

---

# Monday, 16 October 2017 Senate Hansard

---

Session Q4-1, Quarter 4 of 2017  
16 October 2017

---

## Bills tabled:

<b>Bill Name</b> Proposer	<b>Bill No</b>	<b>Stage of Consideration</b>	<b>Division</b> (Ayes/Noes)
<b>Fifth Haven Committee Bill</b> House of Representatives	17Q306.006	Second Reading	7/0

**Original report written by:**  
SilverWolv  
**16 October 2017**

---

## 17Q306.006

---

### Bill Name:

Fifth Haven Parliamentary Committee Bill

### Tabled By:

House of Representatives

### Points Made:

1. [SilverWolv, Independent] Why should elected MPs have a say on how 5th Haven will turn out? An elected MP will is automatically eligible for status in the committee. And is later forced to commit to fifth haven in areas such as building and city planning.

I believe that this opens the door to people who have poor build quality. And to make matters worse, the way this committe's decisions are binding (they are binding by default) would be disasterous for 5th Haven's Development

Why should we compromise the best possible outcome for 5th Haven for a committee like this with so many loopholes? In my opinion, this is a bill that will prove disasterous for Fifth Haven.

I therefore move that the bill:-

A) Have the committee's decisions be non binding

B) Only restrict participation of voting in the committee to MPs & Architects only

C) Have public hearings where citizens may come in and express their views to the committee for consideration

D) Have the committee's main function to produce reports for the main team building 5H with recommendations.

E) Be better worded

Or better still, that the senate rejects its recognition of this bill and ask the HOR to come up with a new better thought out bill. Because it is clear that not a lot of thought and consideration was put into the formulation of this bill.

2. [ChickenJoshBwak, Independent] seems like a trojan horse for more citizen contribution regarding trains
3. [Axton, Independent] Last time, I rejected the bill for the fact that City Planning Design will suppose to have some sort of non-legal-binding meetings anyway.  
I would like to hear all opinions, but I would like to still have my iron-fist, though.

4. [\_Ezzo, NCP] i agree on B, C, D, E. But A... hmmm nothing binding is really binding anyway here, anything can be overthrown with either public demand or senate approval so maybe do some sort of semi binding system where the committee does its sort of work and passes the bill, then is sent for voting by citizens parliament-style and also limit the committee's ability to plan transport systems
5. [GukkyGukz, WAP] Well we could let the committee act as an approval for plans and maybe have a place for people see all the project's progress
6. [ChickenJoshBwak, Independent] Reject this bill tbh. Don't see anything coming into fruition in the future regarding this committee.

Division: The question is this house agrees on rejecting the bill.

A Y E S	N O E S
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. y0urs_Tr1y</li> <li>2. ROM5419</li> <li>3. Axton</li> <li>4. Carew</li> <li>5. SilverWolv</li> <li>6. GukkyGukz</li> <li>7. ChickenJoshBwak</li> </ol>	

**AYES: 7 NOES: 0**

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