

---

## Saturday, 10 February, 2018 Hansard

---

Session 3, Quarter 1 of 2018  
10, February 2018

---

### Bills tabled:

<b>Bill Name</b> Proposer	<b>Bill No</b>	<b>Stage of Consideration</b>	<b>Outcome</b> (Ayes/Noes)
<b>Government and Parliament Reform Bill</b> Minebuilder1223, MP, PFG	18105	Second Reading (Cont.)	3/9
<b>Gardellia Abandoned Claims (Amendment) Bill</b> Endarmatster, MP, NAT	18107	First Reading	Adjourned
<b>Discord Player Bans Bill</b> Autobus22, MP, HGP	18108	First Reading	Adjourned
<b>Single Layer Interjection Suggestions Bill</b> Autobus22, MP, HGP	18109	First Reading	Postponed

### Speaker of Parliament:

1. Grass\_Jelly (Bills 18105, 18107)
2. Hinwapoon (Bills 18108-1809)

**Original report written by:**  
Hinwapoon  
SpaceInvader11  
**10 February 2018**

---

# 18105

---

## Bill Name:

Government and Parliament Reform Bill

## Tabled By:

Minebuidler1223, MP, PFG

## Debate:

1. [autobus22, MP, HGP] To add to the issues with this bill, last time the prime minister mentioned something. That something is, that the representation in senate from parliament is fine, because right now the opposition basically controls the senate. Which is, as should be pointed out insane, because the parties that control parliament will fluctuate with elections. The argument works solely for this term. But is not logic, nor functioning for any upcoming seasons. Me myself is an (crossbench) opposition member, I think it's important to point out, would the current oppositionary parties win the next or any upcoming sessions. The exact same issue will appear in reverse, but even worse. It doesn't solve anything in that sense, and creates more misrepresentation in Senate, which is suppose to avoid insane bills from passing. An election system for Senate members in some shape might be something useful, but not in this way. The arguments presented do not hold up to logical scrutiny.
2. [minebuilder1223, MP, PFG] May I firstly point I am no longer prime minister. Now I think that the opposition is becoming more prone to fear mongering and exaggerating situations excessively. By referring to issues as "insane" and suggesting a total collapse of the political system, you seem to be creating some form of "Project Fear" and this has been true on the mentionable list bill as well where the opposition predicted chaos if the bill passed. Well I don't know about you, but I can't quite see any anarchy erupting on the streets. Anyway, What i was saying about representation in the senate, I was saying that since there are already members of parties in the senate, The argument that my bill will bring partisan issues into the senate is false. There are already partisan divides in the senate and chaos hasn't erupted there either. I think the opposition should start thinking of things logically instead of predicting the end of the world for every bill.

3. [autobus22, MP, HGP] I would like to remind the former prime minister that this is a strawman. The current senate has members picked solely for the purpose enlisted to the senate, not elected members, especially not solely added from the governing coalition. Specifically, if members would be added in any fashion to senate by public or semi-public choice, that needs to be representative as well of the decisions of voters. Which would not be guaranteed by the proposed system, as the majority has historically been extremely low, so 2 members are set to represent ~55% of parliament and none of the other 45%. This gives a misrepresentation error of 45% y coalitionary opposition. The crossbench does not suggest it will definitely go wrong, but the main argument enlisted last session came around democratic choice being in senate with this bill as well. Which is, as now shown, clearly not actually the case with this bill in the parliament environment that Exists here. Hence, the crossbench suggest the making of a new bill, system or proposal to (semi-)democratically elect senate members, if this would still be wished by the current governing coalition.
4. [yOurs\_TrU1y, Independent] Would the dear crossbench please wake up his idea. IF the senate was meant to be representative it wouldn't be by appointment only. We are not interested in making sure everybody is represented fairly. The sole purpose of adding 2 members is to allow opinions of parliament to be heard. Now, if we had 3 senate seats open for nomination, sure, we can have 1 opposition and 2 ruling. Since we don't 55% is greater than 45%.
5. [ROM5419, MP, NAT] This MP would like to clarify to the MP from PFG/FWH. That although this member is a member of a party, this does not mean this MP's duties in the senate are influenced by the party ideologies. This MP is in senate for reasons established before the parties. The statement that the opposition controls the senate not really carries that much weight.
6. [minebuilder1223, MP, PFG] The point that the previous member made only strengthens my point. If partisan issues don't carry as much into the senate, the way that the leader of HGP is making it out to be carries every less truth. And even if that wasn't true, due to the makeup of senate, and even with 2 nominated members from the government, the appointed staff in the senate would still keep a majority and would still have more power of the partisan section of the senate. And I would also like the stress that the leader of HGP, as the President himself stated "hardly any bills pass through senate" It has much less importance than the opposition makes out to be. This all culminates to make it true that the nomination of 2 members to the senate will not cause chaos. And the senate will still retain the use that it started out with since nonpartisan staff majority will exist to overturn silly bills. Therefore, I move that the leader of HGP is using the tactic of fear mongering in an attempt to stop this bill from passing.

7. [autobus22, MP, HGP] I would like to remind the former prime minister, that the argument around democratic representation came from he himself, in the last session as just verified in the logs from the said session and that the crossbench was responded to as to why this wouldn't work. Not discrediting the HGP based on the fight on the statements that we are actually the former prime ministers own, is rather silly. Which is why, the crossbench is clear, that we agree, the current system does not create a partisan issue, but that is also by how the current Senate is picked. But adding a democratic option exactly in the governing coalitions position, will allow (due to lack of control of it), partisan issues to come into existence. Further, the crossbench would like to remind if both opposition and government send one, mis representation would be at 5% under that calculation. If the government would send two, it would be at 45%. If the government were to send two and the opposition 1, it would be at roughly 30% Only strengthening my point in misrepresentation.

Division:

A Y E S	N O E S
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>_AngelKevin_</b></li> <li>2. <b>Hinwapoon</b></li> <li>3. <b>Minebuilder1223</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>_ezzo</b></li> <li>2. <b>Autobus22</b></li> <li>3. <b>MC_Dunc</b></li> <li>4. Mopistudios</li> <li>5. <b>Number_101</b></li> </ol>

**AYES: 6 NOES: 9**

**Motion is therefore negated.**

Government and Parliament Reform Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Reform and revise the powers and responsibilities of an incumbent government

**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 -

**I. Powers to be introduced**

- A. The prime minister has the power to nominate elected members of his/her government to become members of the senate.
  - 1. The Prime Minister may only nominate 2 elected members to the senate at the start of each parliamentary term.
  - 2. These members remain members of the senate for the duration of a parliamentary term, after which they cease to be members of the senate.
  - 3. Both the Senate and the President must approve the decision before the member can be appointed.
- B. Upon advice from the Prime Minister, the President must declare a state of emergency.
  - 1. This state of emergency lasts for 7 days, unless parliament votes to extend it.
  - 2. In this time, emergency laws can be put in place by the prime minister without approval by the House of Representatives or Senate.
    - a) The President must ratify laws passed in a state of emergency.
    - b) These laws must be voted on by parliament as soon as the state of emergency expires
  - 3. The state of emergency can be vetoed by the president or the senate at any time.
  - 4. Both the senate and the president have the power to impeach the prime minister without approval of the HoR.
  - 5. The president no longer must ask the Senate for approval to declare a state of emergency.

**II. Cabinet**

- A. The prime minister must assign a cabinet consisting of a Leader of the House, Minister for Infrastructure, Home Minister, Chief Minister for Gardellia and Minister for Foreign Affairs and upon gaining office after a general election.

1. These secretaries are made up of the elected members of the incumbent government.
  - a) In the event that there are not enough members to fill every role, Roles will be filled with the first in the list taking priority.
2. The role of these secretaries is to represent their respective sectors in the parliament and advise the Prime Minister.

### **III. Obligations**

- A. The prime minister must be assigned a discord role on the WolvHaven discord server by the name of “Prime Minister” upon achieving or retaining office after a general election
  1. This role will (in addition to permissions granted to verified members)-
    - a) Be displayed separately from online members
    - b) Have the power to mention “@everyone”
    - c) Have access to #announcements channel
  2. The additional powers of this role may only be used for the following purposes-
    - a) Announcing the ratification of a bill, regardless of the party which proposed it
    - b) A situation that regards the entirety of WolvHaven e.g. Declaration of a state of emergency, Snap Election, etc.

### **IV. Extent**

- A. This act extends to WolvHaven City, Gardellia, Pangea, Sandbox and Laboratory.

### **V. Commencement**

- A. All sections will come into force following the next general election after this act is ratified.

### **VI. Short Title**

- A. This act may be cited as the Government and Parliament Reform Act 2018

---

## 18105

---

### Bill Name:

Gardellia Abandoned Claims Bill

### Tabled By:

Endarmatster, MP, NAT

### Debate:

1. [Rom5419, MP , NAT] Just to clarify to the house, this is an updated version of the initial desertion bill from quite a while ago. The first desertion bill for managing gardellian land was quite a success, but not times have changed with the expansion of Gardellia's borders. As well as rumors that the leaders of the Southern regimes have defected en masse. Clearly, we need a new desertion bill capable of handling such large scale abandonment. As such, this new version of the desertion bill includes new features such as the Public Domain Cites project. This MP hopes that the debate on this bill will focus on the changes to be added and less on those that have been around for a while.
2. [\_ezzo, MP, NCP] This bill in general is very good, but one loophole I noticed is the hospitalization loophole. In which someone may declare himself hospitalized, as internet citizens we don't really know about it. Second thing, if a person is sadly incapacitated, which actions will occur to such. Can a NAT member comment on such?
3. [Rom5419, MP, NAT] For verifying claims of hospitalisation, as simple one may do such as medical certificate like the ones given to school teachers and lecturers. Anything that is certified by a legal and competent guardian. For incapacitation, it is the player's responsibility to have some contingency plan in case such as asking a friend to inform the server.
4. [y0urs\_Tr1y, Independent] Submit MC? What is this? Why should we require legal proof? For most, that would be far too personal. It will reveal name, place of residence, among other things. Why is it necessary to go to such lengths just to keep what they have built? Would it not make more sense to utilise a system of disproof? Instead of requiring a player to prove they are hospitalised etc. If anybody else spots said player online in another server perhaps, then that shall constitute proof. They are NOT unable to join and therefore we will be able to proceed with declaring their town abandoned.

---

### WolvHaven Minecraft Server:

Copyright © 2017 WolvHaven Minecraft Server All Rights Reserved.

5. [\_AngelKevin\_, PM, MP, PFG] I would want to request the bill proposer to shorten this time to 1 month. Secondly, I wouldn't want anyone to purposely injure or hospitalize themselves to keep their towns. Because, let's be honest, it's just dumb. I also propose that the player who takes a leave writes a formal letter in a format that states the reason for his leave as well as the time length for his leave. In this case, we can protect the privacy for the player, but also gets his intentions of his leave.
6. [MC\_Dunc, MP, DEM] One really does not agree with the medical certificate mentioned by the honorable member just now as this MP thinks that the server is merely a game and really not a professional institute requiring such serious proof of leave. Secondly, as the MP mentioned just now, it is foolish for someone to purposely, injure themselves and I doubt the possibility of that. However, I would like to enquire the MP just now what are the suggested format and procedures for the written statement of absence.
7. [Rom5419, MP, NAT] On review of feedback given by the other MPs, this MP accepts the suggestion of a system of disproof for the hospitalisation or vacations reasons among others. As send by the hon. PM, it is highly improbable for someone to purposely injure themselves, but faking injury from behind the scenes. That is certainly a possibility. Nevertheless, a simple world of mouth statement by the player or their friends should be enough. The emergence of any valid evidence as counterargument. This MP will work on an amendment for now.
8. [y0urs\_Tr1y, Independent] I would simply like to point out that if anyone is genuinely willing to commit self-harm in the interest of keeping their gard town, then kudos to them, they deserve to be in a hospital. The psychological ward perhaps.
9. [\_AngelKevin\_, PM, MP, PFG] I would like to say prevention is always better than a cure. If we have not mentioned the idea, no one would have thought of doing it. Not saying it is a bad idea to reach out to the citizen, but rather if we let the idea out to light, people will slowly think of doing it for various reasons. Hence, I feel that there is not a need for such function. As for the formal letter, I would request the president to create a template of some sort.
10. [y0urs\_Tr1y, Independent] In that case, why not make self-harm a bannable offense? I am sure anyone about to commit suicide will think twice "oh no, I will get banned if I killed myself."
11. [MC\_Dunc, MP, DEM] I really hope what y0urs\_Tr1y mentioned was sarcasm. Because I really doubt the fact that someone would be acting in a fashion that he just mentioned just now and that create a low for that is redundant.

12. [Rom5419, MP, NAT] Just to inform the house that amendments to that clause 2d(i) will be proposed and debated on next reading

**13. Debate Adjourned**

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
- d. Nullify the original Gardellia Abandoned Claims Act

**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
    1. All claims by the claimant qualify to be considered abandoned
    2. Claimants who log in for a short period of time in order to circumvent the criteria will not have said time considered
- 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 settlement radius of over 250m
    1. Airports will not be considered in the settlement's radius
  - iii. The final decision of exemption will be reviewed by WolvHaven Staff or the Gardellian Council.
    1. WolvHaven Staff rulings override that of the Gardellian Council
- 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 Assembly
  - ii. The WolvHaven Senate
- b. Senate decisions overrule the decisions made by the Gardellian Assembly
- 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
  - iv. Be given Public Domain Settlement status

### **5. Public Domain Settlements**

- a. The President owns Public Domain Settlements
- b. Members may be granted permission to:-
  - i. Make essential changes
  - ii. Complete incomplete structures
  - iii. Move structures
- c. Structures in Public Domain Settlements may be copied and reused elsewhere

### **6. Powers of the President**

- a. The president may:-
  - i. deem any settlement as Abandoned and proceed with any of the options for abandoned claims
  - ii. Order the construction of a new Gardellia railway line or road through a Public Domain Settlement
    1. Construction may only be carried out by assigned individuals
    2. Structures in the way of the route of the railway may only be moved and not deleted

### **7. Short title**

- a. This act may be cited as the Gardellia Abandoned Claims Act, 2018

### **8. Implementation**

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

## 18106

---

### Bill Name:

Discord Player Bans Bill

### Tabled By:

Autobus22, MP, HGP

### Debate:

1. [L\_izzo, MP, NCP] This in fact, will require simple edits to the law. For now, most verbal guidelines are said that a discord ban is seperate. For one example, when a certain player was once banned from the server, he was in discord just waiting for it. He did not make much trouble. Also, discord can be used to appeal in case of inaccessibility of the forum due to reasons. Also, unless the player is banned due to chat spam, his punishment will not affect discord.
2. [autobus22, MP, HGP] The crossbench feels as though a ban is a ban, if the forums is not reachable, email is always available as an alternative already. In previous cases, the two have nearly always been performed alongside with each other already. And there is several possible issues with having banned players remain in discord, as has become apparent in the recent mercury situation, who was able to pester other members because he was, for about 2 days after his initial ban, not banned from discord. The crossbench considered having a semi-muted ranks for players, but this would not have solved such issues. In addition, as there is alternative already for ban appeals, I would like to request any reason to specifically exclude discord as a platform from a server ban.
3. [L\_izzo, MP, NCP] First of all, the email is rarely mentioned. Most newbies DON'T even know it. Secondly, about the spam issue, a full ban in this case was called I think and it was a problem not related to the law itself. This thing does not need much precautions. Why is this needed, really, again? I do not believe such cases unless the spammer came again is needed.
4. [Rom5419, MP, NAT] Firstly, this MP would like to point out that all bans in discord are perm bans. There is no temp ban function so it's not as convenient. Kicking out the person has little effect if there is a public invite. So discord bans are only to be used in

---

### WolvHaven Minecraft Server:

Copyright © 2017 WolvHaven Minecraft Server All Rights Reserved.

dire circumstances. Secondly, we are already banning players on discord and in game simultaneously, case-by-case basis. It depends on the nature of the offence. If the crime is limited to in-game scope only, it is less appropriate to extend punishments to discord. As for offences that involve or can be replicated in discord, this bill is quite redundant.

5. [autobus22, MP, HGP] The bill already contains a section that makes this not apply to temp bans. Kicking is not the same action as banning a user from discord. Saying the fact there's a public link, so it can be evaded is useless. Bans on the server can also be evaded the same way by using an alternate account. Further, then if case by case basis is preferred, I'd instead would like to propose to amend the bill, to include that this is handled on a case by case basis into law as the law currently does not mention the subject at all.
6. [MC\_Dunc, MP, DEM] Thank you mr speaker. As the honorable member just mentioned, bans on server can also be evaded by an alternate account, this is sometimes false, as there is this magical function called IP ban. Thus, may the honorable member please do not stray from the fact we are discussing the discord and that the server bans should not be related. It is pointless to temp ban someone on discord, even using the kick function.
7. [y0urs\_Tr1y, Independent] As mentioned by the dear crossbench member earlier, the law does not mention this at all, obviously, because the section regarding discord law in the WH statutes hasn't even been written yet.
8. [autobus22, MP, HGP] The crossbench would like to remind Mc\_Dunc that firstly, it was just stated this bill already excludes temp bans. So why temp bans are being brought up again is a mystery to the crossbench. Additionally, Discord Automatically IP bans upon banning players, (checking the main used IP of accounts, not all Ip's) so similarly to an IP ban on the server, this would mean a VPN is needed to bypass, or the use of a computer in a different location. This means, if banned, going around the ban, is about as easy/hard as a server IP ban. It is indeed pointless to use the kick function, this bill does not mention the kick function. "That server bans shouldn't be related" is also a rather odd statement to make, as that would be the exact proposition made by this bill. The discord and server are all one community, so the crossbench sees no reason to not cross-apply bans and to also address Ezzo's concern in regards to emails, Then it might be a good idea to make the options available, actually available to members in information, rather than reject a further unrelated proposal in that sense, and Fourthly: towards my friend the ghost-Admin, This was never clarified upon the passing of the current legal statutes, resulting in there no ground for such an assumption

9. [MC\_Dunc, MP, DEM]I would like to remind the right honorable member that this server has VPN prevention which im not sure discord has
10. [y0urs\_Tr1y, Independent] when we went through the 1st 2 parts of the statutes last month, i clearly stated that there was more, A LOT MORE to come, was that not clear enough?
11. [autobuss22, MP, HGP] No, that was not clear enough,as in no way the context of further statutes was mentioned. Not even roughly, so it would've never been confirmable to know what would still be yet to come in these statues or not and I'd like to remind the opposition member that, the slightly lighter protections, does not at all, have meaning towards if, or ifn't bans should cross-apply.
12. [y0urs\_Tr1y] No, I didn't tell you what was to come, and that is why i'm telling you now
13. **Debate Adjourned**

## Discord Player Bans Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Make it a requirement for, if any known discord accounts exist, for them to be banned when an ingame ban is performed.

**B**e 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. Add a clause to the rules that would make it so banned players will also be banned on discord.
  - i. This will not apply to temp banned members due to difficulty of moderation

**2. Reason(s):**

- a. Though it hasn't really happened before there is technically no legislation that would say a member that was banned in-game also would be banned on discord.

**3. Short title**

- a. This act may be cited as the Discord Player Bans act, 2018

**4. Implementation**

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

---

# 18107

---

**Bill Name:**

Single Layer Interjection Suggestions Bill

**Tabled By:**

Autobus22, MP, HGP

**Debate:**

- 1. Question put on the house and agreed on (Postpone this bill to next session)**

## Single Layer Interjection Suggestions 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. Upon a proposed Amendment, People in Parliament will now be able to call a Single Layer Interjection (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.) to suggest a different Amendment instead (and provide reasoning for this Amendment.)
  - 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.