasingly concerning as of recent due to the amount of space these towns are consuming, which could impact the development of other towns in their vicinity. Therefore this bill aims to combat that by proposing to impose Green Belts on certain towns that are of concern to staff or fellow mayors. [Opening Speech]

**Division:**

A Y E S	N O E S
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Hinwapoon</li><li>2. Minebuilder1223</li><li>3. CackleFresh</li><li>4. Mc_Dunc</li><li>5. SilverWolv</li><li>6. ROM5419</li></ol>	

**AYES: 10 NOES: 0**

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

## Gardellia Green Belt &amp; Town Development Restriction Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Keep control and regulation over the expansions and development of Gardellian towns as not to hinder others.

**B**e 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. Green Belt Criteria**

- a. Green Belts are established when Towns/Cities develop to a point where they are clearly hindering the development of other nearby towns
- b. Green Belts act as a Belt of land circling a city on which-
  - i. No Cities or privately owned infrastructure may be built.
  - ii. Only national and inter-city infrastructure may be built.
- c. Green Belts can be considered when both-
  - i. Separate Towns'/Cities' Radiuses are within 600 blocks of each other.
  - ii. The town/city in question contains 30 buildings or more.
- d. The form that Green Belts take on is as follows-
  - i. They will be approx. 100 bks in width to allow for a buffer space.
  - ii. They will roughly follow the space of the town/city in question.

**2. Green Belt Implementation**

- a. The Implementation of Green Belts will be Decided on in one of 2 ways, one of which depends on the presence of a Gardellian council.
  - i. An owner of a town/city in Gardellia makes a case for a Green Belt to be put in place around a town/city whose expansion is threatening to infringe on the expansion of their town.
    1. In the situation that there is no Gardellian Council, the case is to be made on the forums where staff review it and decide on it further
    2. In the situation there is a Gardellian Council, the case will be brought to the council where it will be debated and voted on by all representatives. If accepted will be passed on to staff to implement.
  - ii. Staff Independently make the decision to implement a Green Belt due to concerns of rapid growth of a town/city.

- b. When implementing a Green Belt, staff must consider the needs of all parties involved such as-
    - i. Room for continued expansion on a small scale for the town/city in question.
    - ii. Allowing expansion space for the surrounding towns so that the purpose of the Green Belt is not defeated.
    - iii. The belt must follow the shape of the town/city in question- not a simple circle shape.
    - iv. Future expansion plans for cities in the area so that the Green Belt can allow for these to be accommodated.
  - c. Town/City Mayors will be notified of the planned Green Belt through being provided a map which details the form that the Green Belt will take around their town/city
- 3. Green Belt Enforcement**
- a. Staff will always have a map available of every Green Belt which can then be used on dynmap to check if towns have breached their Green Belt Boundary.
  - b. If a player has breached a Green Belt Boundary, they will be provided 2 weeks to either move or remove the buildings breaching the boundary. After 2 weeks, these buildings will be forcibly removed.
    - i. A player can contest the ruling to staff by giving a valid reason why the building/set of buildings is/are breaching the Green Belt and why it/they should be allowed to remain.
- 4. Short Title**
- a. This act may be cited as the Gardellia Green Belt Act 2017
- 5. Implementation**
- a. Bill will be presented to parliament, and if passed will be moved to senate for inspection
  - b. If passed, it will be ratified by president, and enacted into law

---

## 17Q3-7.005

---

**Bill Name:**

BERT To Metro Conversion Bill

**Tabled By:**

Davey925, Independent

**Debate:**

1. Metro is doing a great job transporting players around the city. But there are some weak spots that metro doesn't serve like Monecau, Supreme Court, and the IDA, that used to be served by an independent transit system called BERT. BERT and Metro almost serviced all areas of the city, until BERT was dismantled because of Lag, low ridership, and high cost to transfer. This September, We will all get transit service to the low served areas. The 4 manual lines will benefit commuters and tourists, taking the new lines or not. It will bust congestion on existing Metro lines too, so even if you don't ride the new Metro lines, you will benefit too. And, Construction of the lines uses 100% existing track and stations, so all you need to do is convert the line to manual, add a train depot, and convert the signs to Metro. [Opening Speech]

**Division:**

A Y E S	N O E S
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. SilverWolv</li><li>2. <b>Hinwapoon</b></li><li>3. ROM5419</li><li>4. y0urs_Tr1y</li><li>5. <b>CackleFresh</b></li><li>6. <b>Minebuilder1223</b></li><li>7. <b>MC_Dunc</b></li><li>8. Number_101</li></ol>

**AYES: 0 NOES: 12****Motion is therefore resolved in the affirmative.**

BERT to Metro Conversion Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Merge and Convert BERTransit lines to the WolvHaven Metro system

**B**e 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. Proposed Changes**

- a. New signage and reconfigured faregates will be introduced on existing BERTransit lines to convert it to integrate into the WolvHaven Metro system
- b. BERTransit lines will be renamed as follows-
  - i. District Line to Line 11
  - ii. Westford Line to Line 12
  - iii. Wolfminster Line to Line 13
  - iv. Circle Line to Line 14

**2. Reasons for changes**

- a. WolvHaven Metro currently does not serve areas that is currently being served by BERTransit
- b. Service on BERTransit was stopped because of Metro's increased popularity and cheaper fares
- c. Lack of BERT service requires people to walk from a Metro to a BERT station resulting in a drawback to public transportation and an increase of Carbon Dioxide emissions each year (WHAT THE FUCK??)

**3. Benefits (YEAH RIGHT, RAILTARD.)**

- a. Benefits people who live, work and play in areas underserved by Metro
- b. Reduce congestion on existing rail lines (WHAT CONGESTION?)
- c. Greater coverage by Metro
- d. Less traffic congestion
- e. A better environment for WolvHaven

**4. Short Title**

- a. This act may be cited as the BERT to Metro Conversion Act 2017

**5. Implementation**

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

## 17Q3-7.006

---

Bill Name:

Easier Driver Access Bill

Tabled By:

Davey925, Independent

Debate:

1. Metro has 4 underutilized lines that could serve high demand areas, but instead only run when a Metro driver is on. Since trains don't derail, we have a solution that will bring more trains to more people than ever before! [Opening Speech]

Division:

A Y E S	N O E S
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. SilverWolv</li><li>2. <b>Minebuilder1223</b></li><li>3. <b>Hinwapoon</b></li><li>4. <b>MC_Dunc</b></li><li>5. y0urs_Tr1y</li><li>6. AGAHO_NOT_AGARIO</li><li>7. <b>CackleFresh</b></li></ol>

**AYES: 0 NOES: 11**

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

Easier Driver Access Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Allow any citizen to request an admin to add them as a Metro driver

**B**e 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. Proposed changes**

- a. Any citizen will be allowed to request for an admin to add them as a driver without a test
  - i. Citizens will be rejected if they have a train related offence such as-
    1. Collision
    2. Ignoring of Signals

**2. Reasons for changes**

- a. Trains no longer derail
- b. Tourists often have to walk to their destination when there is a train station there
- c. Get more people on public transport
- d. Reduce congestion on Line 8

**3. Short Title**

- a. This act may be cited as the Easier Driver Access Act 2017

**4. Implementation**

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

---

## 17Q3-7.007

---

**Bill Name:**

Stalingrad Tram Fare Payment Bill

**Tabled By:**

Davey925, Independent

**Debate:**

1. Metro is running low on funds to expand the transit of a growing city. In addition, the economy is falling, due to players holding money. Trams are a good place to start for improving the economy, since they are free right now. A Proof Of Payment system will still allow Metro to collect fares while still providing fare gate free tram service. [Opening Speech]

**Division:**

A Y E S	N O E S
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. SilverWolv</li><li>2. <b>MC_Dunc</b></li><li>3. y0urs_Tr1y</li><li>4. <b>Minebuilder1223</b></li><li>5. <b>CackleFresh</b></li><li>6. AGAHO_NOT_AGARIO</li></ol>

**AYES: 0 NOES: 9****Motion is therefore resolved in the affirmative.**

## Stalingrad Tram Fare Payment Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Introduce Proof-of-Payment on the Stalingrad Tram

**B**e 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. Proposed changes**

- a. Metro+ readers will be installed at tram stations

**2. Reasons for changes**

- a. Additional revenue from tram

**3. Short Title**

- a. This act may be cited as the Stalingrad Tram Fare Payment Act 2017

**4. Implementation**

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