




Parliament of  
**Woly Haven**



# House of Representatives

## Hansard

---

**Saturday, 19 May 2018**

---

Session 2, Quarter 2 of 2018

---

**Original report written by:**

SilverWolv  
Spaceinvader11  
Hinwapoon  
Grass\_Jelly  
**19 May 2018**

## Ninth Parliament

### Elected Members of Parliament

Name of Member	Role (If Any)	Affiliated Party
Grass_Jelly	Prime Minister	FWH
minebuilder1223	Chief Minister of Gardellia	FWH
hinwapoon	Deputy Speaker	FWH
TheLamborghini		FWH
Togaguy	Minister for Home Affairs	FWH
_ezzo	Minister for Foreign Affairs	FWH
disCackle		FWH
MC_Dunc	Leader of the House	DEM
Mystiquely	Minister for Infrastructure	DEM
Hemtai		DEM
sambrose		CEN
mopistudios	Leader of the Opposition	CEN
Tony515		CEN
HurricanePanda08		CEN
autobus22		HGP
Guyswhosbadatmath		HGP
_sSamuel		HGP

**All other names mentioned in this document are non-party affiliated.**

## Bills tabled

<b>Bill Name</b> Proposer	<b>Bill No</b>	<b>Stage of Consideration</b>	<b>Outcome</b> (Ayes/Noes)
<b>Foreign Relations Bill</b> Minebuilder1223	18201	First Reading	30m Speeches capped at 5m

The **SPEAKER** (AngelKevin) took the chair at 13 45, made an acknowledgement of country and read prayers.

---

## 18201

Foreign Relations Bill

---

**Minebuilder1223:** Over the past few weeks and months, WolvHaven has been gripped by waves of attacks that have been consistent and vigorous. These attacks also had strong connections with a foreign server, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that by working together with this and other foreign servers we can mitigate the issues brought to our server. This bill hopes to make way for a new era in WolvHaven foreign policy and I hope that the whole House agrees that it is the safety and security of our server that is at stake here. The aim of the bill as outlined is to allow for members of this house to be sent diplomatic missions to foreign servers or entities. And so, with safeguard outlines in the bills itself, the democratically elected parliament of WolvHaven will also be able to tackle issues regarding foreign relations.

**autobus22:** Firstly, I'd like to ask you a question. "I hope that the whole House agrees that it is the safety and security of our server that is at stake here.", Of course, the whole server agrees. But what will your bill do to make sure of that over the existing system?

**Minebuilder1223:** Thank you Mr speaker, The aim of the bill as outlined is to allow for members of this house to be sent on diplomatic missions to foreign servers or entities and so, with safeguards outlined in the bill itself, the democratically elected parliament of WolvHaven will also be able to tackle issues regarding foreign relations

**autobus22:** Okay, Then that would've been a very simple amendment. Adding to G.1, that also people in the house of representatives can be chosen to be sent on diplomatic missions. Which you've admittedly done in the bill a lot more which is scrutinised. To start, I don't think 5 minutes will be enough so I am requesting a direct extension of time to 10 minutes for my call.

**The SPEAKER:** Approved

**Autobus22:** Firstly, Section 1.a adds that also members of the ministry of foreign affairs can go on these missions. Let's leave that in the middle, for now, I will come back on that later. 1.b requires the ministry of foreign affairs to approve any diplomatic missions as well as the high council, giving this new body extreme power, where its need is already questionable over the current situation. 1.c The removal of section G.1.2.1 doesn't seem to have a purpose, and just implicates higher punishments for extremely mild cases or even plausibly misunderstandings in diplomatic missions. Meaning people could end up going to a ban, for a mistake in diplomatic missions. Is this really something we wish to do? People make mistakes, even if it is harmful if

---

**WolvHaven Minecraft Server:**

Copyright © 2017 WolvHaven Minecraft Server All Rights Reserved.

mistakes are made, having your membership on the server be on the line for that is a bit much.

1.d Gives ministry of foreign affairs permission without approval from the high council to accept inter-server cooperation, which rather than safeguards gives a very un-safeguarded situation.

1.e requires the ministry of foreign affairs to approve any information outgoing to foreign diplomats, meaning the council if need be can't overwrite such information sending giving a potentially dangerous situation where the server is being represented by not actually the server's management.

2.a.2.1 Requires diplomats to be approved by the council, but not do missions, to even further extend the gap in oversight and safeguards of the system.

2.a.4 requires the ministry of foreign affairs to approve councillors to go on diplomatic missions, further removing the power of the council to plausibly overwrite decisions if need be from a server security standpoint and further gives that loophole more power, that allows decisions represented by the server to be made by people not accurately representing the server management.

2.b requires the president to give permission to have people in the ministry of foreign affairs as a requirement to be in, but nowhere is what the ministry of foreign affairs is or any further requirements clarified in a proposal to amend the statues in this bill, giving an inexistent entity power. The bill would need to fully define this to function. This leads me to conclude this bill is so utterly and extremely flawed that I request the bill be retracted to be: Most importantly finished, but also very importantly: have the giant list of security flaws fixed. If it would even be needed in the first place to amend the system more, then to just but a modified section of section 1.a into effect, which no proper reasoning been giving for this bill as it adds to further security to the existing system.

**Starcubed:** Ahem, another point made, does this make the current system better? For example, wouldn't it just make it more inconvenient.

**minebuilder1223:** Okay, firstly I would like to put it to the honourable member opposite me that he has mistake what the meaning of clause 2.b is. Its purpose is to say that any of the new powers entrusted to the Minister and Ministry of Foreign Affairs DO NOT apply without approval from the president. Therefore the Ministry of Foreign Affairs cannot do anything that the bill allows it to do without approval from the presidency I wrote this bill, therefore, I believe I know the meaning of this clause is. I will give it to the honourable member opposite that he is correct in saying I must provide a definition to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Therefore I shall say here that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is defined as the Institution that only includes the Minister of Foreign Affairs as its member. Anyways, I shall continue. In all of the clauses in section 1, I am providing the Ministry of Foreign Affairs equal to the Council in regard to matter pertaining to foreign affairs. This power, as I have already explained, is only held if the President is confident that the Minister of Foreign Affairs can confidently take on this job. I am not sure what you are trying to say about 2.a.2.1, but it only says that the people conducting the interview are in charge of what is asked in that interview.

**autobus22:** I'd like to make a correction to my statement. I confused 2.a.2.1 with 2.a.3 in my notes.

**minebuilder1223:** In response to that, as in clearly said in clause 2.a, these steps are what is needed to be taken in order for someone to take part in a diplomatic mission if they are not already a council member. As for clause 2.b, I believe that the member opposite's perception of that clause is incorrect as I have clarified earlier.

**y0urs\_Tr1y:** FFS, you 2 idiots going on and on and on. It's the first reading for fuck's sake. Can we just get this over with...

**The SPEAKER:** Please withdraw the terms "idiot" and "fuck".

**y0urs\_Tr1y:** Withdraw

**Grass\_Jelly:** I would like to raise a point of order. I would like to request the time to be extended by a further 10 minutes due to the time aversion caused by y0.

**\_AngelKevin\_:** Approved. Starcubed will remove himself from the chamber.

**Autobus22:** Actually I wish to argue against the point of order raised by my friend on the opposition. Considering the amount of time wasted by y- only amounts to 2 minutes and 47 seconds, not 10 minutes.

**SilverWolv:** I move that we extend debate by 1 hour

**Mopsistudios:** Thank you mr speaker. I just don't understand this bill. what is wrong with the current system?

**Minebuilder1223:** The point of the bill is quite clearly stated in its long title. But I shall explain anyway. The bill's aim is to allow for members of parliament and senators to take part in Diplomatic Missions. This allows for people with more political aims who were elected by the people to do their jobs to actually perform these jobs and allow for the public to have more of a voice in our foreign policy

**Autobus22:** You don't give democratic power with this bill, you give the coalition power. Then I propose an amendment. If the purpose of this bill is truly what was just exclaimed. Remove sections: 1.b, 1.c, 1.d, 1.e and 2.a (including all sub-sections) and rewrite section 1a. to be the following. In section II/G/1 of the Wolvhaven Statue after the word "members" shall be added "and Members of the House of Representatives.

**Question put to the house and rejected**

**Autobus22:** Then let me finish my call and get an explanation from all people that voted nay here, as to why reducing the bill down to the literal given purpose of the bill is being declined.

**Minebuilder1223:** Thank you Mr speaker, This parliament uses a number of role model parliaments to base off of it's runnings such as the Australian parliament and the Singaporean parliament now to my knowledge It is the elected government that is in charge of Foreign affairs within its own house That is also the model used across almost the rest of the entire world We are not saying the opposition is not eligible for diplomatic missions We are saying they are but under the supervision of the government and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs

**Autobus22:** I'd like to after talking with my party members make a response to that as follows: I'd like to challenge the prime minister in that logic first considering the systems he mentioned all have a ruling prime minister rather than a set-presidential democracy. The system here, partially for functionality in Minecraft and accuracy of actions of the differences in functionality due to that differs quite a bit in many ways. I'd like to with that also take into question if the prime minister is fully aware of the purpose of the legislative (Representative) and the executive branch of government in the parliamentary system that is used in WolvHaven. The argument it's based on models from the real world is invalid either way in addition as the multiple systems we take inspiration from in WolvHaven would with that logic also conflict with each other making the entire parliament system we have here invalid under that argument. (He offers his satire laden congratulations). Further to note the issue of no definition of ministry of foreign affairs is still not solved and will need to be solved first to negate the arguments against this bill because what it's exactly defined as in statutes in this bill dictates the arguments premise Further, despite the bills proposers views on 1.b, it is a fact his intentions as pointed out written are not written in the bill here for a good chunk. Furthermore, the bill requires being amended here to make sure the bill represents the views the bills proposer has set forth. Then Further-even-more, the bill proposer argued the ministry of foreign affairs jobs are secured because the president has to approve but the bill only contains provision that means the president has to approve of the appointment of such members, not of him or her making any diplomatic missions, which is not unimportant to address seeing as this bill claims to be for security.

**SilverWolv:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I'd just like to point out given auto's rambling for the past over 5 minutes, I pretty much understood like less than 50 percent of what he's talking about.

**Minebuilder1223:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I do understand how this parliament works Mr speaker. I led it for almost 8 months and throughout learnt the intricacies of it and I understand that this parliament is one of the most important parts of it. Placing more power, with the

endorsement of the president, of course, is only in order to encourage the democratic will of the majority of our population. What the member opposite wants is not clearly defined power. Mr Speaker, the member opposite appears to be encouraging a hung parliament with no defined leadership only for the sake of "representation". Well, I put it to the member opposite, that this kind of model has only ever resulted in disaster and if we want to continue on that path then he can wave goodbye to the current democratic structure, which has worked so well for the past year. Onto the other points that he made. I accept that clarification is required for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I shall put into place this clarification and definition after this session. Regarding clause 2/b, I believe he is the only member here misunderstanding it. And this trend of over-complication that he likes to take only results in the confusion of most of this chamber. And means that clear decisions cannot be taken and may lead to problems down the line.

**Autobus22:** Firstly, I'd like to note that the intention of the proposal of the bill is irrelevant to what is written in the bill. If the two don't match, there's no use arguing over intention rather than what is written and the bill has to be amended, as noted twice now. Even if everyone understands a fish to be a goldfish, while it's actually a shark, doesn't make it less of a shark. to put it bluntly. (sorry for the ocean-based analogy) Secondly, I believe there can be no further argument without the clear definition of the ministry of foreign affairs because practically the entire bill relies on its definition of security and function. *Minebuilder1223 Interjecting*

**Minebuilder1223:** I have promised its definition already, don't even try and attack me on that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order. Autobus has the call and has the right to be heard.

**Autobus22:** So I move we continue the first reading next session after the Amendment. As before the amendment is made there isn't anything to argue upon. I am not blaming the member opposite for not making an Amendment. I am saying that to respond accurately the Amendment has to be made first, so I move that we extend the first reading to next session to continue discussing the amendments have been made.

**Grass\_Jelly:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to point out at this point the only person continuing to argue is actually you. Everyone understands your points to this house like a bear is to a dinosaur and like sushi is to a volcano. They just don't make sense and literally are just a mess of metaphors forcibly joined together in an attempt to make sense. They don't. Yes, a goldfish is a fish and a shark is a shark, but I've never seen a goldfish attack a human. Anyways, I would like to finish with, sometimes life is like a goldfish, we make boats.

**Tony515:** I'd like to start off by saying. Even though a goldfish hasn't attacked a human. It's still like trying to magnify something that's blurry. There isn't much to debate over if it's already blurry.

**SilverWolv:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to say. how on earth does a goldfish equate to being blurry? Also to further emphasize, the bill's contents are stating what words should be inserted into which parts of the statutes which gives the executive branch a clearer understanding of what the bill is supposed to do. And for the love of god goldfish vs shark? what kind of comparison is that? If you want to compare, at least compare two fishes that are of similar sizes and colour.

**Autobus22:** I'd like to make multiple statements. I chose two fishes vastly different as I don't know the names of fishes in English, these were the quickest examples I could find. and the point of the comparison was actually beautifully demonstrated by the chief minister of Gardellia's reply. As indeed, a goldfish won't hurt people, but a shark that everyone thinks is a goldfish will. Especially because everyone thinks it's a goldfish. Furthermore, I'd like to point out I am not the only one opposing this bill right now. I've been speaking with the collective opposition the whole time to establish our points. We are all opposed and have concerns. The concerns raised are already our collective. So please stop acting like I am the only one here, who has anything to say about the bill. Now I, as we can't argue on the contents of the bill properly because the definition of the ministry of foreign affairs doesn't exist yet, I move once again we continue the first hearing next session.

**Grass\_Jelly:** I will admit. Goldfish and shark are almost the same. Both can be eaten. if the opposition has something to say and they all have their own opinions. Why are they silent? Do they not have a voice? Of course, you'd know what wasting time is.

**Autobus22:** If we all share the same concerns, it'd be rather useless to all make the exact same comment would it? that'd just be wasting everyone's valuable time.

**SilverWolv:** Thank you Mr Speaker. My question is to the member opposite. Would he kindly state whatever the heck he finds wrong with the bill in one simple sentence? Instead of pasting paragraphs upon paragraphs for people to read and confusing the house with his goldfish or shark analogies, and to put it bluntly, wasting time.

**Tony515:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. All comparisons aside. To put in the simplest of terms. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs isn't defined yet.

**Autobus22:** I am going to try to put this the simplest way possible. I gave detailed information on the issues with all points in the bill. These weren't answered properly, which is fine as I can see the point it was too much at once. however, to accurately continue to ask questions and repeat the questions in a clear way. I'd still need the ministry of foreign affairs defined in the bill first as otherwise, we are debating over a partially speculative object with no definition. Further,

I'd like to note that even if I would have been the only one opposed to such arguments. it's a red herring to ignore the subject and point that out diverting away from the issues. I'd like to call on the coalition to quit making red herring fallacies repeatedly, as has happened multiple times the past dozen meetings as well. Further, I'd like to note whether or not I agree the parliament system itself is fine or not is irrelevant to this bill, and therefore a strawman so I will not be addressing that. I'd like to once again, move that we continue the first hearing next session because the definition of the ministry of foreign affairs may or may not make certain points invalid or different outside of our current knowledge, making it impossible to argue anything right now. please for the love of god let us argue on the bill, rather than speculation.

**minebuilder1223:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Firstly may I say, Can the leader of the opposition stop making the same point over and over and over and over again. Secondly, There is one word that is an issue to all the arguments he made and that is the word "subjective". It appears to him that the only way for my response to the points he made to not be fallacies os if they agree with him. it is subjective that the arguments I made are red herrings. These points will not be agreed on as long as they are subjective between the two sides of the house

**SilverWolv:** Thank you Mr speaker, My question asked for it to be phrased in a single sentence. Yet, the member decided to spew loads of paragraphs and jumping from topic to topic. Also, with regards to your cries for a definition in the ministry of foreign affairs, isn't it the same as how the department of transport isn't defined as well? Furthermore, I would like to point out that minebuilder has already said, he is promising a definition for that, which I expect will come when the bill returns for its second hearing so I do not get what all this bickering is about. Also to add on, kindly stop using animals to compare. It's seriously confusing the nuts out of everyone.

**Autobus22:** I can not fulfil the member's request for a single sentence point because the ministry of foreign affairs hasn't been defined, as there is a boatload still to be discussed I requested multiple times now to stop the debate right now and continue first reading next session. What has been ignored is my request for the debate to be adjourned to next session to actually respond to the subject at hand after the definition is modified so I can make sure my response will be accurate with the definitions as the bill proposer wants them to be talk about bill, respond an attack on the person commenting irrelevant to bill to defer attention, which is a red herring and thirdly, would the bill proposer quite calling my members who are not currently in the chamber undemocratic via discord private message please? I, and I am pretty sure others, do not appreciate this behaviour.

**SilverWolv:** I'd like to say that looking at it, the context shows that he didn't call your members undemocratic but whatever yall are implying turns out to be undemocratic. So no, it is not him calling you undemocratic. It is him saying what you all are supporting to be undemocratic. So I suggest you withdraw that allegation.

Foreign Relations Bill

A  
**B I L L**  
TO

Improve how this server handles matters regarding Foreign Relations

**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. Amendments to the WolvHaven Statute**

- a. In section II/G/1 of the WolvHaven Statute after the word “members” shall be added “, Senators and Members of Parliament” .
- b. In section II/G/1.1 of the WolvHaven Statute after the word “council” shall be added “and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs”.
- c. The section II/G/1.2.1 of the WolvHaven Statute shall be omitted from the Statute.
- d. In section II/G/3 of the WolvHaven Statute after the word “council” shall be added “and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs”
- e. In section II/G/3.1 of the WolvHaven Statute the words “council approval” shall be omitted and replaced with “approval of the council and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs”.

**2. New Laws**

- a. In order for a member to be eligible to partake in a diplomatic mission, they must have taken part in the following processes entirely unless they are a Council member,
  - i. A Background Check undertaken by the DIU Notwithstanding if one has already been undertaken on the member.
  - ii. The member will need to partake in an interview undertaken by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and/or by members of the Council through private Discord Direct Messages.
    1. The details of what would be asked in such interview are at the discretion of the person or institution conducting the interview.
  - iii. Received Approval by the Council.
  - iv. If the member is a councillor, they must

- v. seek approval by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the new powers hereby entrusted to the Minister for Foreign Affairs
  - vi. This act may only apply if His Excellency the President provides his personal endorsement of the incumbent Minister for Foreign Affairs.
  - b. Any final agreements made between this server and any other foreign server or entity regarding any form of Arrangement, Protocol, Agreement, Pact or Treaty must first be reviewed and approved by the council before this server can accept it.
- 3. Commencement**
- a. All sections will come into force as soon as this act is ratified.
- 4. Short Title**
- a. This act may be cited as the Foreign Relations Act 2018.

---

## Questions Without Notice

---

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hinwapoon)** took the chair at 16 15

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Questions without notice. The Prime Minister has the call.

**Grass\_Jelly**: I would like to join in the house in offering our support and well wishes in sambrose's ongoing in real life situation. Hope everything turns out fine and kudos to you for making it to this session.

**Minebuilder1223**: I join grass\_jelly in his offering of support. I hope and believe that our honourable member will pull through well.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: This is questions without notice. Not statements without notice.

**Minebuilder1223**: My question is now. My question is this. Does the member opposite me who accused me of attacking party members without valid basis consider this a personal attack. I shall now clarify what I meant when I said what I did? I was saying that the member opposite was encouraging more parties to enter parliament. And for there to be less power of the government since larger coalitions would be needed. For him to accuse me of attacking other honourable members I find deeply offensive.

**Autobus22**: I'd like to first and foremost apologise. The accusation came from a misreading of my information. Secondly, to respond to the question. Whether or not I support a strong governing coalition, or equal representation of all parties. makes no difference, in the topics I argued on in regards to the bill earlier. meaning it's a red herring, as pointed out as it direct attention away and onto me, for my stance on an irrelevant issue. I did not intention to continue animal references. It's by coincidence, actually the name of the fallacy.

**Tony515**: Thank you Mr. Speaker. May I ask everyone Why are we all arguing over something that doesn't have much relevance to the argument at hand. I am not taking any sides here.

**Guywhobadatmath**: Thank you mr speaker. I would like to admit and apologize that I was the one who auto referred to as "party member" and I apologize for the direct attack I posed on minebuilder1223. The opinion auto stated on my behalf was that it was not the job of the legislative branch to conduct diplomatic missions, rather it was the executive branch. I sadly misread the proposers comments thinking that he said I was undemocratic rather than the

speech saying all of those things was undemocratic. I fully accept all consequences for my actions and the drama that has been caused.

**Tony515:** Even if there was a slight misunderstanding between all sides. Why should we currently make such a strong deal out of it?

**Minebuilder1223:** Thank you mr speaker. To reply to tony: Because this is parliament. Also I would like to say I appreciate the apologies from this misunderstanding and I accept them. I can see this was a misunderstanding, all I would like to say is to think before making such bold claims. But otherwise, I appreciate you coming forward and accepting responsibility.

**Grass\_Jelly:** This question is directed at Autobus22. When does he foresee his economic reform bill being put to the house?

**Autobus22:** Most likely next session, I am spending about 40 minutes a day on the bill (and have done so past 2 weeks) (Which an almost sad amount of is providing the configurations correctly and functionally) though I can't 100% promise it'll be ready by next session. I am aiming for next session as much as I was aiming for this session. unforeseen bugs happened causing it to take longer. or rather I replaced all .'s with ,s and the other way around. That'd be fine if it happened once. Let's say it was more than one point that happened at. I apologise, to repeat, most likely next week, but it may delay further if unforeseen circumstances happen.

**Parliament Adjourned at 16 37**