

**RUBBISH**  
**chedet.co.cc**  
**December 10,2010**

1. It is reported that Malaysia produces 94,000 tons of rubbish per day or 34,310,000 tons per year.

2. I suppose a substantial portion of this must be produced by Greater Kuala Lumpur (population of about 5.5 million).

3. Population wise Greater KL has about 20 per cent of Malaysia's population. Therefore Greater KL's production of rubbish is approximately seven million tons per year.

4. What can we do with 7 million tons of rubbish. Well, we can throw it on the road outside our houses, or in the drain and rivers. In no time all our drains and rivers will be clogged up and water will overflow and flood the land. The health of the people will be at risk.

5. We can collect the rubbish and bury in a designated area. With 7 million tons a year we will be needing more and more land, and land in Greater KL is expensive. To use the land again the rubbish has to be dug and removed to another place for burial.

6. Alternatively we can have a rubbish mountain and people can go there to scrounge for any useful item. Probably the mountain of rubbish will be burnt slowly and pollute the atmosphere.

7. We can if we like, burn the rubbish behind our houses. One house doing this would be okay. But when everyone does this in KL the smoke would not only cause a haze to hang over KL, but the smell would be quite unbearable.

8. Again we can collect the rubbish and burn it in an incinerator. But no community wants to have the incinerator located anywhere near them. We must find a place where no one is living there. Look around Greater KL and you cannot find a piece of land far enough from any community to site the incinerator.

9. If you do find it would be so far away that the cost of transporting the rubbish would be a drain on the finances of City Hall. Maybe the rubbish producers should pay a special fee for rubbish disposal. I don't think anyone would agree to that. It's not the Malaysian way to pay what we can get for free.

10. I am putting this dilemma of the authorities on my blog so that people can come up with solutions. Frankly I think the authorities are scared to apply any solution because we are a democracy and no one wants to lose votes.

11. For those who are interested, read about the rubbish collection problem in Italy here.

12. Your comments please.

149 Comments

By siti rosna Author Profile Page on January 2, 2011 11:33 AM

Assalamualaikum YBHG Tun,

I just wanted to give a short comment on rubbish. All these years I failed to educate school children around my neighbourhood not to litter and throw rubbish in the drain. I forwarded multiple complains to municipal councils how to manage rubbish collections which always spilled on the road. And the discard the leachate on the road. I put my last solution to this problem by putting a notice on my fence. It reads: Anda adalah sampah masyarakat (3 times jika membuang sampah minuman, makanan, putung rokok, kotak rokok, tisu paper, plastik ais krim dan lain-lain xi kawasan ini. Jagalah kebersihan kawasan perumahan anda. It works. I wish our municipal councillors should learn how to manage rubbish disposal from other country not far away, we can learn from Singapore especially self-discipline. Thank you.  
By KA LimAuthor Profile Page on December 31, 2010 1:07 AM

Dear Tun,

Good topic from your side on the waste and in fact I have tried in proposing in getting grant from the government to start up the processing on the waste papers with the technology and at the same time would bring benefits to the country but I think it did not went well as the government did not have fund for the grant.

If you are really serious into this and able to help then I have no problem to get the right person to further discuss and to work on this project. Thanks.  
By BungaCengkehAuthor Profile Page on December 28, 2010 2:04 PM

Baru-baru ni saya bercuti di Thailand. Apa yang saya perhatikan, kesedaran sivik penduduk Thai amat tinggi. Sebelum membuang sampah mereka akan perhatikan dulu kat mana hendak dibuang sampah tersebut. Terdapat 3-4 tong yang berlainan warna dan mereka sanggup berhenti sebentar untuk meneliti dimana harus dibuang sampah tersebut. Kalau di Malaysia, bagaimana pula gelagatnya? "buang jer kat situ, panai-pandailah mereka asingkannya nati" "letak je lah situ, buat apa nak sibuk-sibuk asingkan sampah tu" ...  
By nrazmiAuthor Profile Page on December 28, 2010 1:30 AM

Selamat bagi Tun,

Tafsiran sampah bagi setiap orang adalah hanya sampah, iaitu suatu bahan yang tidak diperlukan lagi, kotor dan busuk. Jika kita dapat menukarkan tafsiran sampah sebagai suatu sumber yang berguna dan memanfaatkan, maka kita dapat menukar persepsi ini. Ia dapat ditukarguna menjadi suatu sumber yang boleh menampung sebahagian keperluan manusia. Sampai bila kita hendak mengambil contoh dari negara-negara lain dalam menangani masalah ini. Adakah kita tidak mampu mengatasinya sendiri.

Sampai bila-bila sampah tetap akan ada tetapi dapatkah kita mengurangkannya.

Antara langkah-langkah tukarguna yang sedang dalam peringkat kajian :

1) Gas metana sebagai sumber kuasa

Masalah : Kos tinggi untuk dikomersial

2) Penghasilan semula bahan asal

Masalah : Tiada proses pengasingan yang betul-betul berkesan

3) Penghasilan kepada bahan sekunder

Masalah : Hanya sebahagian jenis bahan yang dapat digunakan

4) Penghasilan produk

Masalah : Mutu produk yang dihasilkan rendah

Walaupun penyelidikan-penyelidikan ini menghadapi masalah-masalah ini, kita berdoa supaya suatu hari nanti mereka akan berjaya. Cuma, apa yang kita boleh lakukan pada masa ini ialah menyokong usaha mereka dari segi kewangan dan sumber. Dan, menukar

cara hidup kita dalam meminimalkan impak masalah ini.

By katakhybridAuthor Profile Page on December 26, 2010 3:00 AM

salam TUN..

Antara langkah yang saya fikirkan wajar adalah dengan menggunakan mekanisma sama seperti yang TUN nyatakan diatas... memang kos yang sgt tinggi untuk melupuskan sampah secara lebih efficient..

TETAPI..

kita perlu faham x semua sampah adalah SAMPAH.. terdapat besi buruk, botol, kertas, plastik dan lain2 bahan yang boleh dijual atau dikitar semula.. SOLUSI saya ialah kerajaan menggaji pekerja khusus dalam mengutip bahan2 yang boleh dikitar semula ini dan jualkan saja.

rakyat yang berpendidikan rendah mampu menjana pendapatan, ekonomi negara bertambah baik.. dan x mustahil dpt menarik minat pengusaha barangan kitar semula dari luar negara.. Dengan hasil jualan barangan terpakai ini saya yakin kerajaan dapat menampung kos pelupusan sampah dengan berkesan dan mampu menggaji pekerja2 dalam bidang ini...

saya kurang mahir dlm bhs inggeris namun saya harap TUN sudi mempertimbangkan cadangan saya.. TQ

By azrinAuthor Profile Page on December 26, 2010 12:23 AM

My solution is quite drastic but manageable.

If UAE can build the Palm in the Sea, then we build a super big pool, staggered in height so we can pump all the river and longkang water there, a barrage as we say, and use the stagger to be a Hydro-Electric Dam just as Loch Awe in Scotland (pump water upwards during low use at nite)

The project will be 50KM AWAY from our shores, just as far as our oil rigs. Then, we make a special area for incineration plant, just like what Singapore did.

Transporting trash to the incinerator is hell a logistical nightmare, but with the need to do our 'POND' 40 km across, 100M high, 3km thick in barrage need loads of soil, so we dig up a super huge tunnel from KL to say.. PCB Kelantan? 10 Laned Super Smart Highway with rail connectivity with 4 tunnels (20M diameter) to serve the purpose.All powered by green Energy, and we can rear many milk cattle to promote the national milk program, so cheaper milk and the cattle eats on grass and plants ..with the manure recovered and used to extract methane gas to burn the trash~

Route will be MRR2 (BATU) - Kuala Kubu - Fraser - Raub - onwards and to the causeway and serves many purposes and solutions such as:

- No more Balik Kampong rush at KL-Karak-Bentong to Kelantan,jams gone!
- No more flooding to KLANG VALLEY as WHOLE NATION water is pooled to the pond
- No more drought problem. Whole Nation (PENINSULAR) get CLEAN WATER at SAME RATE
- Green Energy from Hydro-Electric Dam
- Green Energy from Wind Farm where we place the incinerator (500units?)
- Green Energy from Waste

- Recycling all materials at the facility
- Fast Train to East Coast
- Green solution to waste issue
- Composting of biological materials
- Pollution reduction as it's 50km away!
- Serves as a BREAKWATER for fisherman from HIGH WAVES
- Artificial Reefing for the area (Tyre trashed!)
- Biodegradable waste as compost being recycled for palm plantation and later on stabilised to be a resort ....??? (30-50yr plan)

May be very costly, but sure beat the NUCLEAR version.

400KM of Tunnels (50-100km) and roadways and reclamation works with train services (Cargo and trash done at night?)

We can save the landfills for human waste later on.... This can be a NATIONAL Solution.

So what say you TokDet?  
if idea is taken up.. I want my copyright fee ya....

Dr Azrin  
<http://www.azrin.info>  
By Hadi Ramli Author Profile Page on December 26, 2010 12:15 AM

Salam semua,

Ini berdasarkan pengalaman saya semasa belajar di Jerman dan saya rasa apa yang baik boleh pelajari dan diikuti.

1. Kedai-kedai di sana hanya memberi "paperbag". Kalau nak "plastic bag", kene bayar. Jadi, saya lihat, untuk elak bayar, semua orang bawa bakul, "plastic bag" atau beg kain sendiri. (Majoriti sampah yang saya lihat di tepi jalan kat Malaysia ni adalah plastik).
2. Pengguna di sana diwajibkan membayar untuk botol air. Contoh: Beli air mineral, jus atau pepsi. Pengguna kene bayar untuk air + botol. Kalau nak dapatkan balik duit untuk botol, hantar balik ke kedai. (Vendor machine untuk botol kosong pon ada). Apa yang menarik, even bekas minuman pon dikenakan caj. Contoh semasa saya menonton bola sepak di stadium, beli air untuk di minum. Harga air 1 euro je. Tapi harga gelas plastik 2 euro. Jadi, nak dapat balik 2 euro, kene hantar gelas plastik tuh balik. (Patut takde org buang objek dalam stadium. Kalau dekat Malaysia, penuh stadium dengan bekas air)
3. RECYCLE. Ini paling kurang. Di Jerman, ada tong sampah khas untuk plastik, tin atau besi, kertas dan bio (sisa makanan dan tumbuh-tumbuhan). Bukan tidak ada di Malaysia, tapi tidak menyeluruh. Berapa kerat tempat je sedia tong khas untuk recycle. Mungkin kurang syarikat nak melabur untuk bina kilang recycle. Jadi apa kata kerajaan buat je GLC untuk bidang recycle. Sampah semakin banyak, dah boleh jadi industri. (Out of topic: Better haramkan kegiatan untuk menjual dan membeli besi. Itu punca utama kecurian terutama oleh mat-mat gian. Besi yang tak berguna perlu dibuang di tong sampah sahaja. Mungkin PBT sahaja dibenarkan mengumpul dan menjual besi.)

Sekian.  
By eanisazman Author Profile Page on December 23, 2010 12:14 PM

Salam Tun,

I refer to your queries about rubbish. FYI, my auntie is with UiTM Shah Alam serving as lecturer. She is currently in Tokyo developing a new invention on waste management. Based on her simple explanation, she founded a formula to turn our daily rubbish into cooking gas. But she does not know how to make the incenerator become compact so that it can be used in home.

Her invention has attracted the Japanese and they are willing to contribute their technology to come out with a rubbish compacting system. It is said that eventually the whole device will be in a compact form and can be used to recycle daily rubbish into cooking gas. Both the Japanese and Malaysian are working on this project as we speak.

I am of the opinion that this is the best way to solve the rubbish issue as per your query. Government can help by ensuring that the project is a success.

Thank you

By bnaipalAuthor Profile Page on December 22, 2010 5:26 PM

Export the rubbish to USA and Israel FOC.

By Anti Pembelit 1Author Profile Page on December 21, 2010 4:16 PM

Masalah orang ramai enggan membayar untuk mendapatkan sesuatu yang selama ini diberi percuma adalah akibat didikan songsang, atas nama keadilan sosial, daripada pemimpin politik selama ini, termasuklah Tun.

Saya rasa perkhidmatan angkat sampah tidaklah percuma. Bukankah kita semua bayar cukai pintu? Tak tahulah kalau Tun tak bayar.

Masalah orang ramai menolak pembinaan loji bakar sampah (incinerator) boleh diatasi dengan pemimpin politik memimpin melalui teladan, iaitu loji bakar sampah dibina di kawasan kediaman pemimpin-pemimpin ini.

By rarunasalamAuthor Profile Page on December 21, 2010 4:06 PM

Tun

the predicament we face is not something that was created overnight...it's something that has compounded from 30 years ago.

Like Illness, we pay the price of unsustainable development where there have not been much planning of how we are meant to manage our rubbish as time progressed.

And today, present day governments have to find ways to solve issues that were possibly created by past governments because we were most interested to create new economies and development without a careful alerting, monitoring and management system.

No point dwindling on the past some might say...how do we address this issue of not having an adequate waste management solution?

Well, two thoughts that come to mind...

a/ make trash profitable for local councils - in the absence of true recycling, stipulate a tonnage for waste disposal per household. Fit the garbage collection with sensors to weigh

on collection and if it exceeds the stipulated weight, the household OR business pays a fee for waste removal/disposal.

b/ make trash profitable for private enterprises - one man's trash is another man's treasure...or so I have been told. Get household to separate general trash (food, scraps) and large items i.e. broken furniture, old cabinets, wood etc. Have different collection bins and days and those large items go to a location where it's further separated to see which items can be salvaged, refurbished and resold...

thoughts?

(Ravi)

By HanaAuthor Profile Page on December 21, 2010 8:06 AM

Salam buat YAB Tun

Pada pendapat saya, Pihak Berkuasa Tempatan (PBT) telah sedia maklum tentang masalah sampah ini. Namun belum bersedia untuk mengambil langkah bagi menyelesaikan masalah. Walau bagaimanapun tindakan perlu dimulakan. Masyarakat perlu didik untuk mengasingkan sampah untuk pelupusan. Misalannya di Jepun, pengumpulan sampah dibuat berdasarkan hari seperti Isnin sampah-sampah yang boleh dikitar semula seperti tin, botol, kertas, plastik. Hari Selasa dan Jumaat untuk sampah-sampah yang tidak boleh dikitar semula seperti bahan-bahan masakan, makanan dsb. Hari Rabu sampah yang boleh diguna semula tanpa perlu dikitar semula. Plastik sampah pula perlu disyaratkan lutsinar untuk memastikan sampah tidak bercampur aduk. Dengan mengasingkan hari-hari sebegini kita secara tidak langsung mendidik masyarakat untuk membuang sampah secara lebih sistematik serta memudahkan proses pelupusan sampah oleh pihak yang dilantik oleh PBT.

Pendidikan pelupusan juga perlu dimulakan di sekolah-sekolah bagi mendidik generasi muda tentang kepentingan mengasingkan sampah ini. Lebih mudah melentur rebung dari buluh. Melalui anak-anak sekolah ini, sedikit sebanyak dapat membantu pelaksanaan kaedah pelupusan sampah.

HANAMARU.....

By beautiful malaysiaAuthor Profile Page on December 20, 2010 8:21 AM

Dear Tun Mahathir

I am happy that you seems healthy

The conscience that the garbage which are corrected for recycling rather than throw it away seems to rise in the developed country.

As such, Malaysia doesn't live in the clean country if Malaysian peoples throw away their garbage everywhere .

I think it really depend on the mentality of Malaysian

By the way Malaysia where Tun Mahathir was developed is a very nice country

I pray that Tun Mahathir and Tun Siti Hasmah to be healthy all the time  
malaysia boleh

By Mohd FaizAuthor Profile Page on December 20, 2010 2:32 AM

Salam Tun Mahathir

1. Seandainya sistem untuk melupuskan sampah ini sudah diputuskan, maka sistem GIS (Geographics Information System) boleh digunapakai bagi mencari tanah yang sesuai untuk dijadikan tapak. Sistem ini adalah sistem yang terbaik untuk menguruskan data ruang (spatial) mengikut kriteria yang diperlukan.
2. Kaedah kitar sampah (tong berwarna) pada hari ini sudah efisien. Masalahnya cuma kita tidak membuang sampah ke tong yang disediakan. Cuma, adakah sampah sisa makanan boleh dikitar menjadi baja? Jika boleh, apakah kaedahnya. Nyatakan pada umum dan jadikan ia sebagai satu peluang perniagaan baru.
3. Laksanakan satu spesifikasi kepada pengilang untuk diacuankan (mould) bakul sampah kepada bahagian yang berasingan contohnya sisa makanan (1 part), plastik (1 part), kertas (1 part), botol (1 part).
4. Plastik sampah yang dibuat oleh pengilang mestilah boleh di biodegradasikan (reput). Jika kosnya mahal, keluarkan kuota dan awardkan dalam bentuk pengeluaran berkonsessi.
5. Hebahkan kepada umum akan korelasi Environmental Impact Assessment berkadar terus kepada penebangan pokok bagi mendapatkan kertas, berkadar terus kepada berlakunya masalah banjir berkadar terus kepada pembangunan sistem infrastruktur terbaru (longkang) yang mana longkang yang melebihi 10 kilometer panjangnya harus dibetulkan ketinggiannya disebabkan oleh kelengkungan bumi.
6. Lantik syarikat swasta untuk membuat belian balik barangan yang boleh dikitar semula. Bayar dalam harga yang berpatutan.
7. Sampah yang dibuang di tapak pelupusan sudah kurang jumlah produk yang tidak boleh mereput. Yang ada secara nominalnya adalah sampah sisa makanan. Conduct research oleh mana-mana kilang baja, guna balik sisa makanan yang telah mereput ini dan jual semula. Untuk mempercepatkan pereputan sisa makanan, gunakan bakteria.
8. Mungkin dengan cara ini, keluasan tapak yang diperlukan bagi tujuan melupuskan sampah akan bertahan lama. Tanah yang telah digunapakai untuk tujuan ini boleh dirawat semula oleh jurutera awam.

Terima kasih Tun.

By samexAuthor Profile Page on December 19, 2010 11:10 PM

Assalamualaikum Ayahanda Tun

Saya masih ingat didalam ucapan terakhir tun sebagai presiden UMNO di dalam Perhimpunan Agung UMNO pada tahun 2003 dimana Tun menegur rakyat Malaysia yang telah menjadi sombong kerana menolak cadangan kerajaan yang mahu membina sebuah Loji Pelupusan Sampah Berteknologi Tinggi diluar Kuala Lumpur pada ketika itu ... Loji Pelupusan Sampah Berteknologi Tinggi itu sangat maju sehinggakan asap atau gas yg dilepaskan oleh loji itu sangatlah bersih dari pencemaran ... rakyat negara Jepun yg menggunakan Loji Pelupusan Sampah Berteknologi Tinggi ini membina loji tersebut didalam kawasan perumahan mereka dan loji ini juga sangatlah bersih sehinggakan mereka menjadikan ianya sebagai sebuah pusat rekreasi masyarakat dan tempat beriadah untuk keluarga ! Kerajaan Tun pada waktu itu mahu membina loji ini diluar Kuala Lumpur, jauh dari kawasan perumahan tetapi rakyat Malaysia membantah dan menolak cadangan ini ... dan seperti kata Tun, "kita telah menjadi begitu sombong sehingga kita merasakan bahawa teknologi yang digunakan oleh mereka yg sepuluh kali lebih maju dari kita pun masih lagi tidak cukup bagus untuk kita..." kita sebenarnya telah telalu dimanjakan ... kita mahukan perkhidmatan kelas pertama tetapi tidak sanggup membayar untuk setiap perkhidmatan itu .. dan kerajaan pula terlalu lembut tidak mahu mengambil risiko diatas setiap tindakan yg kurang popular dimata rakyat ... kita mahu kerajaan yang berani bertindak demi kesejahteraan rakyat ... buatlah, kalau ianya mendatangkan kebaikan kepada rakyat,

rakyat pasti akan dapat melihatnya dan menyokong dan seterusnya akan lebih menyakini kerajaan ... rakyat sekarang bukan lagi bodoh, mereka memerhati pencapaian dan prestasi kerajaan yang mereka pilih ...

Terima Kasih Ayahanda Tun, jaga kesihatan yaa ... :)  
By HOT ZOOMAuthor Profile Page on December 19, 2010 7:19 AM

banyaknya sampah...ok x pe jangan banyak sampah masyarakat sudah la kan  
[http://bloginfo4uall.blogspot.com/2010/12/bolasepak-keputusan-penuh-piala-aff\\_18.html](http://bloginfo4uall.blogspot.com/2010/12/bolasepak-keputusan-penuh-piala-aff_18.html)  
By SHARATAuthor Profile Page on December 18, 2010 6:27 PM

Salam Tun,

Dah lama tak jumpa.... hope to meet u soon.. insyaAllah..

I would urge if you could do one last thing for the nation:

To get the government to focus and invest on saving our environment!

must we have greater KL, billions dollar building, billions dollar rail projects, etc...

we malaysian just need to live a simple and healthy life!

more and more malaysian leave the countries is bcoz they are fed up with the way the government is leading the country.... from big 'justified' projects to personal glory here and there..

just one thing Tun.... ask 'them' to focus on environment!

invest billions in it

invest billions in cleaning our beaches!

invest billions in making sure all the poor kids got good education and good 'environment' (environment: also means good upbringing) to grow up with

wasalam,

Sheikh Faleigh  
By parameswara 2Author Profile Page on December 18, 2010 12:23 PM

Dearest Tun

//10. I am putting this dilemma of the authorities on my blog so that people can come up with solutions. Frankly I think the authorities are scared to apply any solution because we are a democracy and no one wants to lose votes.//

1-We do not have a solution problem.The solutions are all available;some are already in action successfully in our backyards without much fan fare,others successfully done in Japan,Brazil,Sxxxxxxx,Taiwan,NZ,etc.

2-If these are not enough we can google out for more from the internet.And if these also are not sufficient we can just adopt some of awesome local ideas of difefu,Amin Tan or yes,

jalil7 who in particular offers his idea for free.

3-Its the decision to implement the solutions that is the problem.I think his decision to start cutting subsidies is more vote risking than a decision over an incinerator which in the long run eases the rakyat as compared to subsidy cuts that will only promise more hardship to come..

4-That is why the Islam our politicians are talking about are all cosmetics.If they really fear Allah and understands their responsibilities they will only do what is right.If Allah is pleased with them who cares about the votes.Is paradise less attractive than the gifts of this world?

Thanks Tun

By OrangLamaAuthor Profile Page on December 17, 2010 12:13 AM

Salam,

Mohon izin membincangkan dua jenis sampah iaitu sampah sisa pepejal dan sampah politik. Kedua-dua jenis sampah ini adalah hasil perbuatan manusia. Saya harap penulisan saya tidak bersifat sampah. Penulisan ini hanyalah untuk orang kuat semangat kerana ada sedikit sindiran,kalau tak tahan jangan baca seterusnya. Kalau nak teruskan membaca, mohon maaf jika terasa pedih.

\*\*\*\*1. SAMPAH SISA PEPEJAL \*\*\*\*\*

Ada empat kaedah untuk pengurusan sampah(sisa pepejal):

- \*\*tapak pelupusan sampah(dumping)
- \*\*pembakaran (burning termasuk incinerator)
- \*\*kitar semula(reuse/recycle)
- \*\*\*kurangkan penghasilan sampah( waste prevention)

Di Amerika Syarikat kaedah paling utama ialah landfill dumping. Amerika Syarikat bolehlah negara besar banyak tanah lagi. Di Jepun dah semakin kurang pilihan dan terpaksa ke arah penggunaan incinerator. Tapi kita harus ketahui, ada beberapa kategori sampah ==sampah perumahan dan perbandaran(municipal), sisabuangan industri, sisa pertanian, sisa perlombongan. Sisa toksik SEPERTI SISA NUKLEAR lagi perlu lebih perhatian. Di Amerika Syarikat , sampah dari kawasan perumahan dan perbandaran iaitu municipal waste tak sampai pun 5%. Yg lain lebih 95% adalah dari sisa industri, pertanian,perlombongan dan lain2. Malaysia bagaimana?

Bekas tanah Lombong-lombong kat Perak tu bolehlah jadikan tapak pelupusan. Kat Serdang dan Seri Petaling dah banyak bekas tapak pelupusan sampah dah jadi kawasan perniagaan. Tapi berhati2 sekarang di Malaysia pun dah mula rasa gegaran gempa bumi. Mana tau kalau2 gempa bumi terpelosok bawah tanah bangunan dan business bersama sampah sarap. Nauzubillah.

\*\*\*\*CADANGAN SAYA::::: TAPAK PELUPUSAN BARU YANG MUNGKIN PELIK\*\*

Mungkin kerajaan kena cari kawasan yang lebih selamat seperti gaung antara bukit2 dan gunung ganang untuk dijadikan tapak pelupusan sampah. Lama2 kelamaan dapat paraskan kawasan itu dan boleh dijadikan kawasan tanah lapang untuk kegunaan aktiviti lain pada masa hadapan. Di Malaysia ada banyak gaung2 sepanjang Banjaran Titiwangsa. Kat Genting Highland, cukup banyak gaung2 yang menakutkan. Sekurang2nya pemandu F1

Genting Highland , bila turun bukit dan sukar kawal kenderaan dapat juga 'landing' atas 'Genting' sampah.

Sekiranya menggunakan gaung2 sebagai tapak baru pelupusan sampah serta mematuhi amalan EIA, hanya barangkali mengganggu sedikit habitat semulajadi haiwan liar di hutan. Dari struktur geologi, InsyaAllah selamat. Tetapi untuk berjaya kena berperang dahulu dengan Sahabat Alam Malaysia(SAM), WWF lepas tu dengan pembangkang sebab kerja pembangkang ialah membangkang.

\*\*\*\*\*2. SAMPAH POLITIK\*\*\*\*\*

Politik Malaysia amat dinamik. Pelbagai istilah dicipta dalam politik. Perkataan "katak" adalah salah satu perkataan yang selalu digunakan oleh Parti Pakatan Rakyat untuk perlu orangnya yang keluar parti. Katak paling besar sekali siapa?

Satu lagi istilah yang terkenal ialah "sampah" kalau tak silap saya telah dicipta oleh Tok Guru Nik Aziz. Dewan Bahasa Pustaka nampaknya kena mengemaskini istilah2 dalam Kamus Dewan Bahasa. Sekiranya Pakatan Rakyat memerintah Malaysia, mungkin soalan SPM untuk Sejarah ialah Siapakah pernah diberi gelaran "sampah"?

Sekarang ini lebih banyak ahli-ahli politik sampah. Setiap Parti politik ada sampah. Masing-masing kena cari kaedah pelupusan sampah-sampah politik. Seperti 4 kaedah pelupusan sampah yang disebutkan diatas iaitu dumping, burning, reuse or recycle dan waste prevention. Untuk UMNO, saya cadangkan hantar sampah-sampah untuk proses reuse dan recycle. Hantar depa mengikuti program2 keusahawanan. suruh depa ambil peluang2 keusahawanan dan lain-lain lagi. Kalau guna kaedah burning seperti penggunaan "incinerator" bahaya tu, nanti kesan2 sampingannya mengganggu alam sekitar. Disamping itu, UMNO harus mengamalkan 'waste prevention' terutamanya di kalangan ahli muda.

\*\*\*Kepada semua Rakyat Malaysia?\*\*\*\*\*

Duduk diam2, fikir dengan tenang soalan ini. Bolehkan Pakatan Rakyat memerintah Malaysia dengan aman makmur dan sejahtera ? Saya kata amat sukar sekiranya pemimpinnya berperangai macam yang ada sekarang ini. Kebanyakan depa kaki gaduh. Tak bimbangkan kalau kita tak dengar cakap depa, depa jadi agresif. Ssesama kawan depa dalam parti pun amalan sepak terajang, penumbuk dan lain2 adalah cara depa berhujah.

Duduk diam2, fikir sampai bila Malaysia nak aman dengan asyik berdemonstrasi terpekik terlolong di tengah jalanraya. Kalau Pakatan Rakyat memerintah Malaysia mungkin depa memepkenalkan Doktrin Bush "Either you are with us or against us"

Duduk diam2, fikir siapa jadi Perdana Menteri dan Timbalan Perdana Menteri Malaysia sekiranya Pakatan rakyat memerintah? Larat ke nak tengok muka depa selalu kat berita TV. Belum jadi pemimpin pun dah nak bertengkar2 dan meninggi suara. Tanpa disedari Lebai2 PAS yang terkenal dan digormati dengan sopan santun dah terikut2 perangai beberapa samseng jalanan. Kena kelentong dengan DAP pun masih nak tersengih2 macam di Perak dan Selangor? Bagaimanapun PAS Kedah dan Kelantan masih kemas, PAS negeri lain dah tak serupa macam PAS yang asli. Lebai Celup kot?

Pakatan Rakyat kata BN tak adil kepada semua. Kalau Pakatan Rakyat memerintah, adakah rakyat semua akan puas hati dengan Pakatan Rakyat? sedarilah masalah Malaysia ialah masalah sikap. Tak kira siapa jadi pemerintah, sama saja selagi pemimpin yang kita naikkan itu dua kali lima!!!! Ingatlah UMNO pada mula-mula dulu ramai yang ikhlas ,lama2 dah nak jaga "class" . ORang PAS tak mungkin jadi begitu ke? Perhiasan dunia ini suatu

godaan amat dahsyat, tergoncang hati bila kita lalai.  
Orang PAS tak pernah lalai? Hanya yang betul-betul beriman sepenuhnya saja yang tak lalai.

\*\*\*\*Kepada Dato Najib\*\*\*\*\*

Kalau BN nak menang besar PRU jangan buat PRU tahun hadapan. Menang mungkin boleh menang tetapi menang sikit kot. Pakatan Rakyat sebenarnya boleh menang besar tetapi depa kena selesai satu masalah. Tak payah cakapla sebab saya nak UMNO dan BN menang.

Ini cerita saya seorang rakyat biasa yang berkawan pun dengan orang biasa. Kami ini hanya ada kuasa mengundi sahaja. Kalau berjalan, tak ada siapa pun kenal kami, maklumla rakyat biasa. tetapi kami kenal siapa yang kami nak undi.

Tunggu sikit masa lagi, sampai PKR dah habis tenaga berdemonstrasi, PAS mula terbangun dari mimpi dan mulai menyampah kat PKR dan DAP, masa itu serang habis2an. Kerana masa itu rakyat pun sama2 tak percaya gempar terlebih Pakatan Rakyat. Ketahuilah, InsyaAllah satu hari PAS akan sedar dengan jelas bahawa masa hadapan Islam ialah bersama UMNO bukannya bersama PKR atau DAP. Juga rakyat Malaysia bukan bumiputera akan yakin satu hari bahawa secara keseluruhan BN adalah berkali ganda lebih baik dari Pakatan Rakyat untuk mencapai negara Malaysia yang aman,nakmur dan sejahtera.

Mohon maaf sekiranya menyakitkan hati sesiapa pun.

By rsaAuthor Profile Page on December 16, 2010 6:19 PM

Tun,

I remember when I was small, in my kampung in Seri Menanti, N9 in the 60's, we used to bring back bottles that had been used because the shopkeeper will buy back the empty bottles.

How nice if all bottles or recyclable containers be bought back by the shops, ya. Then we tend to bring our empty containers back and get a rebate when we buy our things.

Thank you for listening.

PS: Hope somebody/someone will take up idea2009 tech soon.

By MarzainiAuthor Profile Page on December 16, 2010 5:36 PM

Assalamualaikum Tun,

Maybe we can also learn from Brazil's experience where they have committed to recycling, and even make money from rubbish (creating jobs) excerpt from

<http://earth911.com/news/2009/08/17/trash-planet-brazil/>

as below:

In 2006, Brazil recycled 3.9 million tons, or 45 percent, of the paper materials produced that year. Taking into consideration only the paper used in packaging, the recycling rate is even higher at 70 percent, according to CEMPRE News.

According to the World Steel Association, in 2007, Brazil's recycling rate for steel cans was 49 percent, and in 2005, the country managed to recycle an incredible 96 percent of the aluminum cans sold that year – almost 9.4 million cans.

Brazil does compost its organic waste, with the quality of the final product being standardized. Any commercial compost created from domestic materials must adhere to minimum values set forth by the country's Ministry of Agriculture. For example, the amount of organic matter, nitrogen, humidity and pH level are all regulated, according to the Integrated Municipal Solid Waste Management Manual.

Wassalam.

By difefuAuthor Profile Page on December 16, 2010 1:47 PM

Dearest Tun,

To an ordinary rakyat, what has happened in our country today is totally rubbish. Today is a sad day.

By HBTAuthor Profile Page on December 16, 2010 9:47 AM

Good morning Ayahanda Tun,

1. Does Rais Yatim knows what is Malaysia Sovereignty (Kedaulatan Malaysia)?
2. Does YB Rais Yatim knows what is Malay Sovereignty (Kedaulatan Melayu)?
3. The way he expressed 'His' Public R is very rigid like Malaysia belongs to Umno Lama.
4. Today, younger generation will not buy this hard sell Public R due to democracy and freedom of expression in ballot boxes.
5. From The Star (TS) Group.....

I. Thursday December 16, 2010

Rais: It is Malaysia's right to express displeasure

II. KUALA LUMPUR: The Government has done the right thing by protesting over the unjustified comments made against the Malaysian leadership and situation in the country, said Information, Communications and Culture Minister Datuk Seri Dr Rais Yatim.

III. He said it was the Government's right to express its views over the comments made by its neighbour.

IV. "What Foreign Minister (Datuk Seri Anifah Aman) did is right because Singapore did not deny the statements made by (Singapore Ministry of Foreign Affairs senior officials) Peter Ho and Tommy Koh.

V. "If that is the case, for sure their statements will be deemed as real and genuine.

VI. "It is our right to express our views and disappointment over the comments made by a neighbour because to say a person is less competent is very rude," he said at a press conference after the launching of Tunku & The Star exhibition here yesterday.

VII. Dr Rais also warned those involving in keeping official secrets to be more careful to ensure they would not be used by third parties.

VIII. "This time it may be about diplomatic ties but in the future, it may hurt other parties in our country," he said, adding that what is revealed by WikiLeaks may not be 100% true.

VIV. The website released the confidential US State Department cables exclusively to Australia's The Sun-Herald.

X. The cables, recorded in 2008 and 2009, involved senior ministry officials like Ho, Koh and Bilahari Kausikan in meetings with senior US officials. The cables revealed damning statements made about Malaysia, Thailand, Japan and India.

COMMENT:

A. Due to freedom of expression, Tun Dr MM is nama manjakan as "Old Horse (name written in Chinese character as Horse)" or MM Lee as Old Lee (his surname is Lee).

B. Don't judge (gossip) the men if we r Malaysian Gentlemen representing Kedaulatan Malaysia dan Kedaulatan Melayu.

C. As Malaysian Gentlemen in BN national front's coalition, Yang Berhormat should act like Gentleman and trust YB Anifah as MFA Minister in representing Kedaulatan Malaysia.

D. Don't tell US that he has never bad-mouthed anyone emotionally in his entire life as Malay and Muslim?

E. Even Tun Dr M judged/gossip out of 'Frustration' by naming GB PM, Mr Tony Blair as Poodle to US President Junior Blair cable.

F. Currently YB DS Najib is also judged/gossip by Singapore Officials in the past as 'Opportunist', did we see him express his emotional displeasure in Public Relation as PM cum UMNO President cum FM cum BN Chairman in the whole country today.

G. Even PM Hsien Loong pun tak buat macam tu.

H. Will YB change or be changed, it will depend Malaysia GE13 ballot votes, we will leave it to him lah.

I. Wow, DS Najib indeed is heavy loaded with so much 'multi-tanggungjawab' for Kedaulatan Negara and Melayu'.

J. Ayahanda Tun should assist him in delegating some of his multi-tasks to those Senior Government Servants who r capable, accountable, hardworking, discipline and with with relevant experiences & merit regardless of races.

A pleasant day Ayahanda Tun.

By difefuAuthor Profile Page on December 15, 2010 11:06 PM

Dearest Tun,

Speaking of highways, I have some small ideas.

Perhaps the way we make roads can be revolutionized

We could use sections of pre[-fabricated blocks with honeycomb shape empty spaces in each block.

We can use these as garbage containers. After each rectangular box has been filled, hermetically seal it by putting slabs of concrete on top, and put the tar on it too.. one by one, while we build roads around and out of the citites and towns.

Over a period of time, we can open up stretches that are ready for use by vehicles, one stretch by one stretch.

The end result is: we will have a network or rings of roads to ease traffic congestion, and the garbage inside can be sealed away.

Speaking of road building, we can use the used tyres as guard rails, because I noticed that the "iron blades" acting as the guard rails actually killed people during accidents.

Having those scary things around really fail us. Our country is not short of used rubbers by the way. This may initiate a new industry around the world.

On another note, if the government has ideas that make it compulsory for all the vehicles to use rubbers as the body of the vehicles, I am sure the roads will be a safer place to be. Because in accidents, the kinetic energy will be mostly transformed into potential energy inside the rubber.

Recently there have been many burn-to-death road accidents. I think it is time for the gov to make it compulsory for vehicles (or at least start with taxis, and other commonly seen vehicles but not private vehicles) to have a mini fire extinguisher installed, so that it will come in handy when these fiery incidents happen again.

Sorry Tun, a bit out of topic. Thanks Tun.

By difefuAuthor Profile Page on December 15, 2010 10:07 PM

Dearest Tun,

I have some small ideas:

Each house / premise should have two tong sampah instead of one, one for recyclable materials and another for perishable materials. Allow private companies truck to pick up the recyclable materials and thus, the local authorities only left with the perishable materials to deal with. This, theoretically should cut the burden by half. Also, the authority can deny taking the recyclable materials unless the residence / company pay up.

Secondly, perhaps there are some lousy islands out there, no man's land with lousy beaches, near but not too near the big cities, that can be used to dump the garbage by using some sort of garbage truck carrying floatilla. Also, sterilized stray dogs can be dumped there too. Then, they will not be hungry nor destroyed inhumanly, yet they can't disturb other people in town anymore. Local rules can be erected such that, e.g., if at least two or three of the neighbours complain about dogs' noise, the dogs can be taken away, sterilized and dump onto such garbage islands.

Thirdly, I wish to draw the authorities' attention to illegal dumping activities especially along the roads to some "tempat tadahan air", like quiet roads to some highlands important for agricultural activities. I suspect many unscrupulous businessmen throw toxic materials into the ravines, and this cause water polution and affect public health. I once saw a lorry with suspicious people doing that.

Fourthly, perhaps we can build some concrete, waterproof walls in the sea near big cities, to make manmade boxes, pump out the water, and fill the boxes with garbage. After each section is full, top them up with some "batu kapur" and to conceal the stench.. After some time, when all sections are filled, can make some piling and put concrete on top and sell them to the budget airlines as airports.

Lastly, I watch the documentary on Smart Tunnel. Learned that there could be some caves beneath the big cities. Perhaps we can just drill a big hole all the way down and dump the garbage there. But make sure the pollution to the water source does not occur due to this.

Thanks Tun, for your wisdom. Every time I use the NS highway, I would think about Tun.  
By blackwhiteAuthor Profile Page on December 15, 2010 7:05 PM

Dear great leader,

A very interesting topic you have posted. Well rubbish is a main problem in human civilisation through out history, but what if we can make money out of those waste. It is still the same matter that make the universe and in physics matter cannot be destroy nor created.

How about we recycle those rubbish. With a little bit of science and creativity we can make the world a much greener place and boost the economy.

By BCAuthor Profile Page on December 15, 2010 4:34 PM

Dear Tun:

It is timely that you have mentioned this subject which is relevant at this time when 200 Governments coming together at Cancun , Mexico cannot agree on a Solution how to stop cutting down Carbon Dioxide to the Desired Level to stop Global Warming Effects now felt all over the world.

Statistics showed Rubbish Dumps contribute to almost 50% of the Carbon Dioxide that has been released in the atmosphere and is a continuous process, when the rubbish is not been recycled or converted.

We have a System where we use In Fill System and can deal with the Rubbish you are talking about. The IN FILL System runs at a capacity of 2000 Tonnes per hour rating and if we install only 2 of such plants in Strategic location especially in the dumps near the city , then all of the 94,000 Tonnes per day can be converted.

We convert Rubbish into clean water, methane gas recycled for plant use and/or kept and containerised for household use, and the residual is turned into fertiliser.

The ONLY Problem with Malaysia is the tedious and long process in getting something approved for use. On Top , everyone wants to pass on bucks and do not wish to pay for it. Capex for such plant are high though it can be affordable for a country like Malaysia if there is enough political will to move it forward.

I am sure many , including Tun will be interested to know more of such items.

Feel free to contact me beckchew@gmail.com. I will respond to this privately when you are interested.

regards,

beck chew

By leluconAuthor Profile Page on December 15, 2010 4:26 PM

Assalamualaikum Tun,

Saya rasa lebih wajar jika ditekankan bagaimana untuk mendidik generasi muda di Malaysia menghormati dan menyayangi alam sekitar. Mereka perlu diajar bagaimana mengurus sampah (elakkan membuang sampah merata-rata, dll.), dan mengajar mereka menghasilkan kreativiti daripada bahan buangan. Bahkan penekanan kepada konsep akhlak dan etika juga wajar dilakukan.

Saya semasa kecil tidak endah pun membuang sampah di merata tempat. Jika menaiki kereta/kenderaan, saya lempar sampah ke luar tingkap tanpa sedikit pun rasa bersalah. Tetapi bila dah dewasa/tua, saya menghayati bahawa alam ciptaan Allah ni ada 1 saja. Maka perlu dijaga. Dari penghayatan ini timbul cinta saya pada alam (sbg anugerah Allah). Sekang tiap kali saya membuang sampah (hatta meludah) saya pastikan saya buang di tempat yg sepatutnya. Tiada siapa suruh pun. Bahkan saya nasihatkan ahli keluarga lakukan etika yg sama, dan tunjukkan contoh yg baik pd anak2. Ini adalah hasil pendidikan, dan bukan penguatkuasaan. Sewajarnya etika dan keinginan menjaga alam sekitar lahir dari naluri masyarakat.

Saya yakin (insya'allah) jika masyarakat blh mengurus sendiri pembuangan sampah, tak perlu pihak berkuasa nak fikirkan bgmana nak menguruskan atau membersihkannya lagi. Inilah yg berlaku di negara maju.

Saya mengesyorkan agar subjek 'ilmu seni kreatif' diwujudkan (dlm pendidikan seni) supaya anak-anak dapat bimbingan untuk menghasilkan seni kreatif dari bahan buangan. Ini juga menggalakkan generasi muda berfikir lebih kritikal kerana mereka akan cuba cari idea untuk hasilkan karya mereka.

By musatoAuthor Profile Page on December 15, 2010 12:35 PM

Assalamualaikum Tun.

'Rubbish'

Sebelum Tok Pulau Manis meninggal, beliau telah berpesan kepada anak-anaknya supaya jangan ditinggalkan orang-orang yang jahil.

Beliau merupakan seorang pelopor sekolah pondok di Terengganu. Aktiviti ini diteruskan oleh cucu cicit beliau sampailah kepada Haji Muhammad bin Isa.

Tetapi Haji Muhammad tidak dapat meneruskan warisan ini dengan begitu gigih kerana sibuk dengan urusan pentadbiran negeri dengan membantu Sultan Omar ketika itu.

Salah satu sebab saya suka menulis di sini adalah kerana chedet.cc mencapai 32 juta hit. Bukankah ini juga merupakan sekolah pondok?

Saya tak berminat nak selesaikan masalah rubbish kerana ramai orang politik boleh

selesaikan dan buat duit dengan rubbish kalau rajin.

Apa yang dikecohkan sekarang adalah tentang pluralisme dalam agama. Saya telah nampak akan perkara ini tak lama dulu dalam arah tuju pentadiran kerajaan sekarang. Dan ini telah diberitahu secara tidak langsung. Harap sekarang lebih dapat difahamkan dengan adanya wacana ancaman pluralisme agama di Malaysia : satu tinjauan awal.

'Rubbish' seperti ini adalah seperti oksigen yang disedut dan karbon dioksida dihembus. Kalau terperangkap dalam bilik kedap, kita akan mati kerana kekurangan oksigen.

Terima kasih Tun.

By GreenLavaAuthor Profile Page on December 15, 2010 12:29 PM

Dear Tun,

1. Do away with non-biodegradable plastic bags and packaging. I feel they are the "hardcore" rubbish if you will.

2. I want my incinerator, and I want it now! :)

By HBTAuthor Profile Page on December 15, 2010 8:05 AM

Good morning Ayahanda Tun,

A. The Star Group HQ in Petaling Jaya claimed: WikiLeaks: Singapore denies comments

1. Published: Tuesday December 14, 2010 MYT 4:02:00 PM

Updated: Tuesday December 14, 2010 MYT 9:56:38 PM

WikiLeaks: Singapore denies comments (Updated)

2. PETALING JAYA: Singapore's Minister of Foreign Affairs (MFA) George Yeo called his Malaysian counterpart Datuk Seri Anifah Aman Tuesday to clarify the republic's policy of not commenting on leaks.

3. According to a media statement on the MFA website, "In response to media queries, the MFA spokesman confirmed that Singapore's High Commissioner in Kuala Lumpur, T. Jasudasen, had been asked to see Malaysian Foreign Minister Datuk Seri Anifah Aman this morning and received a protest note regarding press reports of US Embassy cables leaked by WikiLeaks.

4. "On the specific complaints raised by the Malaysians, what Singapore officials were alleged by WikiLeaks to have said did not tally with our own records. One purported meeting did not even take place.

5. "Minister Yeo and Minister Anifah agreed on the importance of good bilateral relations and strengthening cooperation further," the statement said.

6. Earlier Tuesday, Jasudasen was summoned by Wisma Putra over comments purportedly made by Singapore officials on Malaysia's leadership.

7. Anifah had summoned the Singapore diplomat and handed him Malaysia's official protest note over comments made by MFA senior officials concerning the leadership of Malaysia and the situation in the country.

8. Anifah also conveyed Malaysia's deep concern and displeasure over the comments as

revealed by WikiLeaks and subsequently reported in the media.

Related Stories:

9. Lee knew of Anwar's activities, says Dr M
10. Najib: Ignore snide remarks, focus on achievement
11. Singapore's disdain exposed
12. Red faces in Singapore no thanks to WikiLeaks

B. Singapore TOP STORY

HOME > BREAKING NEWS > SINGAPORE > STORY

1. Dec 15, 2010

MFA SAYS FACTS DON'T TALLY

MFA clarifies with M'sia

By Vanessa Jalleh

Captioned: Minister for Foreign Affairs George Yeo called his Malaysian counterpart Dato' Seri Anifah Aman to clarify Singapore's policy of not commenting on leaks. -- PHOTO: AFP

2. THE Ministry of Foreign Affairs confirmed that Singapore's High Commissioner in Kuala Lumpur T Jasudasen had been asked to see Malaysian Foreign Minister Dato' Seri Anifah Aman this morning regarding press reports of US Embassy cables leaked by WikiLeaks.

3. He also received a protest note.

4. Minister for Foreign Affairs George Yeo called Mr Anifah later on Tuesday to clarify Singapore's policy of not commenting on leaks.

5. Highlighting a disparity of facts, the MFA spokesman said the 'specific complaints raised by the Malaysians, what Singapore officials were alleged by WikiLeaks to have said did not tally with our own records'.

6. 'One purported meeting did not even take place.' the spokesman added.

7. Both Mr Yeo and Mr Anifah have agreed on the importance of good bilateral relations and strengthening cooperation further.

Read also:

8. Ignore remarks: Najib

9. Lee knew of activities

A/I. If The Star Group is Accountable Transparent in Journalism, they should have made the title that will not cause ambiguity/grey, manipulative and speculative claims in its TOP NATION NEWS.

B/II. Many of the English educated younger Chinese of 40 years and above do not trust The Star news.

C/III. We do not trust The Star news because they like to add salt (masin) and vinegar (masam) as and when they like (speculative and manipulative) which can spoil the main menu.

D/IV. Ayahanda Tun, please do not post this comment to avoid unnecessary grey/danger economic/political territories in the T-Junction between KLFT and Putrajaya.

E/V. Though I am tired, but I can't stop right now in contributing news since PM cum FM are in another level of game between Singapore Ministry, KLFT and Malaysia Putrajaya Ministry.

F/VI. Singapore Ministry is trying to cool off this WikiLeaks issue to avoid over-heated value of property and financial markets due to speculation, exploitation and manipulation of macro economic activity between 2 countries that will indeed 'bad' for the economy due to democracy.

Good day Ayahanda Tun. Because of insecurity, power, wealth and pride, these MCA members indeed have forgotten why they joined BN Alliance in governing the whole country.

P.S: Singapore Ministries are not jealous about Malaysia, it is our MCA and Gerakan Supreme Councils hiding behind the BN and PR curtains are jealous and felt threaten by their own shadows because they are too influenced with western cultures on competency self-regulated transparency until they forgot the brotherhood love of who are they, what a pity.

PM Japan has visited Iwo Jima Island yesterday, Tuesday, 14 December 2010 whereby 21,000 Japanese troops were killed by US Marines to stabilize value of property and financial markets to avoid deeper deflation, and he wants to show to the Japanese political parties that he has not forgotten the history of Japan in protecting Iwo Jima whereby all Japanese troops (owned by father and son in war businesses) were left to kill by US Marines.(Remarks: US made movies on "Flag of the Father" and "The Letters from Iwo Jima" including a China-made movie by Director Mr Feng Xio-kang, will let the audiences to decide on SHOULD WE SUPPORT WARS/HARD MEASURES TO PROTECT THE COUNTRY BY KILLING OUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS?)

Premier Wen Jiabao is visiting India to improve bilateral ties between China and India. (Remarks: Mrs Wen is a powerful business woman in her family business of Jewellery in China and they have a boy and girl).

By HBTAuthor Profile Page on December 14, 2010 9:36 PM

Good evening Ayahanda Tun,

News update from thestar online Anwar's action on WikiLeaks and he will check with his link in Australia a.k.a. base on case law means got money to pay for caj loyar, no problems.

1. Published: Tuesday December 14, 2010 MYT 7:18:00 PM

Updated: Tuesday December 14, 2010 MYT 7:19:32 PM

WikiLeaks: Anwar plans to sue Dr Mahathir, media

2. KUALA LUMPUR: Opposition Leader Datuk Seri Anwar Ibrahim will file a suit against former Prime Minister Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad for his comments on the WikiLeaks cable controversy.

3. When contacted Tuesday, Anwar's lawyer Sankara Nair confirmed that Anwar would be filing a suit against Dr Mahathir and that they were still gathering further information for "possible suits against several other individuals and certain newspapers.

4. "There are no further details at the moment.

5. "We are checking the authenticity of The Sun-Herald story which was published in Australia as our initial investigations show that their story was not based on any WikiLeaks story," he said Tuesday.

6. When asked if Anwar would also be filing a suit against Singapore's Minister Mentor Lee Kuan Yew, he replied: "Until now, there have been no instructions from my client to sue Lee Kuan Yew."

(\*\*Anwar will not dare because he has many Chinese Dap's eh behs).

7. However, he added that he was checking on certain facts in Australia, and would then advise his client accordingly.

8. He also said that they had contacted the Singaporean Deputy High Commissioner, and were still awaiting a response.

9. "I will be writing in officially tomorrow (Wednesday) asking for a response," he said.

Related Stories:

10. PKR wants S'pore to clarify WikiLeaks disclosure

11. WikiLeaks: Wisma Putra gives S'pore protest note over comments

12. Lee knew of Anwar's activities, says Dr M

13. Najib: Ignore snide remarks, focus on achievement

14. Karpal: Singapore's allegations of Anwar's 'set-up' is in contempt

15. Anwar is on WikiLeaks

WHAT IS COMMON LAW?

Common law

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

This article is about the general legal concept. For the book by Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., see The Common Law.

Common law, also known as case law or precedent, is law developed by judges through decisions of courts and similar tribunals rather than through legislative statutes or executive branch action. A "common law system" is a legal system that gives great precedential weight to common law,[1] on the principle that it is unfair to treat similar facts differently on different occasions.[2] The body of precedent is called "common law" and it binds future decisions. In cases where the parties disagree on what the law is, an idealized common law court looks to past precedential decisions of relevant courts. If a similar dispute has been resolved in the past, the court is bound to follow the reasoning used in the prior decision (this principle is known as stare decisis). If, however, the court finds that the current dispute is fundamentally distinct from all previous cases (called a "matter of first impression"), judges have the authority and duty to make law by creating precedent.[3]

Thereafter, the new decision becomes precedent, and will bind future courts.

In practice, common law systems are considerably more complicated than the idealized system described above. The decisions of a court are binding only in a particular jurisdiction, and even within a given jurisdiction, some courts have more power than others. For example, in most jurisdictions, decisions by appellate courts are binding on lower courts in the same jurisdiction and on future decisions of the same appellate court, but decisions of

lower courts are only non-binding persuasive authority. Interactions between common law, constitutional law, statutory law and regulatory law also give rise to considerable complexity. However stare decisis, the principle that similar cases should be decided according to consistent principled rules so that they will reach similar results, lies at the heart of all common law systems.

Common law legal systems are in widespread use, particularly in England where it originated in the Middle Ages,[4] and in nations that trace their legal heritage to England as former colonies of the British Empire, including the United States, Malaysia, Singapore, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, India,[5] Ghana, Cameroon, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, Hong Kong and Australia.[6]

Contents [hide]

## 1 Primary connotations

- 1.1 1. Common law as opposed to statutory law and regulatory law
- 1.2 2. Common law legal systems as opposed to civil law legal systems
- 1.3 3. Law as opposed to equity
- 1.4 4. Historical uses

## 2 Basic principles of common law

- 2.1 Common law adjudication
- 2.2 The common law evolves to meet changing social needs and improved understanding
- 2.3 Interaction of constitutional, statutory and common law
- 2.4 Overruling precedent—the limits of stare decisis
- 2.5 Common law as a foundation for commercial economies

## 3 History

- 3.1 Medieval English common law
- 3.2 Influences of foreign legal systems
  - 3.2.1 Roman law
  - 3.3 Propagation of the common law to the colonies and Commonwealth by reception statutes
    - 3.3.1 Initial reception of English common law into new colonies
    - 3.3.2 Reception statutes as a step in decolonization
    - 3.3.3 Reception in Hong Kong
  - 3.4 Decline of Latin maxims, and adding flexibility to stare decisis
  - 3.5 1870 through 20th century, and the procedural merger of law and equity
  - 3.6 Common law pleading and its abolition in the early 20th century

## 4 Contrasts between common law and civil law systems

- 4.1 Adversarial system vs. inquisitorial system
- 4.2 Contrasting role of treatises and academic writings in common law and civil law systems

## 5 Common law legal systems in the present day

- 5.1 Scotland (1707)
- 5.2 States of the United States (1775 on)
- 5.3 United States federal system (1789 and 1938)
- 5.4 India (1857)
- 5.5 Canada (1867)
- 5.6 Nicaragua
- 5.7 Israel (1948)
- 5.8 Alternatives to common law systems

## 6 Scholarly works

## 7 See also

## 8 References

## 9 External links

[edit]Primary connotations

The term common law has three main connotations and several historical meanings worth mentioning:

[edit]1. Common law as opposed to statutory law and regulatory law

This connotation distinguishes the authority that promulgated a law. For example, most areas of law in most Anglo-American jurisdictions include "statutory law" enacted by a legislature, "regulatory law" promulgated by executive branch agencies pursuant to delegation of rule-making authority from the legislature, and common law or "case law", i.e., decisions issued by courts (or quasi-judicial tribunals within agencies).[7][8] This first connotation can be further differentiated into (a) pure common law arising from the traditional and inherent authority of courts to define what the law is, even in absence of an underlying statute, e.g., most criminal law and procedural law before the 20th century, and even today, most of contract law and the law of torts, and (b) court decisions that decide the fine boundaries and distinctions in law promulgated by other bodies, such as judicial interpretations of the Constitution, of statutes, and of regulations.[9]

[edit]2. Common law legal systems as opposed to civil law legal systems

This connotation differentiates "common law" jurisdictions and legal systems from "civil law" or "code" jurisdictions.[9] Common law systems place great weight on court decisions, which are considered "law" with the same force of law as statutes. By contrast, in civil law jurisdictions (the legal tradition that prevails in, or is combined with common law in, Europe and most non-Islamic, non-common law countries), judicial precedent is given less weight (which means that a judge deciding a given case has more freedom to interpret the text of a statute independently, and less predictably), and scholarly literature is given more. For example, the Napoleonic code expressly forbade French judges from pronouncing general principles of law.[10]

As a rough rule of thumb, common law systems trace their history to England, while civil law systems trace their history to Roman law and the Napoleonic Code.

The contrast between common law and civil law systems is elaborated in Alternatives to common law systems, below.

[edit]3. Law as opposed to equity

This connotation differentiates "common law" (or just "law") from "equity".[7][8] Before 1873, England had two parallel court systems: courts of "law" that could only award money damages and recognized only the legal owner of property, and courts of "equity" (courts of chancery) that could issue injunctive relief (that is, a court order to a party to do something, give something to someone, or stop doing something) and recognized trusts of property. This split propagated to many of the colonies, including the United States (see "Reception Statutes", below). For most purposes, most jurisdictions, including the U.S. federal system and most states, have merged the two courts.

[11][12] Additionally, even before the separate courts were merged together, most courts were permitted to apply both law and equity, though under potentially different procedural law. Nonetheless, the historical distinction between "law" and "equity" remains important today when the case involves issues such as the following:

categorizing and prioritizing rights to property—for example, the same article of property often has a "legal title" and an "equitable title," and these two groups of ownership rights

may be held by different people.

in the United States, determining whether the Seventh Amendment's right to a jury trial applies (a determination of a fact necessary to resolution of a "common law" claim)[13] or whether the issue will be decided by a judge (issues of what the law is, and all issues relating to equity).

the standard of review and degree of deference given by an appellate tribunal to the decision of the lower tribunal under review (issues of law are reviewed *de novo*, that is, "as if new" from scratch by the appellate tribunal, while most issues of equity are reviewed for "abuse of discretion," that is, with great deference to the tribunal below).

the remedies available and rules of procedure to be applied.  
[edit]4. Historical uses

In addition, there are several historical uses of the term that provide some background as to its meaning. The English Court of Common Pleas dealt with lawsuits in which the King had no interest, i.e. between commoners. Additionally, from at least the 11th century and continuing for several centuries after that, there were several different circuits in the royal court system, served by itinerant judges who would travel from town to town dispensing the King's justice. The term "common law" was used to describe the law held in common between the circuits and the different stops in each circuit.

The more widely a particular law was recognized, the more weight it held, whereas purely local customs were generally subordinate to law recognized in a plurality of jurisdictions. These definitions are archaic, their relevance having dissipated with the development of the English legal system over the centuries, but they do explain the origin of the term.

[edit]Basic principles of common law

[edit]Common law adjudication

In a common law jurisdiction several stages of research and analysis are required to determine "what the law is" in a given situation. First, one must ascertain the facts. Then, one must locate any relevant statutes and cases. Then one must extract the principles, analogies and statements by various courts of what they consider important to determine how the next court is likely to rule on the facts of the present case. Later decisions, and decisions of higher courts or legislatures carry more weight than earlier cases and those of lower courts.[14] Finally, one integrates all the lines drawn and reasons given, and determines what "the law is". Then, one applies that law to the facts.

[edit]The common law evolves to meet changing social needs and improved understanding

The common law is more malleable than statutory law. First, common law courts are not absolutely bound by precedent, but can (when extraordinarily good reason is shown) reinterpret and revise the law, without legislative intervention, to adapt to new trends in political, legal and social philosophy. Second, the common law evolves through a series of gradual steps, that gradually works out all the details, so that over a decade or more, the law can change substantially but without a sharp break, thereby reducing disruptive effects.[15] In contrast to common law incrementalism, the legislative process is very difficult to get started, as legislatures tend to delay action until a situation is totally intolerable. For these reasons, legislative changes tend to be large, jarring and disruptive (sometimes positively, sometimes negatively, and sometimes with unintended

consequences).

One example of the gradual change that typifies the common law is the gradual change in liability for negligence. For example, the traditional common law rule through most of the 19th century was that a plaintiff could not recover for a defendant's negligence unless the two were in privity of contract. Thus, only the immediate purchaser could recover for a product defect, and if a part was built up out of parts from parts manufacturers, the ultimate buyer could not recover for injury caused by a defect in the part.

*Winterbottom v. Wright*, 10 M&W 109, 152 Eng.Rep. 402, 1842 WL 5519 (Exchequer of pleas 1842). In *Winterbottom*, the postal service had contracted with Wright to maintain its coaches. Winterbottom was a driver for the post. When the coach failed and injured Winterbottom, he sued Wright. The *Winterbottom* court recognized that there would be "absurd and outrageous consequences" if an injured person could sue any person peripherally involved, and knew it had to draw a line somewhere, a limit on the causal connection between the negligent conduct and the injury. The court looked to the contractual relationships, and held that liability would only flow as far as the person in immediate contract ("privity") with the negligent party.

A first exception to this rule arose in *Thomas v. Winchester*, 6 N.Y. 397 (N.Y. 1852), which held that mislabeling a poison as an innocuous herb, and then selling the mislabeled poison through a dealer who would be expected to resell it, put "human life in imminent danger." Thomas used this as a reason to create an exception to the "privity" rule. In *Statler v. Ray Mfg. Co.*, 195 N.Y. 478, 480 (N.Y. 1909) held that a coffee urn manufacturer was liable to a person injured when the urn exploded, because the urn "was of such a character inherently that, when applied to the purposes for which it was designed, it was liable to become a source of great danger to many people if not carefully and properly constructed."

Yet the privity rule survived. In *Cadillac Motor Car Co. v. Johnson*, 221 F. 801 (2nd Cir. 1915) (decided by the federal appeals court for New York and several neighboring states), the court held that a car owner could not recover for injuries from a defective wheel, when the automobile owner had a contract only with the automobile dealer and not with the manufacturer, even though there was "no question that the wheel was made of dead and 'dozy' wood, quite insufficient for its purposes." The Cadillac court was willing to acknowledge that the case law supported exceptions for "an article dangerous in its nature or likely to become so in the course of the ordinary usage to be contemplated by the vendor." However, held the Cadillac court, "one who manufactures articles dangerous only if defectively made, or installed, e.g., tables, chairs, pictures or mirrors hung on the walls, carriages, automobiles, and so on, is not liable to third parties for injuries caused by them, except in case of willful injury or fraud,"

Finally, in the famous case of *MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.*, 217 N.Y. 382, 111 N.E. 1050 (N.Y. 1916), Judge Benjamin Cardozo pulled a broader principle out of these predecessor cases. The facts were almost identical to Cadillac a year earlier: a wheel from a wheel manufacturer was sold to Buick, to a dealer, to MacPherson, and the wheel failed, injuring MacPherson. Judge Cardozo held:

It may be that *Statler v. Ray Mfg. Co.* have extended the rule of *Thomas v. Winchester*. If so, this court is committed to the extension. The defendant argues that things imminently dangerous to life are poisons, explosives, deadly weapons—things whose normal function it is to injure or destroy. But whatever the rule in *Thomas v. Winchester* may once have been, it has no longer that restricted meaning. A scaffold (*Devlin v. Smith*, *supra*) is not inherently a destructive instrument. It becomes destructive only if imperfectly constructed. A large coffee urn (*Statler v. Ray Mfg. Co.*, *supra*) may have within itself, if negligently made, the

potency of danger, yet no one thinks of it as an implement whose normal function is destruction. What is true of the coffee urn is equally true of bottles of aerated water (Torgeson v. Schultz, 192 N. Y. 156). We have mentioned only cases in this court. But the rule has received a like extension in our courts of intermediate appeal. In *Burke v. Ireland* (26 App. Div. 487), in an opinion by CULLEN, J., it was applied to a builder who constructed a defective building; in *Kahner v. Otis Elevator Co.* (96 App. Div. 169) to the manufacturer of an elevator; in *Davies v. Pelham Hod Elevating Co.* (65 Hun, 573; affirmed in this court without opinion, 146 N. Y. 363) to a contractor who furnished a defective rope with knowledge of the purpose for which the rope was to be used. We are not required at this time either to approve or to disapprove the application of the rule that was made in these cases. It is enough that they help to characterize the trend of judicial thought.

We hold, then, that the principle of *Thomas v. Winchester* is not limited to poisons, explosives, and things of like nature, to things which in their normal operation are implements of destruction. If the nature of a thing is such that it is reasonably certain to place life and limb in peril when negligently made, it is then a thing of danger. Its nature gives warning of the consequences to be expected. If to the element of danger there is added knowledge that the thing will be used by persons other than the purchaser, and used without new tests then, irrespective of contract, the manufacturer of this thing of danger is under a duty to make it carefully. ... There must be knowledge of a danger, not merely possible, but probable.

Note that Cardozo's new "rule" exists in no prior case, but is inferrable as a synthesis of the "thing of danger" principle stated in them, merely extending it to "foreseeable danger" even if "the purposes for which it was designed" were not themselves "a source of great danger." MacPherson takes some care to present itself as foreseeable progression, not a wild departure. Note that Judge Cardozo continues to adhere to the original principle of *Winterbottom*, that "absurd and outrageous consequences" must be avoided, and he does so by drawing a new line in the last sentence quoted above: "There must be knowledge of a danger, not merely possible, but probable." But while adhering to the underlying principle that some boundary is necessary, MacPherson overruled the prior common law by rendering the formerly dominant factor in the boundary, that is, the privity formality arising out of a contractual relationship between persons, totally irrelevant.

Rather, the most important factor in the boundary would be the nature of the thing sold and the foreseeable uses that downstream purchasers would make of the thing.

This illustrates two crucial principles that are often not well understood by non-lawyers. (a) The law evolves, this evolution is in the hands of judges, and judges have "made law" for hundreds of years. (b) The reasons given for a decision are often more important in the long run than the outcome in a particular case. This is the reason that judicial opinions are usually quite long, and give rationales and policies that can be balanced with judgment in future cases, rather than the bright-line rules usually embodied in statutes.

[edit]Interaction of constitutional, statutory and common law

In common law legal systems (connotation 2), the common law (connotation 1) is crucial to understanding almost all important areas of law. For example, in England and Wales and in most states of the United States, the basic law of contracts, torts and property do not exist in statute, but only in common law (though there may be isolated modifications enacted by statute). In almost all areas of the law (even those where there is a statutory framework, such as contracts for the sale of goods,[16] or the criminal law),[17] legislature-enacted statutes generally give only terse statements of general principle, and the fine boundaries

and definitions exist only in the common law (connotation 1). To find out what the precise law is that applies to a particular set of facts, one has to locate precedential decisions on the topic, and reason from those decisions by analogy. To consider but one example, the First Amendment to the United States Constitution states "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"—but interpretation (that is, determining the fine boundaries, and resolving the tension between the "establishment" and "free exercise" clauses) of each of the important terms was delegated by Article III of the Constitution to the judicial branch,[18] so that the current legal boundaries of the Constitutional text can only be determined by consulting the common law.[19]

In common law jurisdictions, legislatures operate under the assumption that statutes will be interpreted against the backdrop of the pre-existing common law and custom. For example, in most U.S. states, the criminal statutes are primarily codification of pre-existing common law. (Codification is the process of enacting a statute that collects and restates pre-existing law in a single document—when that pre-existing law is common law, the common law remains relevant to the interpretation of these statutes.) In reliance on this assumption, modern statutes often leave a number of terms and fine distinctions unstated—for example, a statute might be very brief, leaving the precise definition of terms unstated, under the assumption that these fine distinctions will be inherited from pre-existing common law. (For this reason, many modern American law schools teach the common law of crime as it stood in England in 1789, because that centuries-old English common law is a necessary foundation to interpreting modern criminal statutes.)

With the transition from English law, which had common law crimes, to the new legal system under the U.S. Constitution, which prohibited ex post facto laws at both the federal and state level, the question was raised whether there could be common law crimes in the United States. It was settled in the case of *United States v. Hudson and Goodwin*, 11 U.S. 32 (1812), which decided that federal courts had no jurisdiction to define new common law crimes, and that there must always be a (constitutional) statute defining the offense and the penalty for it.

Still, many states retain selected common law crimes. For example, in Virginia, the definition of the conduct that constitutes the crime of robbery exists only in the common law, and the robbery statute only sets the punishment.[20] Virginia Code section 1-200 establishes the continued existence and vitality of common law principles and provides that "The common law of England, insofar as it is not repugnant to the principles of the Bill of Rights and Constitution of this Commonwealth, shall continue in full force within the same, and be the rule of decision, except as altered by the General Assembly."

By contrast to statutory codification of common law, some statutes displace common law, for example to create a new cause of action that did not exist in the common law, or to legislatively overrule the common law. An example is the tort of wrongful death, which allows certain persons, usually a spouse, child or estate, to sue for damages on behalf of the deceased. There is no such tort in English common law; thus, any jurisdiction that lacks a wrongful death statute will not allow a lawsuit for the wrongful death of a loved one. Where a wrongful death statute exists, the compensation or other remedy available is limited to the remedy specified in the statute (typically, an upper limit on the amount of damages). Courts generally interpret statutes that create new causes of action narrowly – that is, limited to their precise terms—because the courts generally recognize the legislature as being supreme in deciding the reach of judge-made law unless such statute should violate some "second order" constitutional law provision (cf. judicial activism).

Where a tort is rooted in common law, all traditionally recognized damages for that tort may be sued for, whether or not there is mention of those damages in the current statutory law. For instance, a person who sustains bodily injury through the negligence of another may sue for medical costs, pain, suffering, loss of earnings or earning capacity, mental and/or emotional distress, loss of quality of life, disfigurement and more. These damages need not be set forth in statute as they already exist in the tradition of common law. However, without a wrongful death statute, most of them are extinguished upon death.

In the United States, the power of the federal judiciary to review and invalidate unconstitutional acts of the federal executive branch is stated in the constitution, Article III sections 1 and 2: "The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. ... The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority..." The first famous statement of "the judicial power" was *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803). Later cases interpreted the "judicial power" of Article III to establish the power of federal courts to consider or overturn any action of congress or of any state that conflicts with the constitution.

[edit]Overruling precedent—the limits of stare decisis

Most of the U.S. federal courts of appeal have adopted a rule under which, in the event of any conflict in decisions of panels (most of the courts of appeal almost always sit in panels of three), the earlier panel decision is controlling, and a panel decision may only be overruled by the court of appeals sitting en banc (that is, all active judges of the court) or by a higher court.[21] In these courts, the older decision remains controlling when an issue comes up the third time.

Other courts, for example, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and the Supreme Court, always sit en banc, and thus the later decision controls. These courts essentially overrule all previous cases in each new case, and older cases survive only to the extent they do not conflict with newer cases. The interpretations of these courts - for example, Supreme Court interpretations of the constitution or federal statutes - are stable only so long as the older interpretation maintains the support of a majority of the court. The majority may persist through some combination of belief that the old decision is right, and that it is not sufficiently wrong to be overruled.

In the UK, since 2009, the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom has the authority to overrule and unify decisions of lower courts. From 1966 to 2009, this power lay with the House of Lords, granted by the Practice Statement of 1966.[22]

[edit]Common law as a foundation for commercial economies

The reliance on judicial opinion is a strength of common law systems, and is a significant contributor to the robust commercial systems in the United Kingdom and United States. Because there is common law to give reasonably precise guidance on almost every issue, parties (especially commercial parties) can predict whether a proposed course of action is likely to be lawful or unlawful. This ability to predict gives more freedom to come close to the boundaries of the law.[23] For example, many commercial contracts are more economically efficient, and create greater wealth, because the parties know ahead of time that the proposed arrangement, though perhaps close to the line, is almost certainly legal. Newspapers, taxpayer-funded entities with some religious affiliation, and political parties can obtain fairly clear guidance on the boundaries within which their freedom of expression rights apply.

In contrast, in non-common-law countries, and jurisdictions with very weak respect for precedent (example, the U.S. Patent Office), fine questions of law are redetermined anew each time they arise, making consistency and prediction more difficult, and procedures far more protracted than necessary because parties cannot rely on written statements of law as reliable guides. In jurisdictions that do not have a strong allegiance to a large body of precedent, parties have less a priori guidance and must often leave a bigger "safety margin" of unexploited opportunities, and final determinations are reached only after far larger expenditures on legal fees by the parties.

This is the reason for the frequent choice of the law of the State of New York in commercial contracts.[24] Commercial contracts almost always include a "choice of law clause" to reduce uncertainty.

Somewhat surprisingly, contracts throughout the world (for example, contracts involving parties in Japan, France and Germany, and from most of the other states of the United States) often choose the law of New York, even where the relationship of the parties and transaction to New York is quite attenuated. Because of its history as the nation's commercial center, New York common law has a depth and predictability not (yet) available in any other jurisdiction.

Similarly, corporations are often formed under Delaware corporate law, and contracts relating to corporate law issues (merger and acquisitions of companies, rights of shareholders, etc.) include a Delaware choice of law clause, because of the deep body of law in Delaware on these issues.[25] On the other hand, some other jurisdictions have sufficiently developed bodies of law so that parties have no real motivation to choose the law of a foreign jurisdiction (e.g., England and Wales, and the state of California), but not yet so fully developed that parties with no relationship to the jurisdiction choose that law[citation needed]. The common theme in each case is that commercial parties seek predictability and simplicity in their contractual relations, and frequently choose the law of a common law jurisdiction with a well-developed body of common law to achieve that result.

Likewise, for litigation of commercial disputes arising out of unpredictable torts (as opposed to the prospective choice of law clauses in contracts discussed in the previous paragraph), certain jurisdictions attract an unusually high fraction of cases, because of the predictability afforded by the depth of decided cases. For example, London is considered the pre-eminent centre for litigation of admiralty cases.[26]

This is not to say that common law is better in every situation. For example, civil law can be clearer than case law when the legislature has had the foresight and diligence to address the precise set of facts applicable to a particular situation. For that reason, civil law statutes tend to be somewhat more detailed than statutes written by common law legislatures – but, conversely, that tends to make the statute more difficult to read (the United States tax code is an example).[27] Nonetheless, as a practical matter, no civil law legislature can ever address the full spectrum of factual possibilities in the breadth, depth and detail of the case law of the common law courts of even a smaller jurisdiction, and that deeper, more complete body of law provides additional predictability that promotes commerce.

[edit]History

The term "common law" originally derives from after the Norman Conquest. The "common law" was the law that emerged as "common" throughout the realm, as the king's judges imposed a unified common law throughout England. The doctrine of precedent developed under the inquisitorial system in England during the 12th and 13th centuries,[28] as the

collective judicial decisions that were based in tradition, custom and precedent. Such forms of legal institutions and culture bear resemblance to those that existed historically in societies where precedent and custom played a role in the legal process, including Germanic law.[29]

The form of reasoning used in common law is known as casuistry or case-based reasoning. The common law, as applied in civil cases (as distinct from criminal cases), was devised as a means of compensating someone for wrongful acts known as torts, including both intentional torts and torts caused by negligence, and as developing the body of law recognizing and regulating contracts. The type of procedure practiced in common law courts is known as the adversarial system; this is also a development of the common law.  
[edit]Medieval English common law

See also: English law

This section needs additional citations for verification.

Please help improve this article by adding reliable references. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. (February 2008)

Before the Norman conquest in 1066, justice was administered primarily by county courts, presided by the diocesan bishop and the sheriff, exercising both ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction.[30] Trial by jury began in these courts.[30][citation needed]

In 1154, Henry II became the first Plantagenet king. Among many achievements, Henry institutionalized common law by creating a unified system of law "common" to the country through incorporating and elevating local custom to the national, ending local control and peculiarities, eliminating arbitrary remedies and reinstating a jury system – citizens sworn on oath to investigate reliable criminal accusations and civil claims. The jury reached its verdict through evaluating common local knowledge, not necessarily through the presentation of evidence, a distinguishing factor from today's civil and criminal court systems.

Henry II developed the practice of sending judges from his own central court to hear the various disputes throughout the country. His judges would resolve disputes on an ad hoc basis according to what they interpreted the customs to be. The king's judges would then return to London and often discuss their cases and the decisions they made with the other judges. These decisions would be recorded and filed. In time, a rule, known as *stare decisis* (also commonly known as precedent) developed, whereby a judge would be bound to follow the decision of an earlier judge; he was required to adopt the earlier judge's interpretation of the law and apply the same principles promulgated by that earlier judge if the two cases had similar facts to one another. Once judges began to regard each other's decisions to be binding precedent, the pre-Norman system of local customs and law varying in each locality was replaced by a system that was (at least in theory, though not always in practice) common throughout the whole country, hence the name "common law."

Henry II's creation of a powerful and unified court system, which curbed somewhat the power of canonical (church) courts, brought him (and England) into conflict with the church, most famously with Thomas Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Eventually, Becket was murdered inside Canterbury Cathedral by four knights who believed themselves to be acting on Henry's behalf. Whether Henry actually intended to bring about the assassination of Becket is debatable, but there is no question that at the time of the murder, the two men were embroiled in a bitter dispute regarding the power of Royal Courts to exercise jurisdiction over former clergymen. The murder of the Archbishop gave rise to a wave of popular outrage against the King. Henry was forced to repeal the disputed laws and to abandon his efforts to hold church members accountable for secular crimes (see also

Constitutions of Clarendon).

Judge-made common law operated as the primary source of law for several hundred years, before Parliament acquired legislative powers to create statutory law. It is important to understand that common law is the older and more traditional source of law, and legislative power is simply a layer applied on top of the older common law foundation. Since the 12th century, courts have had parallel and co-equal authority to make law<sup>[31]</sup> -- "legislating from the bench" is a traditional and essential function of courts, which was carried over into the U.S. system as an essential component of the "judicial power" specified by Article III of the U.S. constitution.<sup>[32]</sup> Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. observed in 1917 that "judges do and must legislate."<sup>[33]</sup> There are legitimate debates on how the powers of courts and legislatures should be balanced. However, a view that courts lack law-making power is historically inaccurate and constitutionally unsupportable.

[edit]Influences of foreign legal systems

[edit]Roman law

The term "common law" is often used as a contrast to Roman-derived "civil law" (connotation 2), and the fundamental processes and forms of reasoning in the two are quite different. Nonetheless, there has been considerable cross-fertilization of ideas, while the two traditions and sets of foundational principles remain distinct.

By the time of the rediscovery of the Roman law in Europe in the 12th and 13th centuries, the common law had already developed far enough to prevent a Roman law reception as it occurred on the continent.<sup>[34]</sup> However, the first common law scholars, most notably Glanvill and Bracton, as well as the early royal common law judges, had been well accustomed with Roman law. Often, they were clerics trained in the Roman canon law.<sup>[35]</sup> One of the first and throughout its history one of the most significant treatises of the common law, Bracton's *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae* (On the Laws and Customs of England), was heavily influenced by the division of the law in Justinian's Institutes.<sup>[36]</sup> The impact Roman law had decreased sharply after the age of Bracton, but the Roman divisions of actions into in rem and in personam used by Bracton had a lasting effect and laid the groundwork for a return of Roman law structural concepts in the 18th and 19th centuries. Signs of this can be found in Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England,<sup>[37]</sup> and Roman law ideas regained importance with the revival of academic law schools in the 19th century.<sup>[38]</sup> As a result, today, the main systematic divisions of the law into property, contract, and tort (and to some extent unjust enrichment) can be found in the civil law as well as in the common law.<sup>[39]</sup>

[edit]Propagation of the common law to the colonies and Commonwealth by reception statutes

[edit]Initial reception of English common law into new colonies

In Commentaries on the Laws of England (Bk I, ch.4, pp 106–108), Sir William Blackstone described the process by which English common law followed English colonization:

Plantations or colonies, in distant countries, are either such where the lands are claimed by right of occupancy only, by finding them desert and uncultivated, and peopling them from the mother-country; or where, when already cultivated, they have been either gained by conquest, or ceded to us by treaties. And both these rights are founded upon the law of nature, or at least upon that of nations.

But there is a difference between these two species of colonies, with respect to the laws by which they are bound. For it hath been held, that if an uninhabited country be discovered and planted by English subjects, all the English laws then in being, which are the birthright

of every subject, are immediately there in force... But in conquered or ceded countries, that have already laws of their own, the king may indeed alter and change those laws; but, till he does actually change them, the ancient laws of the country remain, unless such as are against the law of God, as in the case of an infidel country.

In other words, if an 'uninhabited' or 'infidel' territory is colonized by Britain, then the English law automatically applies in this territory from the moment of colonization; however if the colonized territory has a pre-existing legal system, the native law would apply (effectively a form of indirect rule) until formally superseded by the English law, through Royal Prerogative subjected to the Westminster Parliament.

[edit]Reception statutes as a step in decolonization

As colonies gained independence from Britain, most adopted British common law as the basis for their legal systems. In most cases, newly independent colonies received common law precedent as of the date independence as the default law, to the extent not explicitly rejected by the newly freed colony's founding documents or government.

For example, following the American Revolution in 1776, one of the first legislative acts undertaken by each of the newly independent states was to adopt a "reception statute" that gave legal effect to the existing body of British common law to the extent that American legislation or the Constitution had not explicitly rejected British law.[40] Some states enacted reception statutes as legislative statutes, while other states received the English common law through provisions of the state's constitution, and some by court decision.

\*\*British traditions such as the monarchy were rejected by the U.S. Constitution, but many British common law traditions such as habeas corpus, jury trials, and various other civil liberties were adopted in the United States. Significant elements of British common law prior to 1776 still remain in effect in many jurisdictions in the United States, because they have never been rejected by American courts or legislatures.[41]

For example, the New York Constitution of 1777[42] provides that:

[S]uch parts of the common law of England, and of the statute law of England and Great Britain, and of the acts of the legislature of the colony of New York, as together did form the law of the said colony on the 19th day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five, shall be and continue the law of this State, subject to such alterations and provisions as the legislature of this State shall, from time to time, make concerning the same.

Alexander Hamilton emphasized in *The Federalist* that this New York constitutional provision expressly made the common law subject "to such alterations and provisions as the legislature shall from time to time make concerning the same." [43] Thus, even when reception was effected by a constitution, the common law was still subject to alteration by a legislature's statute.

One could note a certain irony: one of the first acts of many of the newly independent states was to adopt the law of the foreign sovereign from whom independence had just been gained. But this is one more demonstration of the point mentioned above (Commercial economies), that the newly independent states recognized the importance of a predictable and established body of law to govern the conduct of citizens and businesses, and therefore adopted the richest available source of law.

The Northwest Ordinance, which was approved by the Congress of the Confederation in

1787, guaranteed "judicial proceedings according to the course of the common law." Nathan Dane, the primary author of the Northwest Ordinance, viewed this provision as a default mechanism in the event that federal or territorial statutes were silent about a particular matter; he wrote that if "a statute makes an offence, and is silent as to the mode of trial, it shall be by jury, according to the course of the common law."<sup>[44]</sup> In effect, the provision operated as a reception statute, giving legal authority to the established common law in the vast territories where no states had yet been established.

Over time, as new states were formed from federal territories, these territorial reception statutes became obsolete and were re-enacted as state law. For example, a reception statute enacted by legislation in the state of Washington requires that "[t]he common law, so far as it is not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, or of the state of Washington nor incompatible with the institutions and condition of society in this state, shall be the rule of decision in all the courts of this state."<sup>[45]</sup> In this way, the common law was eventually incorporated into the legal systems of every state except Louisiana (which inherited a civil law system from its French colonizers before the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, adopting a code similar to but not directly based on the Napoleonic Code of 1804).

The pattern was repeated in many other former British colonies as they gained independence from the United Kingdom. Republic of Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, Belize, and various Caribbean and African nations have adopted English common law through reception statutes.

#### [edit]Reception in Hong Kong

For example, when Hong Kong was returned to China in 1997, Hong Kong retained the common law through a reception statute in Chapter I, Article 8 of the Basic Law of Hong Kong:<sup>[46]</sup>

The laws previously in force in Hong Kong, that is, the common law, rules of equity, ordinances, subordinate legislation and customary law shall be maintained, except for any that contravene this Law, and subject to any amendment by the legislature of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

#### [edit]Decline of Latin maxims, and adding flexibility to stare decisis

Well into the 19th century, ancient maxims played a large role in common law adjudication. Many of these maxims had originated in Roman Law, migrated to England before the introduction of Christianity to the British Isles, and were typically stated in Latin even in English decisions. Many examples are familiar in everyday speech even today, "One cannot be a judge in one's own cause" (see *Dr. Bonham's Case*), rights are reciprocal to obligations, and the like. Judicial decisions and treatises of the 17th and 18th centuries, such as those of Lord Chief Justice Edward Coke, presented the common law as a collection of such maxims. See also Thomas Jefferson's letter to Thomas Cooper.

Reliance on old maxims and rigid adherence to precedent, no matter how old or ill-considered, was under full attack by the late 19th century. Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. in his famous article, "The Path of the Law," 10 *Harvard L.Rev.* 457, 469 (1897), commented, "It is revolting to have no better reason for a rule of law than that so it was laid down in the time of Henry IV. It is still more revolting if the grounds upon which it was laid down have vanished long since, and the rule simply persists from blind imitation of the past."

Justice Holmes noted that study of maxims might be sufficient for "the man of the present,"

but "the man of the future is the man of statistics and the master of economics." In an 1880 lecture at Harvard, he noted "The life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience. The felt necessities of the time, the prevalent moral and political theories, intuitions of public policy, avowed or unconscious, even the prejudices which judges share with their fellow men, have had a good deal more to do than the syllogism in determining the rules by which men should be governed. The law embodies the story of a nation's development through many centuries, and it cannot be dealt with as if it contained only the axioms and corollaries of a book of mathematics."

In the early 20th century, Louis Brandeis, later appointed to the United States Supreme Court, became noted for his use of policy-driving facts and economics in his briefs, and extensive appendices presenting facts that lead a judge to the advocate's conclusion. By this time, briefs relied more on facts than on hoary Latin maxims.

Reliance on old maxims is now deprecated.[47] Common law decisions today reflect both precedent and policy judgment drawn from economics, the social sciences, business, decisions of foreign courts, and the like. The degree to which these external factors should influence adjudication is the subject of active debate, but that judges do draw of learning from other fields and jurisdictions is a fact of modern legal life.

[edit]1870 through 20th century, and the procedural merger of law and equity

As early as the 15th century, it became the practice that litigants who felt they had been cheated by the common-law system would petition the King in person. For example, they might argue that an award of damages (at common law) was not sufficient redress for a trespasser occupying their land, and instead request that the trespasser be evicted. From this developed the system of equity, administered by the Lord Chancellor, in the courts of chancery. By their nature, equity and law were frequently in conflict and litigation would frequently continue for years as one court countermanded the other,[48] even though it was established by the 17th century that equity should prevail. A famous example is the fictional case of Jarndyce and Jarndyce in *Bleak House*, by Charles Dickens.[49]

In England, courts of law and equity were combined by the Judicature Acts of 1873 and 1875, with equity being supreme in case of conflict.[49]

In the United States, parallel systems of law (providing money damages, with cases heard by a jury upon either party's request) and equity (fashioning a remedy to fit the situation, including injunctive relief, heard by a judge) survived well into the 20th century. The United States federal courts procedurally separated law and equity: the same judges could hear either kind of case, but a given case could only pursue causes in law or in equity, and the two kinds of cases proceeded under different procedural rules. This became problematic when a given case required both money damages and injunctive relief. In 1937, the new Federal Rules of Civil Procedure combined law and equity into one form of action, the "civil action." Fed.R.Civ.P. 2. The distinction survives to the extent that issues that were "common law" as of 1791 (the date of adoption of the Seventh Amendment) are still subject to the right of either party to request a jury, and "equity" issues are decided by a judge.[50]

Alabama, Delaware, Mississippi, New Jersey, Tennessee still have separate courts of law and equity, for example, the Court of Chancery. In many states there are separate divisions for law and equity within one court.

[edit]Common law pleading and its abolition in the early 20th century

For centuries, through the 19th century, the common law recognized only specific causes of action, and required very careful drafting of the opening pleading to slot into one of them: Debt, Detinue, Covenant, Special Assumpsit, General Assumpsit, Trespass, Trover, Replevin, Case (or Trespass on the Case), and Ejectment.[51] To initiate a law suit, a pleading had to be drafted to meet myriad technical requirements: correctly categorizing the case into the correct legal pigeonhole (pleading in the alternative was not permitted), and using specific "magic words" encrusted over the centuries. Under the old common law pleading standards, a suit by a pro se ("for oneself," without a lawyer) party was all but impossible, and there was often considerable procedural jousting at the outset of a case over minor wording issues.

One of the major reforms of the late 19th century and early 20th century was the abolition of common law pleading requirements.[52] A plaintiff can initiate a case by giving the defendant "a short and plain statement" of facts that constitute an alleged wrong. This reform moved the attention of courts from technical scrutiny of words to a more rational consideration of the actual facts, and opened access to justice far more broadly.

[edit]Contrasts between common law and civil law systems

[edit]Adversarial system vs. inquisitorial system

Common law courts tend to use an adversarial system, in which two sides present their cases to a neutral judge. In contrast, in civil law systems, inquisitorial system proceedings, where an examining magistrate serves two roles by developing the evidence and arguments for one and the other side during the investigation phase.

The examining magistrate then presents the dossier detailing his or her findings to the president of the bench that will adjudicate on the case where it has been decided that a trial shall be conducted. Therefore the president of the bench's view of the case is not neutral and may be biased while conducting the trial after the reading of the dossier. Unlike the common law proceedings, the president of the bench in the inquisitorial system is not merely an umpire and is entitled to directly interview the witnesses or express comments during the trial, as long as he or she does not express his or her view on the guilt of the accused.

The proceeding in the inquisitorial system is essentially by writing. Most of the witnesses would have given evidence in the investigation phase and such evidence will be contained in the dossier under the form of police reports. In the same way, the accused would have already put his or her case at the investigation phase but he or she will be free to change his evidence at trial. Whether the accused pleads guilty or not, a trial will be conducted. Unlike the adversarial system, the conviction and sentence to served (if any) will be released by the trial jury together with the president of the trial bench, following their common deliberation.

There are many exceptions in both directions. For example, most proceedings before U.S. federal and state agencies are inquisitorial in nature, at least the initial stages (e.g., a patent examiner, a social security hearing officer, etc.) even though the law to be applied is developed through common law processes.

[edit]Contrasting role of treatises and academic writings in common law and civil law systems

The role of the legal academy presents a significant "cultural" difference between common

law (connotation 2) and civil law jurisdictions.

In common law jurisdictions, legal treatises compile common law decisions, and state overarching principles that (in the author's opinion) explain the results of the cases. However, in common law jurisdictions, treatises are not the law, and lawyers and judges tend to use these treatises as only "finding aids" to locate the relevant cases. In common law jurisdictions, scholarly work is seldom cited as authority for what the law is.[53] When common law courts rely on scholarly work, it is almost always only for factual findings, policy justification, or the history and evolution of the law, but the court's legal conclusion is reached through analysis of relevant statutes and common law, seldom scholarly commentary.

In contrast, in civil law jurisdictions, the writings of law professors are given significant weight by courts. In part, this is because civil law decisions traditionally were very brief, sometimes no more than a paragraph stating who wins and who loses. The rationale has to come from somewhere else, and the academy often filled that role. As civil law court decisions move in the direction of common law reasoning, it is possible that this balance may shift.

[edit]Common law legal systems in the present day

Legal Systems of the World

Civil law

Common law

Bijuridical (civil and common law)

Customary law

Fiqh

The common law constitutes the basis of the legal systems of: England and Wales, Northern Ireland, Ireland, federal law in the United States and the law of individual U.S. states (except Louisiana), federal law throughout Canada and the law of the individual provinces and territories (except Quebec), Australia (both federal and individual states), Kenya, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Malaysia, Brunei, Pakistan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and many other generally English-speaking countries or Commonwealth countries (except Scotland, which is bijuridicial, and Malta).

Essentially, every country that was colonised at some time by England, Great Britain, or the United Kingdom uses common law except those that were formerly colonised by other nations, such as Quebec (which follows the law of France in part), South Africa and Sri Lanka (which follow Roman Dutch law), where the prior civil law system was retained to respect the civil rights of the local colonists. India's uses common law except in the state of Goa which retains the Portuguese civil code.

[edit]Scotland (1707)

Scotland is often said to use the civil law system but it has a unique system that combines elements of an uncoded civil law dating back to the Corpus Juris Civilis with an element of common law long predating the Treaty of Union with England in 1707 (see Legal institutions of Scotland in the High Middle Ages). Scots common law differs in that the use of precedents is subject to the courts' seeking to discover the principle that justifies a law rather searching for an example as a precedent, and principles of natural justice and fairness have always played a role in Scots Law. Comparable pluralistic (or 'mixed') legal systems operate in Quebec, Louisiana and South Africa.

[edit]States of the United States (1775 on)

The state of New York, which also has a civil law history from its Dutch colonial days, also began a codification of its law in the 19th century. The only part of this codification process that was considered complete is known as the Field Code applying to civil procedure. The original colony of New Netherland was settled by the Dutch and the law was also Dutch. When the English captured pre-existing colonies they continued to allow the local settlers to keep their civil law. However, the Dutch settlers revolted against the English and the colony was recaptured by the Dutch. When the English finally regained control of New Netherland they forced, as a punishment unique in the history of the British Empire, the English common law upon all the colonists, including the Dutch. This was problematic, as the patroon system of land holding, based on the feudal system and civil law, continued to operate in the colony until it was abolished in the mid-19th century. The influence of Roman Dutch law continued in the colony well into the late 19th century. The codification of a law of general obligations shows how remnants of the civil law tradition in New York continued on from the Dutch days.

The U.S. state of California has a system based on common law, but it has codified the law in the manner of the civil law jurisdictions. The reason for the enactment of the codes in California in the 19th century was to replace a pre-existing system based on Spanish civil law with a system based on common law, similar to that in most other states. California and a number of other Western states, however, have retained the concept of community property derived from civil law. The California courts have treated portions of the codes as an extension of the common-law tradition, subject to judicial development in the same manner as judge-made common law. (Most notably, in the case *Li v. Yellow Cab Co.*, 13 Cal.3d 804 (1975), the California Supreme Court adopted the principle of comparative negligence in the face of a California Civil Code provision codifying the traditional common-law doctrine of contributory negligence.)

Instead of common law, the U.S. state of Louisiana uniquely uses a system based on the Napoleonic code, remaining true to the state's French and Spanish roots, which predate the U.S. annexation of the Louisiana territory in 1803. Historically notable among the code's differences from the more typically implemented system of common law is the role of property rights among women, particularly in inheritance gained by widows.

[edit]United States federal system (1789 and 1938)

The United States federal government (as opposed to the states) only partially has a common law system. United States federal courts only act as interpreters of statutes and the constitution by elaborating and precisely defining the broad language (connotation 1(b) above), but, unlike state courts, do not act as an independent source of common law (connotation 1(a) above).

Before 1938, the federal courts, like almost all other common law courts, decided the law on any issue where the relevant legislature (either the U.S. Congress or state legislature, depending on the issue), had not acted, by looking to courts in the same system, that is, other federal courts, even on issues of state law, and even where there was no express grant of authority from Congress or the Constitution.

In 1938, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Erie Railroad Co. v. Tompkins* 304 U.S. 64, 78 (1938), overruled earlier precedent,<sup>[54]</sup> and held "There is no federal general common law," thus confining the federal courts to act only as interpreters of law originating elsewhere. E.g.,

*Texas Industries v. Radcliff*, 451 U.S. 630 (1981) (without an express grant of statutory authority, federal courts cannot create rules of intuitive justice, for example, a right to contribution from co-conspirators). Post-1938, federal courts deciding issues that arise under state law are required to defer to state court interpretations of state statutes, or reason what a state's highest court would rule if presented with the issue, or to certify the question to the state's highest court for resolution.

Later courts have limited *Erie* slightly, to create a few situations where United States federal courts are permitted to create federal common law rules without express statutory authority, for example, where a federal rule of decision is necessary to protect uniquely federal interests. See, e.g., *Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States*, 318 U.S. 363 (1943) (giving federal courts the authority to fashion common law rules with respect to issues of federal power, in this case negotiable instruments backed by the federal government); see also *International News Service v. Associated Press*, 248 U.S. 215 (1918) (creating a cause of action for misappropriation of "hot news" that lacks any statutory grounding, but that is one of the handful of federal common law actions that survives today); *National Basketball Association v. Motorola, Inc.*, 105 F.3d 841, 843-44, 853 (2d Cir. 1997) (noting continued vitality of INS "hot news" tort under New York state law, but leaving open the question of whether it survives under federal law). Except on Constitutional issues, Congress is free to legislatively overrule federal courts' common law.[55]

[edit]India (1857)

The Constitution of India is the longest written constitution for a country, containing 395 articles, 12 schedules, numerous amendments and 117,369 words.

Indian Law is largely based on English common law because of the long period of British colonial influence during the period of the British Raj.

After the failed rebellion against the British in 1857, the British Parliament took over the reign of India from the British East India Company, and British India came under the direct rule of the Crown. The British Parliament passed the Government of India Act of 1858 to this effect, which set up the structure of British government in India. It established in England the office of the Secretary of State for India through whom the Parliament would exercise its rule, along with a Council of India to aid him. It also established the office of the Governor-General of India along with an Executive Council in India, which consisted of high officials of the British Government.

Much of contemporary Indian law shows substantial European and American influence. Various legislations first introduced by the British are still in effect in their modified forms today. During the drafting of the Indian Constitution, laws from Ireland, the United States, Britain, and France were all synthesized to get a refined set of Indian laws, as it currently stands. Indian laws also adhere to the United Nations guidelines on human rights law and the environmental law. Certain international trade laws, such as those on intellectual property, are also enforced in India.

Indian family law is complex, with each religion adhering to its own specific laws. In most states, registering marriages and divorces is not compulsory. There are separate laws governing Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs and followers of other religions. The exception to this rule is in the state of Goa, where a Portuguese uniform civil code is in place, in which all religions have a common law regarding marriages, divorces and adoption.

Ancient India represented a distinct tradition of law, and had an historically independent

school of legal theory and practice. The Arthashastra, dating from 400 BC and the Manusmriti, from 100 AD, were influential treatises in India, texts that were considered authoritative legal guidance.[56] Manu's central philosophy was tolerance and pluralism, and was cited across Southeast Asia.[57] Early in this period, which finally culminated in the creation of the Gupta Empire, relations with ancient Greece and Rome were not infrequent. The appearance of similar fundamental institutions of international law in various parts of the world show that they are inherent in international society, irrespective of culture and tradition.[58] Inter-State relations in the pre-Islamic period resulted in clear-cut rules of warfare of a high humanitarian standard, in rules of neutrality, of treaty law, of customary law embodied in religious charters, in exchange of embassies of a temporary or semi-permanent character.[59] When India became part of the British Empire, there was a break in tradition, and Hindu and Islamic law were supplanted by the common law.[60] As a result, the present judicial system of the country derives largely from the British system and has little correlation to the institutions of the pre-British era.[61]

There are 1160 laws as on September 2007[62]

[edit]Canada (1867)

All but one of the provinces of Canada use a common law system (the exception being Quebec, which uses a civil law system for issues arising within provincial jurisdiction). Criminal law, which is uniform throughout Canada, is based on the common law as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada. The mid-tier Federal Court of Appeal is a single court that sits and hears cases in multiple cities, and thus mid-tier decisions have precedential value throughout Canada (that is, unlike the United States, Canada is not divided into appellate circuits).[63] Canadian federal statutes, when they refer to matters that are within provincial jurisdiction, such as property ownership, must use the terminology of both the common law and civil law for those matters; this is referred to as legislative bijuralism.[64]

[edit]Nicaragua

Nicaragua's legal system also is a mixture of the English Common Law and the Civil Law through the influence of British administration of the Eastern half of the country from the mid-17th century until about 1905, the William Walker period from about 1855 through 1857, USA interventions/occupations during the period from 1909 to 1933, the influence of USA institutions during the Somoza family administrations (1933 through 1979) and the considerable importation between 1979 and the present of USA culture and institutions.

[edit]Israel (1948)

Israel has a mixed system of common law and civil law. While Israeli law is undergoing codification, its basic principles are inherited from the law of the British Mandate of Palestine and thus resemble those of British and American law, namely: the role of courts in creating the body of law and the authority of the supreme court in reviewing and if necessary overturning legislative and executive decisions, as well as employing the adversarial system. One of the primary reasons that the Israeli constitution remains unwritten is the fear by whatever party holds power that creating a written constitution, combined with the common-law elements, would severely limit the powers of the Knesset (which, following the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, holds near-unlimited power).[65]

[edit]Alternatives to common law systems

The main alternative to the common law system is the civil law system, which is used in Continental Europe, and most of the rest of the world. The contrast between civil law and common law legal systems has become increasingly blurred, with the growing importance of

jurisprudence (almost like case law but in name) in civil law countries, and the growing importance of statute law and codes in common law countries.

Examples of common law being replaced by statute or codified rule in the United States include criminal law (since 1812, U.S. courts have held that criminal law must be embodied in statute if the public is to have fair notice), commercial law (the Uniform Commercial Code in the early 1960s) and procedure (the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in the 1930s and the Federal Rules of Evidence in the 1970s). But note that in each case, the statute sets the general principles, but the common law process determines the scope and application of the statute.

An example of convergence from the other direction is shown in *Srl CILFIT and Lanificio di Gavardo SpA v Ministry of Health* (Corte suprema di Cassazione, Italy, 1982), in which Italy's Supreme Court held that questions it has already answered need not be resubmitted. This brought in a distinctly common law principle into an essentially civil law jurisdiction. As the Italian courts continue to follow this precedent and assume that the Supreme Court's rulings have precedential value.[clarification needed sentence fragment]

The former Soviet Bloc and other Socialist countries used a Socialist law system.

[edit]Scholarly works

Sir William Blackstone as illustrated in his *Commentaries on the Laws of England*. Lord Chief Justice Edward Coke, a 17th-century English jurist and Member of Parliament, wrote several legal texts that formed the basis for the modern common law, with lawyers in both England and America learning their law from his *Institutes and Reports* until the end of the 18th century. His works are still cited by common law courts around the world.

The next definitive historical treatise on the common law is *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, written by Sir William Blackstone and first published in 1765 - 1769. Since 1979, a facsimile edition of that first edition has been available in four paper-bound volumes. Today it has been superseded in the English part of the United Kingdom by Halsbury's *Laws of England* that covers both common and statutory English law.

While he was still on the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, and before being named to the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. published a short volume called *The Common Law*, which remains a classic in the field. Unlike Blackstone and the Restatements, Holmes' book only briefly discusses what the law is; rather, Holmes describes the common law process. Law professor John Chipman Gray's *The Nature and Sources of the Law*, an examination and survey of the common law, is also still commonly read in U.S. law schools.

In the United States, Restatements of various subject matter areas (Contracts, Torts, Judgments, etc.), edited by the American Law Institute, collect the common law for the area. The ALI Restatements are often cited by American courts and lawyers for propositions of uncodified common law, and are considered highly persuasive authority, just below binding precedential decisions. The *Corpus Juris Secundum* is an encyclopedia whose main content is a compendium of the common law and its variations throughout the various state jurisdictions.

Scots common law covers matters including murder and theft, and has sources in custom, in legal writings and previous court decisions. The legal writings used are called Institutional Texts and come mostly from the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. Examples include Craig, *Jus Feudale* (1655) and Stair, *The Institutions of the Law of Scotland* (1681).

[edit]See also

Anglo-Saxon law  
Common law offences  
Alimony  
Doom book, or Code of Alfred the Great  
Arraignment  
Civil law (legal system)  
Common-law marriage  
Russian law  
English law  
Grand jury  
Jury trial  
List of legal topics  
Scots law  
List of legal doctrines  
Rule of law  
Rule According to Higher Law  
[edit]References

^ Washington Probate, "Estate Planning & Probate Glossary", Washington (State) Probate, s.v. "common law", [htm], 8 Dec. 2008:

,  
retrieved on 7 November 2009.

^ Charles Arnold-Baker, *The Companion to British History*, s.v. "English Law" (London: Routledge, 2001), 386.

^ *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) ("It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases, must of necessity expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each.")

^ <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/188090/English-law> British History: Middle Ages "Common Law - Henry II and the Birth of a State". BBC. Retrieved 2009-07-23.

^ "India, being a common law country" (PDF). Retrieved 2010-05-30.

^ "The Common Law in the World: the Australian Experience". W3.uniroma1.it. Retrieved 2010-05-30.

^ a b Garner 177

^ a b Salmond 32

^ a b Garner 178

^ "5. The judges are forbidden to pronounce, by way of general and legislative determination, on the causes submitted to them." Code of Napoleon, Law 5

^ Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, Rule 2 ("There is one form of action—the civil action.") (1938)

^ Friedman xix

^ "In Suits at common law ... the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

^ e.g., *Ex parte Holt*, 19 USPQ2d 1211, 1214 (Bd. Patent App. & Interf. 1991) (explaining the hierarchy of precedent binding on tribunals of the United States Patent Office)

^ The beneficial qualities of the common law's incrementalist evolution was most eloquently expressed by the future Lord Mansfield, then Solicitor General Murray, in the case of

Omychund v. Barker, who contended that "a statute very seldom can take in all cases; therefore the common law, that works itself pure by rules drawn from the fountain of justice, is for that reason superior to an act of parliament." 1 Atk. 21, 33, 26 Eng. Rep. 15, 22-23 (Ch. 1744)

^ E.g., Uniform Commercial Code, Article 2, on Contracts for the Sales of Goods

^ Model Penal Code as adopted in several states, for example, New York's Penal Law

^ Graham Hughes, Common Law Systems, § VII, collected in Alan B. Morrison, Fundamentals of American Law, p. 23-24, Oxford University Press (1996).

^ To consider one example, *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971), resolves one part of the tension between the "establishment" and "free exercise" clauses of the First Amendment with a three part test: a government-sponsored message violates the Establishment Clause if: (1) it does not have a secular purpose; (2) its principal or primary effect advances or inhibits religion; or (3) it creates an excessive entanglement of the government with religion..

^ *Johnson v. Commonwealth*, 209 Va. 291, 293, 163 S.E.2d 570, \_\_\_ (1968)

^ E.g., *South Corp. v. United States*, 690 F.2d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1982) (en banc in relevant part) (explaining order of precedent binding on the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit); *Bonner v. City of Prichard, Alabama*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc) (after the Eleventh Circuit was split off from the Fifth Circuit, adopting precedent of Fifth Circuit as binding until overruled by the Eleventh Circuit en banc: "The [pre-split] Fifth followed the absolute rule that a prior decision of the circuit (panel or en banc) could not be overruled by a panel but only by the court sitting en banc. The Eleventh Circuit decides in this case that it chooses, and will follow, this rule."); *Ex parte Holt*, 19 USPQ2d 1211, 1214 (Bd. Patent App. & Interf. 1991) (explaining the hierarchy of precedent binding on tribunals of the United States Patent Office).

^ 83 Cr App R 191, 73 Cr App R 266

^ See, e.g., Yeo Tiong Min, "A Note on Some Differences in English Law, New York Law, and Singapore Law" (2006).

^ Theodore Eisenberg & Geoffrey P. Miller, *The Flight to New York: An Empirical Study of Choice of Law and Choice of Forum Clauses in Publicly-Held Companies' Contracts* (2008). New York University Law and Economics Working Papers. Paper 124, [http://lsr.nellco.org/nyu\\_lewp/124](http://lsr.nellco.org/nyu_lewp/124) (based on a survey of 2882 contracts, "New York law plays a role for major corporate contracts similar to the role Delaware law plays in the limited setting of corporate governance disputes.")

^ Eisenberg & Miller

^ Osley, Richard (2008-11-23). "London becomes litigation capital of the world". *The Independent* (London).

^ U.S. Internal Revenue Service, Taxpayer Advocate Service, 2008 Report to Congress, [http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-utl/08\\_tas\\_arc\\_msp\\_1.pdf](http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-utl/08_tas_arc_msp_1.pdf)

^ Jeffery, Clarence Ray (1957). "The Development of Crime in Early English Society". *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* (The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 47, No. 6) 47 (6): 647-666. doi:10.2307/1140057.

^ see Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., *The Common Law*, Lecture I, sec. 2, "In Massachusetts today...there are some (rules) which can only be understood by reference to the infancy of procedure among the German tribes."

^ a b "Common Law". *Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. 1913.

^ William Burnham, *Introduction to the Law and Legal System of the United States*, 4th ed. (St. Paul, Thomson West, 2006), 42.

^ E.g., *MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.*, 217 N.Y. 382, 111 N.E. 1050 (N.Y. 1916) (discussed above, adjudicating the tort of negligence that existed in no statute, and expanding the law to cover parties that had never been addressed by statute); *Hadley v Baxendale* (1854) 9 Exch 341 (defining a new rule of contract law with no basis in statute); *Marbury v. Madison*, 137 U.S. 137 (1803) ("It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department

to say what the law is."); Alexander Hamilton, *THE FEDERALIST*, Nos. 78 and 81 (J. Cooke ed. 1961), 521-530, 541-55 ("The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A constitution, is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law. It therefore belongs to them to ascertain its meaning, as well as the meaning of any particular act proceeding from the legislative body."); see rule against perpetuities for a judicially created law originating in 1682 that governs the validity of trusts and future interests in real property, Rule in Shelley's Case for a rule created by judges in 1366 or before, and life estate and fee simple for rules of real property ownership that were judicially created in the late 1100's as the crown began to give law-making power to courts.

- ^ *Southern Pacific Co. v. Jensen*, 244 U.S. 205, 221 (1917) (Holmes, J., dissenting).
- ^ E.g., R. C. van Caenegem, *The Birth of the English Common Law* 89-92 (1988).
- ^ E.g., Peter Birks, Grant McLeod, *Justinian's Institutes* 7 (1987).
- ^ E.g., George E. Woodbine (ed.), Samuel E. Thorne (transl.), *Bracton on the Laws and Customs of England*, Vol. I (Introduction) 46 (1968); Carl Güterbock, *Bracton and his Relation to the Roman Law* 35-38 (1866).
- ^ Stephen P. Buhofer, *Structuring the Law: The Common Law and the Roman Institutional System*, *Swiss Review of International and European Law (SZIER/RSDIE)* 5/2007, 24 (download at <http://www.szier.ch> - archive).
- ^ Peter Stein, *Continental Influences on English Legal thought, 1600 - 1900*, in Peter Stein, *The Character and Influence of the Roman Civil Law* 223 et seq. (1988).
- ^ See generally Stephen P. Buhofer, *Structuring the Law: The Common Law and the Roman Institutional System*, *Swiss Review of International and European Law (SZIER/RSDIE)* 5/2007 (download at <http://www.szier.ch> - archive).
- ^ Glenn Lammi and James Chang, "Michigan High Court Ruling Offers Positive Guidance on Challenges to Tort Reform Laws" (December 17, 2004).
- ^ *Milestones! 200 Years of American Law: Milestones in Our Legal History* By Jethro Koller Lieberman Published by West, 1976 Original from the University of California Digitized Jun 11, 2008 ISBN 0-19-519881-6, 9780195198812, pg. 16 [1]
- ^ *New York Constitution of 1777* via Avalon Project at Yale Law School.
- ^ Alexander Hamilton, *Federalist* 84 (1788).
- ^ Nathan Dane, 6 *General Abridgment and Digest of American Law* §182, art. 5, 230 (Cummings, Hilliard & Co. 1823).
- ^ *Washington Legal Foundation v. Legal Foundation of Washington*, 271 F.3d 835 (9th Cir. 2001).
- ^ "Chapter I, Section 8 of Hong Kong Basic Law". *Basiclaw.gov.hk*. 2008-03-17. Retrieved 2010-05-30.
- ^ *Acree v. Republic of Iraq*, 370 F.3d 41 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (Roberts, J., concurring).
- ^ *Salmond* 34
- ^ a b Lobban, M. (2004). "Preparing for Fusion: Reforming the Nineteenth-Century Court of Chancery, Part II". *Law and History Review*. University of Illinois.
- ^ E.g., *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 370, 376 (1996) ("[W]e [the U.S. Supreme Court] have understood that the right of trial by jury thus preserved is the right which existed under the English common law when the Amendment was adopted. In keeping with our longstanding adherence to this 'historical test,' we ask, first, whether we are dealing with a cause of action that either was tried at law at the time of the founding or is at least analogous to one that was. If the action in question belongs in the law category, we then ask whether the particular trial decision must fall to the jury in order to preserve the substance of the common-law right as it existed in 1791." citations and quotations omitted, holding that interpretation of the scope of a patent had no analogy in 1790, and is thus a question to be decided by a judge, not a jury)
- ^ John Jay McKelvey, *Principles of Common Law Pleading* (1894).
- ^ Note that the remainder of the "common law" discussed in the rest of the article remained intact; all that was abolished were the highly technical requirements for language of the

paper provided by the plaintiff to the defendant to initiate a case.

^ At least in the U.S., practicing lawyers tend to use "law professor" or "law review article" as a pejorative to describe a person or work that is insufficiently grounded in reality or practicality - every young lawyer is admonished repeatedly by senior lawyers not to write "law review articles," but instead to focus on the facts of the case and the practical effects of a given outcome.

^ *Swift v. Tyson*, 41 U.S. 1 (1842). In *Swift*, the United States Supreme Court had held that federal courts hearing cases brought under their diversity jurisdiction (allowing them to hear cases between parties from different states) had to apply the statutory law of the states, but not the common law developed by state courts. Instead, the Supreme Court permitted the federal courts to make their own common law based on general principles of law. *Erie v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64 (1938). *Erie* over-ruled *Swift v. Tyson*, and instead held that federal courts exercising diversity jurisdiction had to use all of the same substantive law as the courts of the states in which they were located. As the *Erie* Court put it, there is no "general federal common law", the key word here being general. This history is elaborated in federal common law.

^ *City of Boerne v. Flores*, 521 U.S. 507 (1997) (invalidating the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, in which Congress had attempted to redefine the court's jurisdiction to decide constitutional issues); *Milwaukee v. Illinois*, 451 U.S. 304 (1981)

^ Glenn 2000, p. 255

^ Glenn 2000, p. 276

^ Alexander, C.H. (July 1952). "International Law in India". *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 1 (3): 289–300. ISSN 00205893.

^ Viswanatha, S.T., *International Law in Ancient India*, 1925

^ Glenn 2000, p. 273

^ Jain 2006, p. 2

^ "Indian Legislation". *Commonlii.org*. Retrieved 2010-05-30.

^ [2]

^ "Canadian Legislative Bijuralism Site At the Crossroads of our Legal Diversity". *Canada.justice.gc.ca*. 2009-08-05. Retrieved 2010-05-30.

^ Mahler, Gregory S. (2004). *Politics and Government in Israel: The Maturation of a Modern State*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield. p. 126. ISBN 0-7425-611-3.

Friedman, Lawrence Meir (2005). *A History of American Law* (3 ed.). Simon and Schuster. ISBN 0743282582.

Garner, Bryan A. (2001). *A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage* (2, revised ed.). Oxford University Press US. ISBN 0195142365.

Morrison, Alan B. (1996). *Fundamentals of American Law*. Oxford University Press US. ISBN 0198764057.

Salmond, John William (1907). *Jurisprudence, or, The Theory of the Law* (2 ed.). Stevens and Haynes.

[edit]External links

Wikiquote has a collection of quotations related to: Common law

The Common Law by Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.

The Common Law by Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. at Project Gutenberg

The History of the Common Law of England by Matthew Hale

The Australian Institute of Comparative Legal Systems

New South Wales Legislation

Historical Laws of Hong Kong Online - University of Hong Kong Libraries, Digital Initiatives

Maxims of Common Law from Bouvier's 1856 Law Dictionary

[hide]

v • d • e

Law

#### Core subjects

Administrative law · Constitutional law · Contract · Criminal law · Evidence · Law of obligations · Property law · Public international law · Public law · Restitution · Tort · Trust law

#### Other subjects

Admiralty law · Aviation law · Banking law · Bankruptcy · Commercial law · Competition law · Conflict of laws · Consumer protection · Corporate law · Energy law · Entertainment law · Environmental law · Family law · Human rights · Immigration law · Intellectual property · International criminal law · Labour law · Military law · Music law · Procedure (Civil · Criminal) · Product liability · Space law · Sports law · Tax law · Unjust enrichment · Wills

#### Legal systems

Canon law · Civil law · Common law · Comparative law · Halakha · Roman law · Sharia · Socialist law · Statutory law · Xeer

#### Legal theory

Critical legal studies · Economic analysis · History · International legal theory · Philosophy · Sociology

#### Legal institutions

Bureaucracy · Civil society · Election management body · Executive · Judiciary · Legal profession · Legislature · Military · Police

#### CONCLUSION:

Anwar is a confused Big Apple Dream (BAD) politician. Did Anwar do it? If he did not do it, as a Muslim, he should 'bertaubat' in National Mosque to prove his innocence.

Goodnight Ayahanda Tun. Common Law/Case Law indeed is complicated. Anwar is addicted to suing his enemy too just like tobacco smokers once he got addicted.

By anacondaAuthor Profile Page on December 14, 2010 6:06 PM

Salam buat Tun sekeluarga.

Sudah menjadi lumrah kehidupan manusia di muka bumi ini sentiasa menghadapi masalah sejak dari zaman Nabi Adam lagi hingga hari ini zaman dunia moden era penerokaan angkasa lepas kini.

Manusia tidak putus dan jemu berfikir mencari jalan, yang semuanya bertujuan bagi menangani bermacam-macam permasalahan yang dihadapi, termasuklah pencemaran alam sekitar yang manusia hadapi kini.

<http://www.waste-management-world.com/index/display/article-display/8781446322/articles/waste-management-world/volume-11/issue-6/regulars/news/uk-urged-to-supply-more-energy-through-waste.html> ).

TUHAN telah memberikan kita AKAL FIKIRAN untuk berfikir bagi mengatasi segala permasalahan yang timbul ketika mana keadaan tidak selesa dan kesejukan yang dihadapi zaman Adam itu akhirnya dapat diatasi dengan terciptanya pakaian, tempat tinggal yang selesa dan kemudahan asas lainnya.

\*\*Isu sampah yang dibangkitkan oleh Tun ada jalan penyelesaiannya. Dengan mencipta dan menggunakan teknologi, manusia dapat mengatasi permasalahan, termasuk isu sampah ini.

<http://www.wasteonline.org.uk/resources/InformationSheets/WasteDisposal.htm> ).  
<http://www.plasmawastedisposal.com/> ).

**\*\*Sebenarnya sampah boleh menjadi sumber PENDAPATAN bagi sesetengah orang yg tiada pekerjaan tetap dan tahu bagaimana memanfaatkannya, asalkan rajin dan sanggup untuk mengusahakannya.** <http://www.nikkhsin.com/> ).

**\*\* Mereka yang berminat BERNIAGA menjadi pembeli Barangan Lusuh dan Re-cycle harus memohon LESEN yang sah, ada kawasan menyimpan sementara, mempunyai transport sendiri (lori 3 tons keatas) dan tahu prosidur pengasingan.**

**\*\*Banyak bahan terbuang yang boleh dikitar semula seperti bahan besi, aluminium, plastic, kaca/glass, can/tin, getah, kertas, kain buruk, komponen elektrik/elektronik dan sebagainya ditukar menjadi wang yang lumayan. Manakala bahan sisa makanan pula diproses menjadi GAS untuk tenaga elektrik dan baja KOMPOS untuk tanaman secara ORGANIK .**  
[http://www.samsung.com/my/news/newsRead.do?news\\_group=corporatenews&news\\_seq=12480](http://www.samsung.com/my/news/newsRead.do?news_group=corporatenews&news_seq=12480) ).

**\*\*Usahawan barangan lusuh dan barangan terbuang kebanyakannya dilakukan oleh kaum India. Amat sedikit penglibatan bangsa lain, terutama Melayu yang melihat sampah itu hanya semata-mata sebagai sampah yang tidak berguna dan kotor tanpa menyangka itu adalah KHAZANAH busuk yang berharga jika BERFIKIR untuk dibuat sesuatu yang boleh ditukarkan menjadi EMAS. Tanggapan ramai orang bahawa DIRTY JOB ini low class, memalukan dan tidak berpotensi.**

Padahal ; mereka adalah PEMBEKAL TERBESAR bagi barangan lusuh dan recycle kepada kilang-kilang besi, aluminium, pelatik, kaca, kertas dan sebagainya untuk dikitar semula(sprt. Perwaja , Kin Steel , <http://pacific.recycle.net/trade/aa1005416.html> ), <http://mblgrp.com/products&services.html> ). Paper Mill, Tissue paper, Kilang Plastic, Gelas dan sebagainya). <http://www.nikkhsin.com/> ).  
<http://www.list-of-companies.org/Malaysia/Environment/Recycling/> ).  
[http://www.henghiap.com/pg\\_products1.htm](http://www.henghiap.com/pg_products1.htm) ).  
[http://www.trademal.com/global/index.php/id/12021/N\\_STAR\\_RECYCLE\\_INDUSTRY\\_SDN\\_BHD/](http://www.trademal.com/global/index.php/id/12021/N_STAR_RECYCLE_INDUSTRY_SDN_BHD/) ).

**\*\*Teknik memproses sampah dan barangan lusuh ini harus ditangani dengan cara Teknologi. Apa yang perlu ialah kerajaan atau dengan kerjasama swasta mendapatkan teknologi bagi mendirikan kilang yang boleh melupuskan bahan tersebut dalam bentuk yang dikehendaki mengikut jenis masing-masing.**  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waste\\_management](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waste_management) ).

Jika di German, Jepun, Korea, U.K, Amerika dan beberapa Negara maju lain terdapat pusat pelupusan dan memproses sampah yang dikitar semula mengikut kategori, maka Negara kita juga sudah sampai masanya harus memilikinya dan melakukan seperti apa yang mereka telah praktikkan.  
<http://www.wasteonline.org.uk/resources/InformationSheets/metals.htm> ).

Dari itu; kerajaan khususnya Pihak Berkuasa Tempatan dan Dewan Bandaraya harus berfikir secara inovasi dengan mengujudkan kilang memproses sampah dikawasan khas di tempat pelupusan sampah itu sendiri yang sedia ada sekarang ini daripada dibakar dan dibiarkan mereput berbau busuk dan tempat pembiakan lalat.

Dengan itu masalah untuk melupuskan sampah dan mencari tempat baru untuk

melupuskan sampah tidak timbul lagi.

<http://www.list-of-companies.org/Malaysia/Environment/Recycling/> ). Pencemaran Alam Sekitar akibat pembakaran dapat dihindarkan, disamping mengujudkan peluang pekerjaan dan pendapatan kepada yang tidak ada kerja (menjadi pemungut barangan lusuh), atau memohon LESEN Membeli Barangan Lusuh untuk memulakan perniagaan itu sendiri.

\*\*Kerana itu lebih baik daripada menjadi Mat rempit, Pecah rumah, Seluk saku, Suka Melepak, Sepak kertas sana-sini tanpa tujuan , Mencuri dan Meminta-minta (pengemis) agar satu hari boleh menjadi pemberi pula, kerana tangan yang memberi itu lebih mulia dari tangan yang menerima. Tq Tun.

By egalitarianAuthor Profile Page on December 14, 2010 12:37 PM

Salaam Tun, semoga sihat selalu Inshaallah.

Problem with our whole system is, the local PBTs never do their planning well. When approving housing schemes etc they must take into account for these amenities.

For a instance, the Selangor govt now is only interested in gaining people support for the coming election and the way forward is by approving places of worship. This even by approving single storey corner terrace houses are being converted into temples and so forth. This is only the tip of the iceberg. Take a ride around Selangor and you'll see the atrocities that's being done. All in the name of gaining support.

We Malaysian are too greedy and selfish and by the days ends, our future is jeopardized for all the goods things that we can achieve. Remember, what goes around will come around and next time it will bite you. Elections are becoming very dangerous as parties might sell their own mothers.

By dinoAuthor Profile Page on December 14, 2010 12:27 PM

Dear Tun,

I couldn't agree more with kuthe2's comments. As rightly pointed out by you and kuthe2, the present Government (read: DSN) are too damn scared of effecting change for fear of the unpredictables (read: votes, financial supports, party backlashes, etc.) Indecision and procrastination would only make it worse as time passes by (time waits for no one).

Problems won't go away if choose to stay put. Decisions can only be good or bad. Look at Putrajaya. In the end, it prevailed.

We are still grappling with two CEOs at JKP, Pulau Pinang(GLC)for the past three months without clear direction from the helm.

By difefuAuthor Profile Page on December 14, 2010 9:37 AM

Dearest Tun,

In my humble opinion, we could:

Help the people affected by the Tsunami prone area by giving them financial means to relocate themselves away from the dangers. We could build a bridge to link the peninsula with the island, request for permission from our neighbours and purchase vast amount of lands at lower costs, and use them as dumping ground.

We must emphasize that, the main idea is to help the potential victims move away from those life-threatening areas.

About the bridge, we can have many toll plaza underneath the bridge and collect toll to

finance our country.

By nase2Author Profile Page on December 13, 2010 11:37 PM

Salam buat Ayahanda Tun..

1. Sampah domestik kita terlalu lembab dan adakalanya basah. Di negara maju, sayur-sayuran dan makanan basah sudah siap dibersihkan sebelum dipek dan memasuki rak jualan. Yang dibawa pulang, hampir keseluruhan bahagian boleh-dimakan, bukan macam kita, sayur - kalau boleh dengan akar dan tanah-tanah sekali nak dijual. Jadi, peniaga kena ubah pendekatan pembungkusan - kena rajin bersihkan barang jualan sebelum dijual untuk kurangkan sisa. Hasil buangan diladang boleh dikomposkan. Apa pendapat Jabatan Pertanian dan FAMA..?
2. Di luar negara, setiap kediaman dibekalkan tong sampah berbeza mengikut jenis sampah (boleh-kitar atau tidak) tetapi di sini tong sampah pun dikebas. Jadi, bergayutlah beg sampah kat pokok-pokok depan rumah. Kalau tong sampah awam pula, pantang jumpa dicucuhnya api. Jadi kesimpulannya, orang Malaysia belum bersedia untuk bersikap berhemah mengurus sampah.
3. Di kawasan Greater K.L pula, berapa ramai pula rakyat asing..? Orang tempatan yang melakukan kesalahan, bolehlah disaman. Orang asing bagaimana..? Macam juga 'sampah' perut, IWK kenakan caj ikut per unit rumah, kalau sebuah rumah teres yang biasa didiami keluarga sederhana lima enam orang, tetapi didiami penyewa orang asing sampai 20 orang, cajnya tetap juga sama tapi IWK dah macam nak karam urus 'sampah perut' ni pasal 'PE ratio' ketika rekabentuk asal sistem kumbahan dah 'burst'.. Begitu juga caj sampah majlis tempatan, cajnya sama walhal sampah dah berganda. Nak mendidik, bayar ikut kapasiti sampah dijana dan tingkatkan penguatkuasaan - kalau tak, sampah berlebihan akan dilambung ke dalam sungai.
4. Kesimpulan paling baik - orang Malaysia suka sampah. Nak buat macamana... Hanya mungkin berubah bila berlakunya wabak penyakit dari sampah yang memakan korban beratus-ratus nyawa. Waktu tu, buatlah apa saja, semua jadi 'boleh'. Nak letak insinerator kat belakang rumah pun boleh. Tak percaya, ambillah teladan semasa krisis JE dahulu.

By idea2009Author Profile Page on December 13, 2010 9:01 PM

Salam Tun,

This is very interesting problem.

My technologists and engineers have developed a technology (yes, designed and produced in-house in Malaysia) where we can process rubbish WITHOUT combustion (we use thermal technology) thus giving no smell, negligible CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, furan and dioxins. In addition, we only use little electricity in the beginning but then when it reaches certain temperature, it automatically shuts off and this device can continue working without any power for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We are only a small SME but for the past 3 years, we have developed this solution on our own for this country and hopefully, for the world later. We have approached the local authorities and presented to them and we even invited them to our research area to see for themselves on how we can help to solve this rubbish problem. So far there are no takers but we are not giving-up. By the way, DOE has also repeatedly tested our device/system to their satisfaction and I am pleased to say that we have already obtained DOE's letter to confirm that we comply with the strict DOE's Air

Quality regulations. Our device, I believe is not the only answer to the rubbish problem but all we need is just a chance by the clients to prove that we can do it.

Wassalam Tun.

By wajaperak Author Profile Page on December 13, 2010 7:32 PM

Assallammualaikumwarahmatullahiwarokatuh...

Semoga mendapat izin dan perkenan Tun..

Mr Parasmeswara 2...Alahai jangan merajuk bang..we need your contribution and never will hate you..ok bro?

Tun..adakah link ini applicable untuk Malaysia??

1)wasteage.com > Magazine Articles

2)en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mobro\_4000

3)streetknowledge.wordpress.com/.../scientists-find-plastic-garbage-barge-twice-the-size-of-us-in-pacific-ocean/

4)www.nader.org/index.php?/archives/588...Barge-of-Garbage

Terima kasih Tun..

By hijazzains Author Profile Page on December 13, 2010 7:09 PM

I have some suggestions

1) Ban plastic bags

2)Make people use special plastic bags issued by government. There will be a tax attached to the price of these rubbish bags.

3)To salvage recyclable resources, the government should open centres that buy recyclable items like bottles, cans and plastic bottles. For example, a can is 5 sen, a big can 20 sen, a plastic bottle 5 sen. This could help people earn income and not to throw recycleble items and government can generate income from the recycleble items it buys for waste dispoable or environmental projects.

4)To encourage people to throw garbage at the right place especially in rural areas, reward people who bring certain a mount of trash. For example, free bus tickets or food coupons for every 5kf of trash.This is being done in Curitiba.

5) Encourage businesse to reuse recyclable items.In the case of banners that pollute our cities, have DBKL and city council allow certain busineeses to collect these banners and recycle them into new banners or turn them into bags. This ha sbeen done in Spain.

I hope the Tun could push for these ideas indirectly. I am sick of jogging in the morning and seeing styrofoam and cans littering out streets. We live in a nice country and it'd be nicer without the rubbish.

By kuthe2 Author Profile Page on December 13, 2010 6:51 PM

Salams Tun Dr M...

My favorite topic..

Waste.. Waste Management.. Wasted Times..

Tun..

The Government as you said.. Too Scared..

Too many brilliant ideas.. but the question is who is paying.? Councils.? they bankrupt..

Actually the people is paying for these so called services.. Collection/Treatment/Disposal..

By paying their 'cukai pintu'... Ahmad Albab.. BUT...

They are paying a very low sum.. That is why Malaysians need to value what they have and what they throw...

This is why PPSPPA was formed.. to Privatize and Manage the Waste Management..

If only we value our waste and environment..

NOW... If I charge you a fee for making and throwing rubbish.. Would you still be doing it without thinking.?

of course NOT.. You will start to feel the pain in your pocket and start throwing wisely.. and maybe you will recycle..

WHY is this not the case NOW even though we are facing shortage of lands to dispose our waste.?

Becoz.. The one at the helm is not brave enough for change.. especially the opposed states..

Malaysian must understand that making rubbish will pollute our environment.. And its costly to clean it up..

But I think Malaysians are not to be blame.. Foreign workers come to our beloved country and produce more waste.. They do not pay for the clean up.. So they don't care.. Do they.?

Maybe we must charge a separate bill for Waste Management.. (people may oppose but its for the future of our existence..) The Gov. can raise fuel prices.. cigarettes.. and sugar.. WHY not the tax for this GOOD cause.. Subsidies it.. maybe.? heheheheee....

People who is responsible for this change does not have the passion and willingness to make the bold move.. Pitty..

When a person wants to help and make this world a better place.. they reject and turn a blind eye..

These season people doesn't really care but for themselves... Takut tak dapat pence.. Hahahahaaa..

Rugi.. Mampus... Out of 10 people I think only 1 person really cares..

If you dont want to pay.. then wise up..

Gov. should seriously look at this matter.. jangan kira nak belanja sekiranya ada masyuk jaa...

Tq..

By AinaqAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 6:17 PM

What is rubbish? If someone writes something you don't apprehend or you don't like. You would say Rubbish!!! Probably rubber was once rubbish....it is of limited use. The plant,leaves,fruits cannot be eaten until someone invented tyres.

If you have new furniture or TV you dumb the old one at rubbish dumb it is rubbish so is "bundle dress" that being marketed to poor or to thrifty geneous.

In agriculture grass in crop areas is considered weeds- agriculture equivalent of rubbish. So is cow dung and chicken waste in the farm.

Rubbish and weeds are useful thing in the wrong place and in the wrong hands.

What make rubbish are rubbish and weeds are weeds are classifications of things...without system of recycling into usefull product or input.

What we need is a method and system research which classify waste material to their potential use than utilise them.

Government should provide fund for research of farm intergration projects and industrial intergration projects and domestics intergration projects for reutilization of waste.

I am experimenting prototype to utilise farm waste,weeds and by products for animal feeds,organic fertilizer and nutrient recylce and soil amendmets plus weed control...It is promising. Burning is the last thing you should do as all biomass are usefull resources.Beside it cause pollution... If ministry of science provide funds for this experiment it can be done in bigger and accelerated phase.

Any one interested can contact me through my company email saujanagrosol@yahoo.com.my

By JamalAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 5:05 PM

Dear Tun,

There several ways available to tackle the RUBBISH problem in big cities such as KL.

Most importantly - Recycling. This like all distribution problem (in reverse),it can be initiated a all levels of the distribution process, i.e. at point of collection, at point of distribution, at point of discharge and at point of reprocessing.

At the point of discarding of rubbish - separation of types of waste such as Food waste (this can be even be broken down to reconsumable and non reconsumable), plastics, ferrous metal, paper, fabric - all the able waste can be separate again into reusable and non reusable.

The government needs to create the enviroment where the bright enterpise can invest and profit from these redistribution/separation processes. Such as the second hand items dealers, etc...

Once the reconsumable and reusable items are taken out, then come the recycleable items which can go to the processing plants to reprocess them for reuse.

Finally the really non usable and recycleble item/waste will need to be incinerated. This is a must to reduce the volume of which.

Incineration plants can be sited at industrial parks. However, the long distances from

commercial and residential areas will require transit/transfer plants where these waste are brought for compression/press and transferred to the incineration plants.

The waste from this incineration plants which is ashes can then be disposed of by land fills. The volume by then will be down by a huge percentage, then if all the waste/rubbish were dumped in the land fill.

Best to let market forces come to play in providing these services.

The government needs to do its part in this and the public MUST realise that there is a high cost for disposal just as there is a huge cost to consumption. This is called the life cycle cost of whatever we do.

Nothing is for FREE!!

By longjaafarAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 4:58 PM

Since the government has large tracts of land in Putrajaya, we can locate the incinerator there. It will be an example of the government's putting their money where their mouth is, because the govt has always maintained that incinerators are safe. Moreover, the incinerator will be able to generate electricity for free, using the heat from the burning.

By dinoAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 4:48 PM

The best is for the Govt to undertake a comprehensive studies. The committee would then list out all the options, its cost and benefits before the Jemaah Menteri decide the best available option and then to pursue it diligently.

If there is fees to be levied, be it for the sake of our our children and the country.

You got to be professional in all these matters; emotions and politics, aside please!

By NMIbrahimAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 3:00 PM

Salam Tun,

The only solution available is to produce electricity using the rubbish. Instead of finding land to dispose of, the government should create garbage incinerators. Not only does it dispose the rubbish, but it provides electricity to towns and districts.

Most people don't know what's best. Incinerators don't produce any smell, apart from the smell of the rubbish being brought to the place. The government should allocate a secluded location in towns and districts to set up such places.

Instead of hiking the tariff of power, the people would benefit from this. The only way to go round this is to start the project. Only once the people has seen the benefits will they not complain.

Thank you Tun.

By lowsirAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 2:48 PM

Dear Tun,

Maybe we should still go ahead with incinerator a bit far from KL, maybe 50 km away and transport the rubbish by Train. If British can build the track to transport tin. We can do the same to transport rubbish. guess is cheaper and safer for long run.

By Renaissance ManAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 1:44 PM

Assalamualaikum Tun,

Here's a website for you to browse through. [www.c-competencies.com](http://www.c-competencies.com)

If interested, then maybe the subject matter can be discussed further. I've been to the plant and knew what they went through in order to get the project completed. Basically, it comes down to money, blood and tears. There's no point elaborating about it in this write up because not many will understand anyway.

Take care and stay healthy.

Wasallam Tun.

By checkerAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 1:19 PM

Salam Tun & Fellow bloggers,

Rubbish can be a great nuisance but looking at it in positive perspective, it offers doors of great opportunities.

We always have great tendencies to import technology or for that matter, many things. Of course it is the easiest thing to do but we will pay great price for them.

First & foremost, Malaysians at all levels have to change in their mind-set. We should have learnt by now that local problems need to have locally developed solutions. Cut & paste solutions is costly and will not necessarily be providing the best & cost effective solution. To solve the RUBBISH PROBLEM is no difference. The key is to encourage more local research & development studies & programs. Possible additional benefits in doing so will be creation & acquisition knowledge, creation & development of new "products" & business opportunities that can also possibly be later exported to other countries which need such "products".

Secondly, continuous general public education in awareness and creating genuine interest and therefore public active participation in becoming part of the solutions to the problem must be strategically implemented.

Lastly - NO PAIN NO GAIN. The government therefore must be sincere and fully committed in this " RUBBISH project".

Remember --- semua yang buruk itu datangnya dari manusia dan segala yang baik itu hanya dari Allah.

By zaki\_77Author Profile Page on December 13, 2010 12:53 PM

\* FIVE STEPS TO SOLVING GREATER KL'S RUBBISH WOES \*

1. Build two large incinerators in Hulu Langat or Dusun Tua.
2. These areas are close to greater KL and also sparsely populated.
3. For transporting the rubbish, we can build a dedicated rail track to the incinerators.
4. This method would by-pass all public transportation and therefore not burden public

routes.

5. Four rubbish collection areas should be designated, from where rubbish is loaded onto rail roads and taken to a central depo for final transportation to the incinerators.

Problem solved!

But as with many things in Malaysia, incompetence, bureaucracy and wastage remains a major hindrance.

Zaki.

By RDAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 12:47 PM

Salam Tun.

Perkara yang paling asas adalah dengan mendidik anak2 kecil supaya membuang sampah dengan betul. Di depan Sekolah, pada waktu tgh hari & petang (waktu keluar/masuk murid) selalunya ada peniaga menjual makanan ringan yang tidak berkhasiat & air & buah dalam plastic. Anak2 selalunya lapar & ketika menunggu bas/ibubapa datang, mereka akan berbelanja dan apabila tiba rumah sudah tidak selera menjamah nasi disediakan ibu. Selain itu sampah, dari plastic dan pembalut jajan akan bertaburan di depan sekolah dan sepanjang perjalanan pulang. Apabila hujan & di tiup angin akan terkumpul dalam longkang. Setahu saya, peniaga tidak dibenarkan depan sekolah.

Mengenai sampah yang sudah terkumpul, 'incinerator' yang tidak mencemarkan udara & persekitaran adalah keadah terbaik. Kaedah pengangkutan dengan lori mestilah di perbaiki sepenuhnya. (Saya pernah menunggang motosikal di siang hari dan di pintas oleh lori sampah yang bertempas dengan air licit. Bau tak payah cerita la. Balik rumah kena mandi dan basuh pakaian).

Di Jepun, saya tak pernah nampak atau bau lori sampah seperti di sini. Mungkin mereka buat kerja waktu kita sedang tidur.

Jika kita sudah buat seperti di Jepun, dan penduduk setempat masih membantah juga, kita boleh katakan: "Kepentingan Majority rakyat lebih diutamakan". Seperti yang kerajaan boleh beli balik tanah penduduk secara paksa untuk buat jalan.

By MustexAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 12:37 PM

Tun M,

If I could recall this matter was as issue during your tenure as PM. I was told that you wanted to find solutions to this problem. From what I was told there were many proposals that were submitted and despite there were some that were technology driven the decision was to use incinerators.

Perhaps the technology used then has been further enhanced and therefore it is timely that this issue should be resolved by the government rather urgently. Living close to a mountain of rubbish is certainly unhealthy and plus the stench! If one is to travel along the Batu Caves (Gombak) to Kepong, passing by the waste disposal centre there is already bad. Just image the people living in that area!

By Gopal Raj KumarAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 11:31 AM

Rubbish or refuse ought to be the responsibility of individuals and their respective communities that create them. I note "Zorro Unmasked" pontificating on this subject on his

blog again in a manner only he can. That is to polarize the debate along UMNO BN and non BN race lines. But that's to be expected where rubbish is identifiable in its intellectual form.

KL is dirty. Klang is dirty as are the major townships in Malaysia unlike what they were say 10 years ago. Governments can benefit from this in a number of ways by imposing fines on entire streets where significant uncollected rubbish is found or not disposed of properly. Each household or shop must pay for the rubbish found on their streets. They must not be allowed the defence of "I did not know or that someone else did it". Strict liability offences have their place in societies.

The impact of such a law would compel neighbours to be on the lookout for offenders. Communities will be more vigilant. Rubbish and dirt is a threat to the health and well being of every society.

Let penalties be painful a responsibility for all and make it enforceable because the consequences of bad hygiene is disease which does not discriminate and which spreads to us all like a blanket fine.

It is a good revenue collecting measure for the state as well. People ought to be personally and collectively responsible. It will also encourage community awareness, community fellowship and create social networking opportunities for those who do not wish the burden of lazy and dirty neighbours.

The second solution is to place in each household and business two types of large bins to be collected each week. These bins will be colour coded. One for normal household rubbish, the other for recyclable rubbish such as bottles, glass, cans, plastic containers and paper.

The impact of separating the rubbish is to aid with its separation for recyclability at the tip where too much these days go in one lump making it impossible to select from that which is reusable through recycling and that which is of an organic matter which will rot.

Of course the cost of such bins and its collection services should rightly be borne by council who will then pass on the cost to rate payers.

If we continue with our consumerism at the present rate, we have to be able to dispose of its waste or be consumed by it. Every action of ours as consumers has an effect on our environment and our neighbours.

Solutions can be found in a number of quality firms operating abroad some of whom we act for. This is not a sales pitch for any of them but a public service.

By Mohd Ali Author Profile Page on December 13, 2010 11:11 AM

ASSalam Ayahanda Tun yang mat di hormati,  
ASSalam ini juga untuk semua pembaca blog ini terutamanya awlz yang mengeluarkan komen hebat dan cukup bernas bagi pendapat saya..  
Saya sebenarnya sudah lama sependapat dengan saudara awlz, Malaysia tidak kurang anak-anak bangsa yang dibekalkan dengan ilmu pendidikan dalam segala aspek mengikut acuan sistem pendidikan kita dahulu yang cukup berwibawa menyelesaikan masalah bukan setakat masalah bahan sisa buangan ini dan bermacam-macam lagi yang lebih canggih hinggan ke kuasa nuklear yang di paparkan oleh pihak-pihak tertentu canggih lah kononnya.. tetapi canggih yang dipaparkan di mata rakyat yang marhain adalah sebenarnya penyusunan strategi peribadi pihak-pihak tertentu mengaut kekayaan yang tak sewajarnya. Maafkan saya, saya tidak berminat untuk mengulas isu pokok berkenaan sampah, tetapi isu

disebalik sampah yang sentiasa berkaitan dalam segala isu di Malaysia. Isu sebenarnya ialah sikap semua pihak dan yang lebih penting lagi ialah sikap kepimpinan yang sengaja tidak yakin dengan kemampuan para pemuda ilmuan malaysia menjalankan apa-apa juga bentuk cadangan kerana ia akan membantutkan pangaturan strategi peribadi mendapatkan kekayaan dalam apa juga bentuk yang di halakan oleh mereka sendiri...

Saya tidak menafikan bahawa ada benda yang memang kita terkebelakang dari segi kemampuan teknologi, tetapi kita tidak kurang ilmuan yang mempunyai kejernihan akal fikiran bersandarkan iman dan berada dalam keadaan yang amat kecewa dengan sebahagian sistem yang kita ada dan mungkin juga keseluruhan sistem..

Alhamdulillah, skrg terdapat sedikit anjakan yang merubah sistem kepada lebih baik tetapi ia adalah jauh belum mencukupi di sebabkan soal kepentingan peribadi, politik, kekayaan, ketamakkan dan.....

Soalnya ialah bab perjuangan tak lagi sama dengan istilah perjuangan orang tua-tua dahulu yang lebih tua dan juga seangkatan dengan ayahanda Tun. DEFINASI PERJUANGAN SUDAH BERBEZA.

Wallahhuaqlam..

By ogos31Author Profile Page on December 13, 2010 9:23 AM

interesting.

the malaysia way - we dont pay what we get free

the malaysia way also states that if we can form a company n let them managed the rubbish we can solve this problem.

solution - form a national company to handle rubbish...this company must b a GLC company like TNB and TM (must be bigger that Alam Flora)...with government intervention i am confident this company will be able to overcome this problem.

do we need to pay?????...like always the government have to subsidized first..i am sure that the saving from the petrol price increase can be used for something else.

New task for PEMANDU...go n study and find a solution for the rubbish issue.

By zebramonesAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 9:14 AM

Salam Tun yang dihormati.

I think most of the Government's policies and ideas for improving Malaysia are good and well-worth implementing. The thing is, now, when Government introduces something new, Malaysians will immediately be taken aback and will come out with something like

'whaaatttt??? That's taxpayer's money you're wasting!. Bodo punya kerajaan!'

After all, it is just the nature of humans (or is it just Malaysians?) to be complaining without really understanding an issue.

My suggestion, for example the incinerator thing; educate the public. I think most of us don't really know what that thing is but we'll just complaint and condemn no matter what.

Have FRONT PAGE advert in newspapers and catch the public's eyes and interest. Do TV ads. Do radio ads. The Government has to be sincere in promoting and idea or policy, not because of filling someone's pocket.

So that's my suggestion. If the Government is serious on implementing the incinerator project, please educate us. Please let us know what the hell is that thing, and how can or cannot affect our lives, and how it will or will not affect our lives. We want you to be sincere to us and we want you to tell the truth. (i'm referring to the incinerator thing la)  
By AndrewAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 8:55 AM

Hi Dr M-rubbish is a very serious issue and like you said MP are afraid to lose votes. Unfortunately someone has to pay for the clean up. In Melbourne, we pay council fees according to the value of the house. It is about \$1000 p.a. for my case. However what I get are 3 bins-red, yellow and green. Red bin is for daily rubbish which is cleared every week. Yellow is for papers, bottles etc for recycling and green is garden wastes such as branches, cut grass, dead plants etc. These bins are emptied every second week.

Depending on councils, hard rubbish are cleared twice a year or some on request. Hard rubbish are things like spoilt tele, microwave ovens, old sofa set, beds, mattresses, fridges, computers etc. At no time building wastes will be cleared. These wastes would need to be transported to landfills either by themselves or the experts in the trade and a dumping fee is payable.

You are right no one wants to pay more money. I suppose educating people the need for proper disposal of rubbish will cost money is the key. We whinge about our council rates however at the same time we know they are a necessity. Hence you dont really find rubbish strewn all over the place here in Melbourne. Maybe for starters, organise a campaign to educate people to stop throwing rubbish indiscriminately and that burning is a definite no no. Good luck Malaysia.

By JohanAuthor Profile Page on December 13, 2010 6:46 AM

Salam Tun,

Suggestion :

1. I would support for both - total disposal(incinerator) & recycling to be done simultaneously.
2. Environmental awareness to be put seriously.

Reason :

As said, the increased rubbish volume are proportional to the volume of population where population increase year by year. Current methods are slow, costly in the long run and not that environment-friendly. We will eventually be living in jungles of rubbish by year 2030.

Views :

Its difficult to convince whether incinerators are worthwhile. It will be depending on how you look at it. Example:

For the sake of value:

Its quite costly, initial investment RM15Mil, estimated ROI of minimum 13 years , new technology, limited track record, location far from population which increase transportation cost and high maintenance cost.

For the sake of the environment :

Its clean, safe, efficient, total disposal possible, fast, and yes, it generate electricity for a small population supply(approx-30,000 homes).

Recycling however, have evolved here in Malaysia but sadly the awareness of it hasn't gone far. Participation in processing are also very low. Maybe a specific body can be set-up to fulfill the necessary needs here or some sort.

So, for me, we should be more responsible towards the environment and go for support of mix combination of incinerator & recycle.

By khairi aliAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 7:48 PM

Assalamualaikum Tun,

If I'm right, the richest person - a woman - in China is a rubbish entrepreneur. May be its time for us to consult her. RUBBISH IS MONEY.

By DUNAAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 6:19 PM

Its good idea but when it is originated from a politician, people will be wondering who will be siphoning hundreds of millions from the project!!

By 6 JahanamAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 3:49 PM

Rakyat Malaysia perlu disiplin.

Disiplin perlu undang undang yg effective untuk menjayakanya.

Ada undang undang tetapi dijiwai dengan budaya rasuah, seperti juga manusia yg tidak bertamadun.

Kerajaan Malaysia tidak mampu menerajui undang undang bagi mencapai tujuan dan matlamat murni,objective.

Kerajaan Malaysia,Badan Authority Kerajaan lemah mengendalikan undang undang.Undand undang seolah mechanisma bagi pegawai kerajaan untuk mencari kepentingan sendiri,daripada mengalah kehaluan matlamat kerajaan sebenar.

Renung pada effectiveness Authority Kerajaan dahulu, baru memperbaiki suasana luar.

Bapa kalau tak betul,anak pun jadi tak betul.

Isu sampah,isu kecil.

Isu Immigrasi dari luar negara tidak di kawal langsung.

Orang luar sewenangnyahijrah ke negara kita tanpa kawalan yg mantap.ini sudah menyempitkan rakyat Malaysia.

Saya yakin jika tidak ada panantauwan yg tegas,Melayu akan tewas.

Saya beri 10 tahun saja,perubahan akan berlaku.

Mengapa tidak kalau Melayu sudah tidak mampu menjaga kedaulatan mereka,kehormatan mereka,kita jemput,orang Islam Cina,dari negeri China.

Takkan Melayu hilang di bumi,

itu cakap Hang Tuah saja,Hang Tuah pun siang siang sudah hilang,cabut entah kemana.Hang Tuah pun bukan hebat,jaguh kerana taat pada Raja,dan kerana Raja nak berbini.Itu bukan Panglima.

Tidak ada sejarah beliau yg beliau menaluki tanah negara lain.

Melayu akan hilang jika tidak berjaga dari sekarang.

By al-DinAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 3:22 PM

If we are unable to solve KL's rubbish problem then:

- i) we have not learn anything from much bigger cities how they go about it but many officials have been sent overseas for study-visits;
- ii) KL should not get bigger than it is meaning no 100 storey superstructure and the likes;
- iii) no more further pronouncements of cities anywhere else in Malaysia.

We are thankful that scrapyards are everywhere. They recycle solid waste especially metal and plastic and make good money. Ordinary people get paid for disposing their waste.

Adults are showing poor example to their children by throwing wastes by the window while driving. Otherwise our roadways are not littered with rubbish.

I have a dream not for KL but to transform desert into fertile oases in Arabia. The engineering feat is to pool human waste (during haj and umrah), siphon and release it to distant desert areas around Mekah, block by block of 100ha each for a period of time. Soon there will be plenty of arab(ie) land!

By priss01Author Profile Page on December 12, 2010 2:50 PM

Energy and Garbage.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NrYJof510NU>

By priss01Author Profile Page on December 12, 2010 2:35 PM

Plasma Gasification

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=plasma-turns-garbage-into-gas>

"Engineers have developed an efficient torch for blasting garbage with a stream of superheated gas, known as plasma. When trash is dropped into a chamber and heated to 10,000 degrees Fahrenheit, its organic components—food, fluids, paper—vaporize into a hot, pressurized gas, which turns a turbine to generate electricity. Steam, a by-product, can generate more. Inorganic refuse such as metals condense at the bottom and can be used in roadbeds and heavy construction."

So Tech is there but will BN MP's make the change.

TNB might have to lower Electric prices (ohhh nooo)

This would put a wrench in the Nuclear power plant plan.

This will cause a lot of cronies and MP's to lose money.

So I don't see this happening at all.

By parameswara 2Author Profile Page on December 12, 2010 1:08 PM

Dearest Tun

1-Since I am no expert on rubbish and hence lacking in depth on the subject I thought I'd stay on the sideline this time around. But I guess its easier said than done. My finger itched to press the comment button so here I am.

2-I like Jalil's highly humorous yet positive contribution to ideas on how to solve this rubbish problem. I think what Brazil has done should be emulated by us so thanks for highlighting. My philosophy has and will always be, though Wajaperak will hate it, is 'no need to reinvent the wheel'. Of course that could be better ways but I am very sure we are not yet ready to be leaders so let us just be the best of copycats.

3-I also like his idea of a nuclear fissioned powered incinerator and since he is offering it free I think its worthwhile for the Govt to take up and do a feasibility study on it. Of course the Govt should give Jalil a cert of appreciation if his idea is eventually materialized later. A datukship will be too much.

4-Most others commented on emulating Japan and Singapore.I know superyusrie will hate me in particular for mentioning that neighbor of ours so I'll just focus on Japan.I think Japan really has a lot to offer us.They have even built an island out of garbage before.But how come we miss all these aspects during our look east policy days?

5-And that incinerator at Broga,if the Govt is so sure of its viability then just make it happen.The people who are against the incinerators are on the other side whether the Govt build it or not.Just be principled minded and do what is right because of God.

6-I would like to talk about a different kind of garbage now...This jeans brand F.C.U.K I wonder if you have ever heard of it.There is one huge advertising poster at the Pavilion showing two sensuous couples in a compromising position in each others arms and at the bottom the words F.C.U.K. What is conjured on the minds of the people I don't know but if such a hati suci pijak semut tak mati kind like me will think X-then I am sure it may be double-X for the rest.

7-Actually in English if you jumble the alphabets in between the alphabets at the start and the end and it would still be taken as the word that is commonly used.So FCUK will still be F\*CK in our minds whether we want to admit it or not.Don't believe tell me what is this sentence FCUK THE DCUK?You need further proof?Then read on...

8-"actlluay in egnlsih you can jmuble up the wrods in bewteen the apalhebts at the strat and at the end,you will hvae no porlbem to fuigre out waht msseage we are tyrnig to cnovey to you."can you read that?

9-That is why I think this brand name should be changed to one that is more decent.We also don't want our sons later to venture out with the opposite sex and start by asking an innocent question like,do you want a FCUK? When the other party is offended he will say that he is only referring to an extra jeans he has..but if not offended.. another baby dumping will soon be on the cards.

10-Maybe I am too old fashioned,but I really find this brand name very disgusting, highly immoralled intentionally or unintentionally,hence a true rubbish that should be incinerated soonest possible.

Thanks Tun

By Mr BennyAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 12:48 PM

just some additional words here:

1. everybody is talking about learning from other nations, but other nations impose such and such regulations, and some, residents have to pay more more for their garbage ----> are we willing to do it here, in Malaysia. To pay more...

2. some say having to learn the hard way when living abroad ---> why can we follow the regulations when we are away, but cant follow some simple regulations here in our country (same like when visiting singapore everybody is so scared to throw their litters out of the car, but do so freely here)..

3. we can recyle at home, at source, and I guess lots are doing so... but when comes to collection by the responsible contractors, are they separating it or just dump everything into one lorry? ----> we can recycle, but channeling whats been recycle is always a problem.

Cheers.

By fbmAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 8:49 AM

Assalamualaikum Tun,

1. There are many crowded cities around the world facing the same problem and in some way succeeded facing it. Some that could be highlighted among them all are cities in Japan. I could not explain any better than others who have commented before me on this matter in this page, they have explained technically and thoroughly, kudos to them.

2. Few months before i went furthering my education in 2007, I do think the government has went for a trip to an incinerator in Tokyo (I think it was a plastic incinerator). I do also remember that it was lead by our own PM. Hopefully the team has concluded something good from that trip.

3. Recycle must be mention beforehand as much of rubbish are not so rubbish. We need to look at our garbage composition (how many percents plastic, recyclable, non-recyclable waste). Again from Japan, 3R (reduce, reuse, and recycle). If somehow we could lessen the rubbish that goes out as waste, we could increase the efficiency of our wastelands and incinerators (if there will be).

4. In our country, there are also people collecting valuable recyclable items and get money from them. It is a business in a way, and Malaysians never ran out of ideas when easy money involved, we just need to make it more organised, structured and cover more people, premises and wastes.

5. Considering incinerators, placement of them require deep studies, not just about the estate values or locations. Things should be considered might include industrial and domestic wastes, wind directions, communities, and etc. Let's give the engineers chance to think, plan and draft out them.

6. This is not so glamorous but legislation should be imposed on companies and societies. Things like higher GST for products with more un-recyclable waste or higher tax on industries (SMI or big one) that produce more wastes could reduce the burden of the government handling this issue. Higher house tax for house/community/district/company which does not recycle and produce more rubbish could also be impose to make 3R as a habit.

7. Transporting waste to the outskirts of a city would cost ringgits, either tax them or bill them is up to the municipal/city councils. If somehow the cost is still bearable by the councils to make it free, it would be great for the people.

8. Don't forget about new technologies like bio-reactors, maybe they might be implementable sooner than we know.

9. One left, the people. Educating the people is the key to address them. Cool advertisements in medias should be done. Nevertheless they do not always result in a full success. The more important things are, the selfishness on Malaysian should also be address and the nature of 'does not care' of Malaysian people when they throw rubbish inconsiderately should also be tackled. This would take time of many years. In the meantime, the problem needs to be solved.

10. It would not be a popular decision to impose rules or build buildings of waste related

near communities' areas (by the way, just put the incinerators near industrial areas). Sure there will be oppositions from communities, political and non-political parties, but what must be done should be done. The government need to be firm on certain matters, delays will make the problem worsen.

11. Keep healthy sir! Thanks for keep 'listening' to our writings.  
By ShamsulAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 6:38 AM

Dear Tun,

I believed we have the solution.

I have posted this message on your Inventors and Innovators blog back in July 2010.

I would like to invite you to Perlis to view our plant.

Initially its plastics but eventually its any sort of rubbish.

By Shamsul Mohd Nor on July 7, 2010 3:29 PM

Dear Tun,

Interestingly enough that you mentioned Conversion of Waste to Oil and Additives for Fuel Products.

We have came out with both of this innovative products and currently working with MOSTI, NCIA and the Perlis State through the Trade and Investment Exco, YBM Dato' Seri Syed Razlan Jamalullail.

All parties are quite aggressive in assisting us on this innovation.

We were given extensive coverage in the media as well including the Edge.

MOSTI -

[http://www.mosti.gov.my/mosti/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=2878&Itemid=1](http://www.mosti.gov.my/mosti/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2878&Itemid=1)

Sinar Harian - <http://www.sinarharian.com.my/utr/index.asp> and  
<http://www.sinarharian.com.my/utr/content/story7687458.asp>

Kosmo -

[http://www.kosmo.com.my/kosmo/content.asp?y=2010&dt=0513&pub=Kosmo&sec=Negara&pg=ne\\_09.htm](http://www.kosmo.com.my/kosmo/content.asp?y=2010&dt=0513&pub=Kosmo&sec=Negara&pg=ne_09.htm)

Bernama (Malay) - [http://www.bernama.com/bernama/v3/bm/news\\_lite.php?id=497665](http://www.bernama.com/bernama/v3/bm/news_lite.php?id=497665)

Yahoo News -

<http://malaysia.news.yahoo.com/bnm/20100512/tbs-syngas-diesel-bm-with-pix-ceeeaba.html>

The Edge -

<http://www.theedgemaalaysia.com/business-news/165426-saham-utama-to-launch-green-diesel-syngas.html>

Bernamea Photo -

--

<http://fotoweb.bernama.com/fotoweb/detail.fwx?position=1&folderid=5093&search=shamsul%20bahar%20mohd%20nor&sorting=modifytime>

Bernamea Photo -

<http://fotoweb.bernama.com/fotoweb/detail.fwx?position=2&folderid=5093&search=shamsul%20bahar%20mohd%20nor&sorting=modifytime>

By anacondaAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 6:35 AM

Salam buat Tun sekeluarga.

Sampah boleh menjadi sumber pendapatan bagi sesetengah orang yang tiada pekerjaan tetap asalkan rajin untuk mengusahakannya. Banyak bahan terbuang yang boleh dikitar semula seperti besi, plastic, kaca/glass, can/tin, aluminium, getah, kertas, kain buruk, komponen elektrik/elektronik dan sebagainya ditukar menjadi wang yang lumayan. Manakala bahan sisa makanan pula diproses menjadi BAJA KOMPOS untuk tanaman secara organic. . <http://www.nikkhsin.com/> ).  
[http://www.samsung.com/my/news/newsRead.do?news\\_group=corporatenews&news\\_seq=12480](http://www.samsung.com/my/news/newsRead.do?news_group=corporatenews&news_seq=12480) ).

\*\*Usahawan barangan lusuh dan barangan terbuang kebanyakannya dilakukan oleh kaum India. Amat sedikit penglibatan bangsa lain, terutama Melayu yang melihat sampah itu hanya semata-mata sebagai sampah yang tidak berguna dan kotor tanpa menyangka itu adalah KHAZANAH busuk yang berharga jika berfikir untuk dibuat sesuatu yang boleh ditukarkan menjadi EMAS. Tanggapan ramai orang bahawa DIRTY JOB ini low class, memalukan dan tidak berpotensi.

Padahal mereka adalah PEMBEKAL TERBESAR bagi barangan lusuh dan recycle kepada kilang-kilang besi, aluminium, pelatik, kaca, kertas dan sebagainya untuk dikitar semula (sprt. kepada Perwaja , Kin Steel , <http://pacific.recycle.net/trade/aa1005416.html> ), <http://mblgrp.com/products&services.html> ). Paper Mill, Tissue paper, Kilang Plastic, Gelas dan sebagainya). <http://www.nikkhsin.com/> ).  
<http://www.list-of-companies.org/Malaysia/Environment/Recycling/> ).  
[http://www.henghiap.com/pg\\_products1.htm](http://www.henghiap.com/pg_products1.htm) ).  
[http://www.trademal.com/global/index.php/id/12021/N\\_STAR\\_RECYCLE\\_INDUSTRY\\_SDN\\_BHD/](http://www.trademal.com/global/index.php/id/12021/N_STAR_RECYCLE_INDUSTRY_SDN_BHD/) ).

Teknik memproses sampah dan barangan lusuh ini harus ditangani dengan cara teknologi. Apa yang perlu ialah kerajaan atau dengan kerjasama swasta mendapatkan teknologi bagi mendirikan kilang yang boleh melupuskan bahan tersebut dalam bentuk yang dikehendaki mengikut jenis masing-masing. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waste\\_management](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waste_management) ).

Jika di German, Jepun, Korea, U.K, Amerika dan beberapa Negara maju lain terdapat pusat pelupusan dan memproses sampah yang dikitar semula mengikut kategori, maka Negara kita juga sudah sampai masanya harus memilikinya dan melakukan seperti apa yang mereka telah praktikkan.  
<http://www.wasteonline.org.uk/resources/InformationSheets/metals.htm> ). Dari itu Ujudkan kilang memproses sampah dikawasan khas pelupusan sampah itu sendiri yang sedia ada sekarang ini daripada dibakar dan dibiarkan mereput berbau busuk dan tempat pembiakan lalat.

Dengan itu masalah untuk melupuskan sampah tidak timbul lagi.  
<http://www.list-of-companies.org/Malaysia/Environment/Recycling/> ). Pencemaran alam akibat pembakaran dapat dihindarkan, disamping mengujudkan peluang pekerjaan kepada yang tidak ada kerja.

\*\*Kerana itu lebih baik daripada menjadi Mat rempit, Pecah rumah, Seluk saku, Suka Melepak, Sepak kertas kesana-sini tanpa tujuan , Mencuri dan Meminta-minta(pengemis) agar satu hari boleh menjadi pemberi pula, kerana tangan yang memberi itu lebih mulia dari menerima. Tq Tun.

By maaAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 1:37 AM

Assalamualaikum,

Saya ternampak pekerja university atau mungkin kontraktor yang diupah untuk memotong ranting pokok yang mengganggu pemandangan atau berpotensi untuk tumbang dan memasukkan ke dalam mesin penghancur untuk dihancurkan terus menjadi serpihan kecil-kecilan. Serpihan ini di tabur di seluruh kawasan university yang ada ditanam pokok bunga. Bagus juga kaedah ini, ia akan reput lama kelamaan dan sehati dengan tanah.

maa

By IdeaAuthor Profile Page on December 12, 2010 12:28 AM

Dear Tun,

1. The people living in the Greater KL are the ones who get access to the most advanced technologies and the best facilities. Although some of them are middle income earners, they still enjoy better technologies and facilities than the rural people.

2. Most of them are very vocal. Sometimes their voices are really loud as if they represent the whole country. To justify their loudness, they say that they are the ones who have significantly contributed to the economic growth, they pay huge sum of taxes and they know better than the rural folks do.

3. Little do they realize that they have also contributed to the country's pollution and garbage problem. Considerably.

4. The way of living in the cities is very much different from that of the rural. I strongly believe people in the cities consume more packed foods than those in the rural. The packing itself will become waste once the food is consumed.

5. There is an increasing number of biodegradable packaging and recycling campaigns in Malaysia. However, these efforts would not help much since a biodegradable packing will still be a form of waste and not many people respond well to the recycling campaigns in terms of action.

6. Apart from marketing, the purpose of packaging is for preservation, convenience and

safety. Manufacturers, foods producers and retailers should re-evaluate the purpose of packing their products. Some products do not need to be packed as they are now. As an example, hypermarkets could alternatively start selling carbonated drinks on taps. For a little discount, consumers will bring their own containers to purchase the drinks.

7. If we can minimize packaging, we can reduce rubbish.

By anacondaAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 11:36 PM

Salam buat Tun sekeluarga.

Sampah boleh menjadi sumber pendapatan bagi sesetengah orang yang tiada pekerjaan tetap asalkan rajin untuk mengusahakannya. Banyak bahan terbuang yang boleh dikitar semula seperti besi, plastic, kaca/glass, can/tin, aluminium, getah, kertas, kain buruk, komponen elektrik/elektronik dan sebagainya ditukar menjadi wang yang lumayan. Manakala bahan sisa makanan pula diproses menjadi baja kompos untuk tanaman secara organic. . <http://www.nikkhsin.com/> ).  
[http://www.samsung.com/my/news/newsRead.do?news\\_group=corporatenews&news\\_seq=12480](http://www.samsung.com/my/news/newsRead.do?news_group=corporatenews&news_seq=12480) ).

\*\*Usahawan barangan lusuh dan barangan terbuang kebanyakannya dilakukan oleh kaum India. Amat sedikit penglibatan bangsa lain, terutama Melayu yang melihat sampah itu hanya semata-mata sebagai sampah yang tidak berguna dan kotor tanpa berfikir untuk dibuat sesuatu yang boleh ditukarkan menjadi EMAS, kerana DIRTY JOB ini dianggap low class, memalukan dan tidak berpotensi.

Padahal mereka lah pembekal terbesar bagi barangan lusuh dan recycle kepada kilang-kilang besi, aluminium, pelatuk, kaca, kertas dan sebagainya untuk dikitar semula(kepada Perwaja , Kin Steel <http://pacific.recycle.net/trade/aa1005416.html> ), <http://mblgrp.com/products&services.html> ). Paper Mill, Tissue paper, Kilang Plastic, Gelas dan sebagainya). <http://www.nikkhsin.com/> ).  
<http://www.list-of-companies.org/Malaysia/Environment/Recycling/> ).  
[http://www.henghiap.com/pg\\_products1.htm](http://www.henghiap.com/pg_products1.htm) ).  
[http://www.trademal.com/global/index.php/id/12021/N\\_STAR\\_RECYCLE\\_INDUSTRY\\_SDN\\_BHD/](http://www.trademal.com/global/index.php/id/12021/N_STAR_RECYCLE_INDUSTRY_SDN_BHD/) ).

Teknik memproses sampah dan barangan lusuh ini harus ditangani dan diterokai dengan cara teknologi. Apa yang perlu ialah kerajaan atau dengan kerjasama swasta mendapatkan teknologi bagi mendirikan kilang yang boleh melupuskan bahan tersebut dalam bentuk yang dikehendaki mengikut jenis masing-masing.  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waste\\_management](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waste_management) ).

Jika di German, Jepun, Korea, U.K, Amerika dan beberapa Negara maju lain terdapat pusat pelupusan dan memproses sampah yang dikitar semula mengikut kategori, maka Negara kita juga sudah sampai masanya harus memilikinya dan melakukan seperti apa yang mereka telah praktikkan.  
<http://www.wasteonline.org.uk/resources/InformationSheets/metals.htm> ).

Dengan itu masalah untuk melupuskan sampah tidak timbul lagi.  
<http://www.list-of-companies.org/Malaysia/Environment/Recycling/> ).  
Pencemaran alam akibat pembakaran dapat dihindarkan, disamping mengujudkan peluang pekerjaan kepada yang tidak ada kerja. Kerana itu lebih baik daripada menjadi Mat rempit,

Pecah rumah, Seluk saku, Mencuri, Suka Melepak dan Sepak kertas kesana-sini tanpa tujuan. Tq Tun.

By lebaikudinAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 11:07 PM

Salam Tun & bloggers,

Incinerator is still the best solution albeit its weaknesses:

Arguments for incineration

\* The concerns over the health effects of dioxin and furan emissions have been significantly lessened by advances in emission control designs and very stringent new governmental regulations that have resulted in large reductions in the amount of dioxins and furans emissions.

\* The U.K. Health Protection Agency concluded in 2009 that "Modern, well managed incinerators make only a small contribution to local concentrations of air pollutants. It is possible that such small additions could have an impact on health but such effects, if they exist, are likely to be very small and not detectable."

Read more here:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incinerator#Arguments\\_for\\_incineration](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incinerator#Arguments_for_incineration)

Wassalam

By solve\_itAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 10:20 PM

ok everyone pays for it. or when we say everyone do we mean m'sia version of "everyone" - i.e. some people really pay while some others hv special provision?

when we say pay its suppose to scare people into more awareness and control their rubbish but it only works if the target group are people whom are used to pay everything in their life. their minds are trained to calculate payment and transform into action. how typical.

on the other hand for those that has been getting away with many kind of special provisions, they will subconsciously think it does not affect them anyway. their minds are trained to ignore payment and result in inaction. what a waste.

there are some exceptional people though given special provision but still prefer to work hard and always have self awareness but these elegant kind will not be many.

By 2worldpeaceAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 10:14 PM

Salam Tun,

Saya pasti pelbagai cadangan boleh dipertimbangkan kerajaan. Saya juga pasti kita tidak ketandusan idea untuk menyelesaikan masalah ini. Masalah ini cukup besar namun mungkin tidak begitu mendesak di kala ini. Akan tetapi kerajaan harus pro-aktif dan menyediakan pelbagai alternatif apabila penyelesaian diperlukan. Kita mungkin boleh juga berbuat sesuatu seperti apa yang Singapura buat, yakni menambak laut dengan sampah-sarap. Kita memang tidak mempunyai masalah tanah seperti negara jiran kita itu, tetapi mungkin ini salah satu penyelesaian kepada masalah tersebut. Lokasi untuk ditambak ini kenalah dipastikan. Dengan itu ia juga membantu kita menghalang penghakisan pantai. Kalau pantai peranginan memanglah tak sesuai. Nanti marahlah pula para pengunjung. Mungkin kawasan yang boleh didirikan kilang-kilang atau seumpamanya lebih sesuai.

By musatoAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 8:50 PM

Assalamualaikum Tun.

Terfikir dah berapa lama Tun tak tulis soundbites. Baru-baru ni baru ada tulis.

Ni rasanya baru Rubbish kedua.

Cadangan saya, mungkin rubbish juga boleh dijadikan arca.

Terima kasih Tun.

By hamzahmcl Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 8:46 PM

Dear Tun,

1. Our group have the technology which can convert all type of plastic waste into oil. The oil could be refined further to produce petrol, diesel and other petrochemicals. The gases that is produced could be converted into electricity. This is a local technology which is patented by local Malay scientist but has been frequently ignored by some states government. (maybe becoz we have little money unlike our big brothers in business)

2. 94 Million tons of rubbish which normally comprise 90% of plastic waste could also produce 84.6 Million tons of oils. If we convert it in litres it is 84.6 Billion litres. It is worth at least RM 169.2 Billion. But the petrochemicals worth more than that. Its ratio for the output is 1:1.

3. The process is environment friendly as there is no waste from the process and no emission is produced in the process. The whole plastic will be turn to oils. If all the rubbish in Malaysia is turned to oil or electricity, then the costs of electricity in Malaysia could be reduced by the government.

4. But surprisingly, our technology is well accepted by one country from the EU which has a similar problem although being totally ignored in Malaysia. In fact the government of the country had committed to pay our group €36 per tonne for the rubbish sent for processing.

5. The plastic waste from the landfill could also be used to convert it into oils and electricity. This plastic could only decomposed for thousand of years. Why not use this technology which can convert plastic waste into oil and electricity with a fraction of the cost for drilling oil wells in the ocean.

6. If you are interested to discuss this with our scientist, emailed it to me at kobena oils@gmail.com. We are in a bio technology business.  
By jalil7 Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 7:44 PM

Salam Tun,

Brazil is reputed to be a world leader in garbage disposal technology. I suspect Germany would be a close second though my expertise is not in this area or perhaps in none at all.

In a documentary on National Geographic ( or perhaps it could have been the Science channel ) ealier this year, the processed garbage are used as fuel for electrctity generation, which is then subsequently supplied to an entire town. The town benefits from a much lower

electricity ( subsidised by garbage ) bill, and coupled with clean, efficient waste management, have absolutely no objection to garbage processing located within their territory.

Back home we have TNB wanting an increase in tariffs further. I wish to say this. I am utterly unimpressed with companies such as TNB or Telecom or Private Hospitals or any Utility Company for that matter claiming to have made any certain huge or increase in profits. When scrollers run their announcements on TV, i stand up for a few seconds, and then i sit down again. I do the same for Negara Ku but for a totally different reason. I think i need not explain further.

Anyway, back to waste manamegemt, i am aware of some proposal being submitted to various governments. But i wish to say this ...

1. It is traditional for the government that any proposal must be supported by a "proven track record" or performance. With this kind of approach, we can never make any solutions. ( read : we can never advance ). If Brazill took this road, they will never become number one and Sao Paolo would remain garbaged.
2. I ask therefore that the government calls for our own answer to this problem. ( i.e call for and PAY for the research ). It also means the start of research business. What i am saying is that research work is in itself a business and a government need. Of course the researched subject is to be followed by a proposal or recommendation. But the proposal or recommendation must not be simply buying or importing a solution from another country ( as is always the case ). If so, it is better for the government to do it by themsleves.
3. If it is simply buying or importing a solution, then all the Malaysian companies will do is shop on behalf of the government and then employ or deploy people with the gift of the gab but not the mind to do sales talk to convince the government their soution is best anbd cheapest. Of course they might also arrange site visits and such. And they normally succeed. People have come to learn this is how to sell to the government. It is an accepted norm. It may very well be that this is the formula taught in MBA scools, i don't know, i have never been to school.
4. However if the govrnment insists on both original locally brewed ideas as well as in comparison with those done by other countries, then the compannies must really and honestly do hard work. They must now get the local scientists and technologists involved.
5. Local companies might be reluctant to pay the right price for the local researches. To pay another Malaysian higher than themselves as CEO ( due to the professionalism and high expertise ) is unheard of in a typical Malaysian company. It is perhaps against the religion of the CEO. But if they remain with this attitude, the government should drop them. Otherwise, if the same formula is still being used by the government, then the government should no longer bat an eye when local scientists and technologists depart to advanced nations.

6. If no original and locally brewed ideas emerge, then it would be faster and easier and much cheaper for our PM or DPM or whomever deemed fit to just fly to Brazil and announce our interest in their solution. Interested companies pun tak payar pikir banyak-banyak, lobi sahaja cukup. Tak perlu nak adakan researcher, engineer, biologist, chemist dan sebagainya, untuk buat kajian. Kene bayar gaji mahal pulak tu.

7. My own mad ideas are as follows. I give free. Possibilities include using nuclear fission power as incinerator for the garbage processing , using concrete to contain the garbage for organised burial in deep mines ( new or unused ), to process the garbage added with chemicals that will change them to oil in a predictable time frame, processing or recycling of the garbage into fertilizer, building materials and many other useful substances.

8. Certainly i see a tremendous amount of R&D potential in what i call "Garbage Science", and is certainly not pseudo-science. I am not surprised if a Chemist tells me that the tons of garbage contains all the elements known to mankind.

All the best to those who seek garbage in their life.

Thank you Tun, that's was my 10 sens worth. ( used to be 2 sens when i was younger )  
By Khabilan SivaGAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 5:09 PM

Hi Tun,  
Recycling is the solution.  
Government should encourage private sectors to do more R&D to recycle waste.

If this is success, people will not look for dustbins to throw rubbish but places to sell it.

IT will create more job opportunity as well.

Rubbish problem is not only for KL but almost everywhere on earth.

TQ Tun  
By asset managementAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 5:02 PM

That is really huge and if they do not work on that time will come that entire Malaysia is floating into rubbish. They should have make an alternative way to at least reduce the garbage volume. Segregate things that are biodegradable and recyclable. People should also work as a team to join the countries worse problems. Once, one Malaysian City has been awarded as Cleanest City, does the evolution of cleanliness ended? They need to focus on this matter, as this one really a big effect on our world campaign against climate change.  
By odan\_odcAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 4:32 PM

Salam Tun & Readers,

Here's my individual current way of doing it:

1. Try to recycle all the material you can recycle (plastic, paper). I'm recycling paper and plastic so far. Although we do face some issues since there's no proper place to send our

recyclable items in Dungun. All Municipal Council should prepare a place for people to send the waste material (plastic, paper, glass, electronics) for recycle maybe within 10 km radius each.

2. If you space around your area of living, try separating the food waste material and let the animals eat them. Good way to reduce waste collection by Council.

Future idea - thinking of doing it

1. Bring your own tupper ware whenever you want to buy foods from stalls (if you always take away). This will reduce the polystyrene packages. Just that you need to learn not to be shy because people rally bring their own tupper ware.

That's my idea so far for individuals to try.

By Mis\_bahAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 4:16 PM

Assamu Alaikum Tun,

I think we need innovative Malaysian to solve this alarming problems. We need to find ways how to reuse the waste and at the end there will be waste at all. If Singapore may turn "waste" into drink water. We have enough scietist. Malaysia Boleh Tun.

By Hazman Abu BakarAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 4:12 PM

The only solution is awareness but for us malaysian, it is million light years away still.let us do it like in victoria australia.authority supply 3 type of bin to each house,recycle,gabage and green waste bin.if a household overfill the bins with gabage, they get fined. Fill wrong type of waste to the wrong bin, they get fined as well. And each type of bin have designated days and frequency to be picked up by the truck.with this, each household will control their waste to not overspill the bins. Theres only one problem. Implementation of this method. Thats the real trickle we need to figure out.

By MAZAIAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:55 PM

Yg. Bhg. Tun,

Terimakasih diatas maklumat yang didedahkan oleh TUN. Satu perkara yang menarik dan harus diambil perhatian oleh semua ialah dua perkara:

1. Kegairahan pihak kerajaan hendak menjadi negara maju sehingga lupa akan keperluan untuk meninjau keupayaan masyarakat.

2. Amalan demokrasi berlebihan sehigga kerajaan tidak sanggup membuat sesuatu jika ada yang membantah walaupun apa yang hendak dibuat itu sesuatu yang baik untuk negara dan rakyat.

Isu pertama ialah tumpuan terlalu tinggi kepada keinginan menjadi negara maju sehingga apa sahaja yang dicadangkan oleh pihak swasta akan diterima walaupun apa yang dicadangkan itu tidak merupakan sesuatu yang diperluakan. Maka setiap inci tanah yang ada mesti diluluskan kepada pemaju - dilembah, digunung, dipaya, dibukit, dilereng dan sebagainya. Seolah-olah negara ini mesti dimajukan segera. Maka banyaklah bencana alam sekitar yang berlaku -tanah runtuh, bajir kilat, bangunan runtuh, perubahan cuaca mendadak. Disdamping itu berlaku keadaan kekurangan kawasan lapang, kekuarangan kawasan rekreasi. Kalau boleh setiap inci tanah mesti dimajukan. Seheinggakan tapak stadium hendak dimajukan, kawasan parking dibina gerai, rizab sungai dijadikan ruang

niaga dan banyak lagi.

Isu kedua kerajaan takut hendak bertindak kerana takut populeriti menurun. Maka banyaklah penerokaan tanah secara haram berlaku, pembinaan kilang dan kedai tanpa kelulusan, membina gegai ditepi jalan, dirizab parit, kawasan parking. Maka semakin padatlah pembangunan. Jika pegawai ingin mengambil tindakan akan ada pihak yang menghalangnya. Maka semakin beranilah orang melakukan kesalahan /melanggar undang-undang.

Apa yang dihuraikan oleh Tun itu adalah kesan dari 2 sikap utama diatas. Untuk mengatasinya. Hanya satu perubahan penting perlu dibuat oleh pihak yang berkuasa dan para pemimpin. Iaitu berani bertegas dan sanggup membenarkan pihak pengutkuasan mengambil tindakan walaupun akan menjejaskan populeriti kerajaan yang memerintah dan merancang demi kepentingan rakyat bukan kepentingan diri.

MAZAI

By LionelcheeAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:51 PM

Dear Tun,

We can seek advice from our neighbour, Singapore and if we feel "malu" then we can go to Seoul or any city in Japan. They are happy to educate us. But I am not sure whether our present government wants to bow to them. The main problem is our politicians are too proud to ask for help.

By jimmyng122Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:23 PM

Good afternoon Tun,

I suppose we are very pampered as a nation, and I am sure many of us are grateful for all the subsidies and incentives that are in place to help us get through our lives as Malaysians. However, the root of the matter is that the income of the population is still low and it does not tally well with the supposed low cost of living.

I support policies that make people more accountable for themselves. The price for fuel has to be paid by both the rakyat as well as the government. Subsidies can only help thus far. As for rubbish disposal, water treatment etc, we also have a role to play to make sure that these needs are taken care of i.e. local councils should charge the residents for the services provided. However, in order for us to afford these fees, our income has to increase in proportion. When our spending power (due to increased income) increases, everything else will fall into place naturally. Prices of goods become more affordable and the economy runs faster.

The bottom line is, everything is a shared responsibility. A government that recognizes the facts that we Malaysians are now prepared to be held as equal regardless of our races, and we can no longer tolerate political plays at the expense of our economic and social development, will be able to find a solution. Otherwise, we'll be caught in a vicious circle of politicians who make populist policies just for the sake of staying in power and nothing gets done properly and the people have no choice but to demand more protection/pampering. It takes great pain to do what is right and good for the nation. Currently, none of the politicians is ready to sacrifice for the nation.

just my two cents.

By usopAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:21 PM

Salaam Tun,

I sincerely hope your latest comment on this issue would receive greater attention from the current government.

The solution is to ask everybody to pay: the more rubbish you generate, the more you need to pay. And enforce it !

Our recreational forest (Hutan Lipur) for example charges no fee for admission. Thus you'll be sure to find all sorts of rubbish especially soiled diapers left in that areas. Given that the facilities are free, the majority of users take our natural resources for granted & sadly, misused it. Instead of employing staff from Jabatan Hutan to collect waste there, why not charge users for a deposit and return it when the users bring back their waste at the entrance?

No plastic day is a good effort & the Federal government should adopt this gradually so that the public would be able to adapt.

I am skeptical about Jabatan Pengurusan Sisa Pepejal but like it or not, the government should acknowledge that the current solid waste management is below par and is unable to cater for the growing population. More allocations needed – by this I mean to replace the current interim payment approach adopted by state/ local authority to better reflect current operation cost & to replace the existing fleet of waste collection lorry that can't even prevent leachate leakage. Yet, they keep on using these lorries.

The time for campaign/education approach is over. We need a serious enforcement on waste separation gradually starting from the most populated areas, with stick and carrot approach. Wait a minute, can KPKT guarantee our separated waste continues as it is until it reaches landfill?

Maybe it is time for another thought on incinerator?

By iceblenderAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:19 PM

I think we can spend more on education to enlighten the community of the basic 3Rs. Reduce, reuse, recycle. Just look at how the Japanese do it.....

By RajaChulanAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:07 PM

I have seen garbage incinerators built and operating in the middle of town and beside shopping complexes in Japan and South Korea. It looks clean and just like an electrical sub-station that we see here. I believe that many of us lack information regarding this matter and many don't trust the Government. At the end of the day, it all boils down to the lack of credibility on the part of the Government.

By faizalAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 12:44 PM

Salam Tun.

I believe its all about awareness. The rubbish problems will be a prolong problems for every country and if we look at best practices around the world, are using incinerator. There is no need to do lots of research about this, just adapt and implement. We know that it will cost much initially but in a long run, it will greener and cheaper and you are able to produce electricity and put it back to the grid.

As we all know, TNB and Petronas are making big bugs and with their help, we will be able to achieve this and again why Petronas? Well, they are the administrator to our wealth, the crude oil in Malaysia, belongs to Malaysia and we are Malaysians....arent we?

The cost of transport will be expensive if we were to use public or tolled road, but is a designated route like rail, the cost will less and designated collection points need to be created.

Awareness plays an important role too. Put in more documentary on recycle, incinerator, best practices and whatever that will do good to dispose rubbish in the media.

Sometimes, its difficult to pleased everyone or some parties will take advantage of the situation. Appointing a private company with concession will be like PLUS, increase toll/services every 2 years, why not appoint GLC to do this. At least, making HUGH profit will not be in their charter.

We need to bite the bullet now, and if the location is strategic, we are able to provide these services to our neighbors at a premium.

Tun, I am not an expert here but this is my humble opinion.  
By pakbelalangAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 12:27 PM

Here is the debate on incinerator which I pick up from Wikipedia. The pros and cons.

#### Debate

Use of incinerators for waste management is controversial. The debate over incinerators typically involves business interests (representing both waste generators and incinerator firms), government regulators, environmental activists and local citizens who must weigh the economic appeal of local industrial activity with their concerns over health and environmental risk.

People and organizations professionally involved in this issue include the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and a great many local and national air quality regulatory agencies worldwide.

#### Arguments for incineration

\* The concerns over the health effects of dioxin and furan emissions have been significantly lessened by advances in emission control designs and very stringent new governmental regulations that have resulted in large reductions in the amount of dioxins and furans emissions.

\* The U.K. Health Protection Agency concluded in 2009 that "Modern, well managed incinerators make only a small contribution to local concentrations of air pollutants. It is possible that such small additions could have an impact on health but such effects, if they exist, are likely to be very small and not detectable."

\* Incineration plants can generate electricity and heat that can substitute power plants powered by other fuels at the regional electric and district heating grid, and steam supply for industrial customers. Incinerators and other waste-to-energy plants generate at least partially biomass-based renewable energy that offsets greenhouse gas pollution from coal-,

oil- and gas-fired power plants.[25] The E.U. considers energy generated from biogenic waste (waste with biological origin) by incinerators as non-fossil renewable energy under its emissions caps. These greenhouse gas reductions are in addition to those generated by the avoidance of landfill methane.

\* The bottom ash residue remaining after combustion has been shown to be a non-hazardous solid waste that can be safely put into landfills or recycled as construction aggregate. Samples are tested for ecotoxic metals.

\* In densely populated areas, finding space for additional landfills is becoming increasingly difficult.

\* The Maishima waste treatment center in Osaka, designed by Friedensreich Hundertwasser, uses heat for power generation. Fine particles can be efficiently removed from the flue gases with baghouse filters. Even though approximately 40 % of the incinerated waste in Denmark was incinerated at plants with no baghouse filters, estimates based on measurements by the Danish Environmental Research Institute showed that incinerators were only responsible for approximately 0.3 % of the total domestic emissions of particulate smaller than 2.5 micrometres (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) to the atmosphere in 2006.

\* Incineration of municipal solid waste avoids the release of methane. Every ton of MSW incinerated, prevents about one ton of carbon dioxide equivalents from being released to the atmosphere.

\* Incineration of medical waste and sewage sludge produces an end product ash that is sterile and non-hazardous.

\* Most municipalities that operate incineration facilities have higher recycling rates than neighboring cities and counties that do not send their waste to incinerators. This is in part due to enhanced recovery of ceramic materials reused in construction, as well as ferrous and in some cases non-ferrous metals that can be recovered from combustion residue. Metals recovered from ash would typically be difficult or impossible to recycle through conventional means, as the removal of attached combustible material through incineration provides an alternative to labor- or energy-intensive mechanical separation methods.

\* Volume of combusted waste is reduced by approximately 90%, increasing the life of landfills. Ash from modern incinerators is vitrified at temperatures of 1,000 °C (1,830 °F) to 1,100 °C (2,010 °F), reducing the leachability and toxicity of residue. As a result, special landfills are generally no longer required for incinerator ash from municipal waste streams, and existing landfills can see their life dramatically increased by combusting waste, reducing the need for municipalities to site and construct new landfills.

#### Arguments against incineration

\* The Scottish Protection Agency's (SEPA) comprehensive health effects research concluded "inconclusively" on health effects in Oct. 2009. The authors stress, that even though no conclusive evidence of non-occupational health effects from incinerators were found in the existing literature, "small but important effects might be virtually impossible to detect". The report highlights epidemiological deficiencies in previous UK health studies and suggests areas for future studies. The U.K. Health Protection Agency produced a lesser summary in September 2009. Many toxicologists criticise and dispute this report as not being comprehensive epidemiologically, thin on peer review and the effects of fine particle effects on health.

\* The highly toxic fly ash must be safely disposed of. This usually involves additional waste miles and the need for specialist toxic waste landfill elsewhere. If not done properly, it may cause concerns for local residents.

\* Some people are still concerned about the health effects of dioxin and furan emissions into the atmosphere from old incinerators; especially during start up and shut down, or where filter bypass is required.

\* Incinerators emit varying levels of heavy metals such as vanadium, manganese, chromium, nickel, arsenic, mercury, lead, and cadmium, which can be toxic at very minute levels.

\* Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) has elevated levels of heavy metals with ecotoxicity concerns if not reused properly. Some people have the opinion that IBA reuse is still in its infancy and is still not considered to be a mature or desirable product, despite additional engineering treatments. Concerns of IBA use in foam concrete have been expressed by the UK Health and Safety Executive in 2010 following several construction and demolition explosions. In its guidance document, IBA is currently banned from use by the UK Highway Authority in concrete work until these incidents have been investigated.

\* Alternative technologies are available or in development such as Mechanical Biological Treatment, Anaerobic Digestion (MBT/AD), Autoclaving or Mechanical Heat Treatment (MHT) using steam or plasma arc gasification PGP, or combinations of these treatments. Erection of incinerators compete with the development and introduction of other emerging technologies. A UK government WRAP report, August 2008 found that in the UK median incinerator costs per ton were generally higher than those for MBT treatments by £18 per metric ton; and £27 per metric ton most for modern (post 2000) incinerators.

\* Building and operating waste processing plants such as incinerators requires long contract periods to recover initial investment costs, causing a long term lock-in. Incinerator lifetimes normally range 25–30 years. This was highlighted by Peter Jones, OBE, the Mayor of London's waste representative in April 2009.

\* Incinerators produce fine particles in the furnace. Even with modern particle filtering of the flue gases, a small part of these is emitted to the atmosphere. PM2.5 is not separately regulated in the European Waste Incineration Directive, even though they are repeatedly correlated spatially to infant mortality in the UK (M.Ryan's ONS data based maps around the EfW/CHP waste incinerators at Edmonton, Coventry, Chineham, Kirklees and Sheffield). Under WID there is no requirement to monitor stack top or downwind incinerator PM2.5 levels.[41] Several European doctors associations (including cross discipline experts such as physicians, environmental chemists and toxicologists) in June 2008 representing over 33,000 doctors wrote a keynote statement directly to the European Parliament citing widespread concerns on incinerator particle emissions and the absence of specific fine and ultrafine particle size monitoring or in depth industry/ government epidemiological studies of these minute and invisible incinerator particle size emissions.

\* Local communities are often opposed to the idea of locating waste processing plants such as incinerators in their vicinity (the Not In My Back Yard phenomenon). Studies in Andover, Massachusetts strongly correlated 10% property devaluations with close incinerator proximity.

\* Prevention, waste minimisation, reuse and recycling of waste should all be preferred to

incineration according to the waste hierarchy. Supporters of zero waste consider incinerators and other waste treatment technologies as barriers to recycling and separation beyond particular levels, and that waste resources are sacrificed for energy production.

\* A 2008 Eunomia report found that under some circumstances and assumptions, incineration causes less CO2 reduction than other emerging EfW and CHP technology combinations for treating residual mixed waste. The authors found that CHP incinerator technology without waste recycling ranked 19 out of 24 combinations (where all alternatives to incineration were combined with advanced waste recycling plants); being 228% less efficient than the ranked 1 Advanced MBT maturation technology; or 211% less efficient than plasma gasification/autoclaving combination ranked 2.

\* Some incinerators are visually undesirable. In many countries they require a visually intrusive chimney stack.

\* If reusable waste fractions are handled in waste processing plants such as incinerators in developing nations, it would cut out viable work for local economies. It is estimated that there are 1 million people making a livelihood off collecting waste.

#### Trends in incinerator use

The history of municipal solid waste (MSW) incineration is linked intimately to the history of landfills and other waste treatment technology. The merits of incineration are inevitably judged in relation to the alternatives available. Since the 1970s, recycling and other prevention measures have changed the context for such judgements. Since the 1990s alternative waste treatment technologies have been maturing and becoming viable.

Incineration is a key process in the treatment of hazardous wastes and clinical wastes. It is often imperative that medical waste be subjected to the high temperatures of incineration to destroy pathogens and toxic contamination it contains.

By pakbelalangAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 12:02 PM

The solution is very simple.

1. Any future new housing development in Greater KL the authorities must make it compulsory for the developers to provide "mini" incinerators to cater for the convenience of the new residents within the area.

2. The authority then will take over the management and maintenance of the incinerators for health and security reasons.

3. The govt. must have the political will to build incinerators. It is the cleanest and safest and efficient modern rubbish disposal system. The govt. need to educate and lead the rakyat for something that is good for them.

By samuraimelayuAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 12:00 PM

SALAM KASIH DAN SAYANG  
AYAHANDA RAKYAT TUN  
Izinkan,

Perhaps, we could suggest a solution ...

HAVE LESS RUBBISH DUMBS AND MORE RUBBISH DUMPS  
HAVE LESS DUMB SIGHS AND MORE DUMP SITES  
EMM...ARE WE TALKING RUBBISH HERE???

Love Ayahanda Mahathir Mohamed and Bonda Siti Hasmah Ali ALWAYS

ALFATIHAH, AMIN

'Kurangkan permohonan NAFSU tingkatkan permohonan IMAN'  
By AzahariAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 11:59 AM

Cadangan ini mungkin bunyinya macam bodoh sebab saya kurang arif tetapi ini cadangan saya:

1)Mungkin kita boleh tukar sampah kepada sumber kuasa. Untuk jimat kos jangka panjang transport kita boleh bina rail keretapi untuk bawa sampah.

2)Sekiranya tidak mencemarkan alam bolehkah sampah jadi bahan untuk penambakan.

3)Kitar semula nampaknya kurang ada sambutan. Kerajaan mungkin boleh promosi kitar semula dengan menawar geran kepada syarikat kecil yang berminat memungut sampah rumah kerumah untuk kitar semula. (Saya sendiri sangat berminat memulakan perniagaan ini kalau ada geran).

4)Mungkin antara cara nak galak kempen kitar semula kita boleh tawar pertandingan yang menawar hadiah jutaan ringgit supaya semua orang berusaha asingkan sampah di rumah mereka untuk menang pertandingan ini. Pertandingan boleh dilakukan kontraktor seperti dalam cadangan nombor 3 di atas.

Azahari Ismail

By GongPauhAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 11:58 AM

Dear Tun and all Malaysian,

Komen saya mungkin not directly on rubbish tapi kebersihan bandaraya kuala lumpur. Tahap kebersihan dan kekemasan bandaraya kuala lumpur sekarang ini adalah terendah dalam masa 30 tahun. Penguatkuasa dah tak berpungsi. Datuk bandaraya tak bersuara. Banyak kerja kerja pemulihan bangunan dalam bandar tidak di tutup pandangan macam nak buat show, gerai menjual kueh tepi jalan macam cendawan di pagi hari, jalan tak rata-bertampal dan berlompak macam masuk ladang kelapa sawit. Kalau kami yang bekerja di KL rasa nak muntah tengok kekotoran badaraya kita, apa kata dan pandangan pelawat-pelawat dari luar.

By shahiranAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 11:25 AM

Solid waste disposal problem huh? Politically, this issue is in no-win situation. If any of our politician really dreamed on handling the rubbish issue as it should be, they maybe gonna be off-voted. Society rejects to live near their waste, as rubbish always been seen as unpleasant, disease centered etc. Landfills? No. Incinerator? No. Fees for rubbish disposal? No.

What citizen are doing right now (no plastic bag, no plastic bottle) is just a matter of fact decreasing the rubbish produce per person, but the population always in increase thus the rubbish problem is by now increasing.

Recycle, recycle and recycle. That is the real solution yet we seems not ready (authority) to run for the larger scale of recycling center.

By fadzlrachimAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 10:32 AM

Salam Tun Dr M. May all be well with you. My humble suggestions:

1. Use latest technology to turn food waste to energy. Japan and Singapore had done this successfully

2. There is still some areas in Greater KL suitable for incinerator, e.g. former KTMB land in Sentul. Since YTL is reaping huge profits from the expensive residential/commercial properties under urban renewal project, should be no issue for a CSR project by them I guess

3. Ask PM DS Najib Razak to pose this to Parliament for all the brilliant minds to answer.

If rubbish issues our authorities could not solve, I think our authorities is full of rubbish and need advice from your brilliant mind.

Thank you.

By faaAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 9:08 AM

Dearest Tun,

My sympathy to the council. On my part, I've been trying to recycle everything that I no longer need. Leftover/wastage food would be turned into compost, plastics, papers etc goes to recycle bins. But it's like fighting a losing battle teaching and asking the children, husband and maid (whom I wish I can dispense with) to do the same. Which goes to my request (and many other women) that we hope the society could teach our Malaysian men that domestic work should be shared by men as well. Then most likely, we do not need to rely on maids/foreign labours anymore.

By kamaliuk1973Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 8:41 AM

Dear Tun,

1. A lot of non-biodegradable rubbish comes from plastic bags.

2. The Pakatan Rakyat government in Selangor has implemented a 'No Plastic Bag' campaign to reduce the amount of non-biodegradable rubbish at the risk of losing votes.

<http://www.sun2surf.com/article.cfm?id=53933>

3. This campaign has also been politicised by BN politicians in criticising that state government because Malaysians have to pay a fee to discourage the use of plastic bags. This is similar to your rubbish disposal fee suggestion above.

<http://www.themalaysianinsider.com/malaysia/article/selangor-risks-voter-backlash-over-plastic-bag-policy/>

4. Which side do you agree with?

By Hantu LautAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 8:22 AM

Dear Tun,

In a nutshell.

Garbage disposal has always been a problem everywhere and most are sent to landfills or incinerators, which has its dire effect....pollution.

While landfills contaminate our ground water, incineration pollutes the air that contribute to global warming. For hundred of years we have used these primitive methods of disposing our wastes with dire consequence on our environment. Only the last few decades, we, human have come to realise that we are killing our planet slowly but surely.

Waste is a source of renewable energy, particularly biodegradable wastes. Dump-sites are full of them which can be used as biomass to generate electricity. Though, burning biomass to generate energy pollutes the air, it is less harmful than fossil fuel particularly coal which release pollutants that can cause acid rain. Such power plant can reduce the impact of pollution by using adequate filtering system.

Easier said than done?

No! Men had sent men to the moon. It only need the will power to do it by inventing the right machines to make it more cost effective.

Let starts at the city council dump-sites where the garbage are multifarious.

First, we need a machine to separate the biodegradable from the non-biodegradable. The non-biodegradable such as plastic, glass, cans, etc can be sent for recycling and the biodegradable kept for biomass.

Next, we need a machine to compact the biomass to reduce its volume so as to reduce the cost of transportation from the dumpsites to the power generating plant.

If we can transport fossil fuel for thousands of miles, there is no reason why we can't with biomass which is probably less than 100 miles to the plant which should be sited away from populated areas.

Private enterprises are reluctant to embark on such ventures because of the high risk factor. This is where government participation is inevitable if such venture were to be successful.

Government participations can be in the form of tax break, subsidy or grants, whichever is viable and that bring benefits to the people, no loss to government and less pollution to the environment.

By rakyat\_biasa Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 8:16 AM

Salam Tun,

Semoga usaha anda diberkati dan diberi petunjuk olehNYa

IMHO, the only solution that is sustainable is to burn it in an incinerator. the amount of rubbish is too huge to be recycle through any traditional way.

location of the incinerator 'MUST' not affect existing people in KL. They have been paying huge amount of money to buy their house and it is not easy to find another house in KL

without another huge investment. Setting up an incinerator next to house would be a nightmare and any ordinary people would get angry. Don't dream to get their vote for the rest of their life. You would be consider as lucky if you can get their relatives and friends' vote.

the additional cost incurred due to transportation cost is unavoidable. This can easily be solve by increasing any existing tax eg. assessment or quit rent. Introducing new tax would not only cause major havoc but prone to increase operation cost, setup cost and tendency to be manipulate by certain individual.

finally, the last thing rakyat would like to hear is another CEO (eg: incinerator's CEO) being paid almost half a million MONTHLY as what happen to Syabas's CEO. We should all know that kind of business is NOT FOR MAKING MONEY, but rather a service back to community.

Wallahua'lam.

By ir\_azminAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 7:46 AM

1.I'm a Malaysian student in Japan.

2.I believe if we cant find the solution inside Malaysia itself,it's better to learn from other community which had succeeded to solve the problem or at least has show some progress in solving this "rubbish" problem.

3.That's why i think you send all of us here in Japan...to find something or solution for something that others can't.

4.Here in Japan, they have a very good way to manage their garbage...I say maybe 10,20 years ahead of Malaysia.

5.I want to explain more about this rubbish thing in Japan but my poor English make it difficult for me to take it further. (maybe because speaking to much Japanese every day)

6.I exchange of that, i found this excellent article about rubbish in Japan and how we can learn from them.I hope this will give some of the basic idea how at least we can start solving this human killing problem.

7.Here's the link

[http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/408576/what\\_americans\\_can\\_learn\\_from\\_japans.html?cat=17](http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/408576/what_americans_can_learn_from_japans.html?cat=17)

By azriAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 7:27 AM

Salam,

1) Problem originated from people attitude (Govt less concern --> Rakyat less concern also)

2) How to make everybody notice?

3) Currently, govt. had made a good step by implement "No Plastic Bag Campaign".

4) KL can strongly prohibit plastic bag usage in KL (Will affect some plastic bag manufacturer and all pasar malam hawkers but who cares)Penang already did what.

5) Less plastic bag --> Less rubbish (Can ask actual figure from DBKL;Plastic bag is not biodegradable)

5) Sometimes, someday, somebody must be different.Totally different.

6) People still can carry goods from shop.Too many ways. Tesco Jusco had proved already.

7) People giving excuse for things they are so lazy to do.

8) Govt. giving excuse also for things they are so lazy to do.

9) So its all about morale.

10) Lets start with No Using Plastic Bag.

\*Bought 2 shopping bag already.haha.

By salesmanAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 7:27 AM

Dear Tun,

From my personal opinion as a ordinary rakyat, I think government should follow how the development country manage their rubbish. Learn from South Korea, Japan and Singapore. People also must produce less rubbish and recycle as per campaign say. (wondering the campaign ads is no more on tv and this will make people forget the important of recycle rubbish).

I wish u in a good health Tun, take care.

By Alpha TangoAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 7:01 AM

Dear Tun

First, through re-cycling, something my family has been practicing for years. This will help reduce the amount of rubbish and earn money in the process [from selling the recycled materials].

Then, we have small rubbish collection hubs where the rubbish is compacted and sprayed with disinfectant. To reduce the volume, smell and health risk for its subsequent transport to the incinerators out-of-town.

The incinerators will have features like :

Scrubbers to ensure only "clean" white smoke is discharged from its chimneys

Generate power for its own power consumption and to sell into the National Grid

Use electrical power [similar to an arc furnace] to incinerate the rubbish

Odor killers sprayed continuously throughout the facility so that the facility always smell nice and there is no foul odor.

Very good sound insulation and barriers to ensure no noise disturbs the surrounding community/ies.

People's main fear and phobia of incinerators are the smell and noise.

To ensure the incinerators have the blessings and support of the local community/ies surrounding it, consider :

Giving them exemption from paying assessments [cukai pintu, cukai tanah].

Build a community hall, mosque, church or temple for their communal needs

Provide free or subsidized power from the power generated by the incinerator

Better education through the mass media and in schools up to Forms 3 or 5 to show the consequences of poor rubbish disposal and the need for modern incinerators

And other incentives that the Federal and State governments, utilities and municipalities can think of. However, not everything should be given away free as Malaysian are not known to appreciate free items.

The compacted rubbish can be further compacted and treated with cement to make a dense, solid semi-concrete block. These can be made in various forms, shapes, sizes, weights and densities to suit every need or function.

Some examples :

Sound barriers / walls isolating the highways from nearby homes

Road dividers and road guardrails : The compacted rubbish blocks can be built with impact absorbing properties to dissipate the force from vehicular impacts. As added savings, these blocks have no theft-value !

Building blocks in construction.

As solid fillers in landfills

Industries will self-materialize to support when entrepreneurs realize the merits and advantages of these "rubbish-core building blocks."

I hope my input will help generate more ideas on disposing rubbish.

Tun, thank you for giving me the opportunity to be heard.  
My Family and I wish you and your wife a long and healthy life ahead.

Best wishes

ATM

blitzatm@gmail.com

By azlan95Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 5:45 AM

The solution to the rubbish problem is, like it or not, the incinerator. Let's have a pilot incinerator in place please. We do not have much time left because the population is growing fast.

Azlan

KL

By KokabalaAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 5:37 AM

Three rubbish bins.

1. Rubbish bin for recycle items e.g. softdrink containers, papers cupboard etc.
2. Rubbish bin for garden waste.
3. Rubbish bin for others which do not fit into 1 and 2.

Compost bin for any left over foods. The compost can be used for fertiliser.

Reduce the rubbish collection to one per week. Also make bin no.3 the smaller size.

By KCAnqAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 4:42 AM

Dear Tun,

I think a lot of Malaysians are taking things for granted and did not appreciate things which they are enjoying now.

As for a Malaysian living in US, I learned it the hard way.

We have to pay for everything here. We have to pay to throw away our rubbish. Depends on how much rubbish you throw, you pay for the size of rubbish bin you can own. That way, people are also forced to recycle their products. Products for recycling will be collected for free. It has to be put into different bin for recycling. Food waste are minimize and whatever can be use for compost will be thrown into compost bin which we have to buy it ourselves. here, we have to pay for our sewer bill every month too, and it cost more per month, than the bill we pay to Indah Water per year! Sewer bill is charge like our water bill, the more you use your water, the more you have to pay for sewer!

By di1bzs0qAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:51 AM

Dear Tun,

I have watched discovery channel regarding waste disposal management. In Taiwan , there's a beautiful park in gao shiung , where the underneath is a rubbish disposal quarry before.

they lay a layer of silicon carpet on top of the rubbish after being compressed, and add soil and solidify the soil. then, they build recreational parks for their citizens, a first class park being made by just adding layers of 'carpet' above the rubbish and add soil to it.

Since it is not gonna be used to build houses, I assume it is safe to be used as a recreational park.

A developed nation should have more kinds of these parks, in UK where I'm currently residing now, these parks are well maintained and every morning or weekends, these mat salleh brought their big fat dogs to walk in the park. If we want to achieve a developed nation, we should show these kinds of enjoyment we should have, although its just a perception, but other countries will see us, the citizens are care free and successful.

These Mat Salleh ain't rich in fact, but they can show these kind of quality of life whereby in Malaysia, its hard to show these carefree as the parks are limited.

Lastly, its all about perception management. If we build more parks, and the citizens get to spend time in there ie. taiwan , china and hong kong citizens are so actively in the park every morning and evening. They ain't rich, but why do they live so care free?

It is because they have confident with their quality of life, they supported the government and they have the faith that they are well protected. Therefore, it is a paramount to build a perception where our people is carefree, whether he is rich or not, other nations citizens must look at him as 'rich,successful,and good government in Malaysia.'

By AmosLimZhenYuAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:39 AM

Dear Tun,

A really efficient air pollution devices should be invested, to a Energy producing incinerator.

1. it rudeces the space needed to landfill.
2. Economically wise because Energy can be sold.
3. material is fully used.

I hope this trash issue would bring awareness of the degrading living environment for the majority people.

Wish Tun healthy and in joy all time.

By sam 93Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 3:29 AM

Salam kasih dan hormat Tun,

Saya merasakan kita perlu menerapkan dalam diri setiap penduduk KL dan seluruh negara akan sifat bertanggungjawab ke atas negara kita yang tercinta.Sekiranya sifat ini sudah berada dalam diri setiap rakyat nescaya insyaallah mereka akan merasa bersalah untuk menghasilkan sampah dalam kadar yang begitu banyak.Saya juga berpendapat bahawa negara kita perlu mencontohi bagaimana negara luar menyelesaikan masalah sampah di negara mereka biarpun mempunyai bilangan penduduk yang ramai.Negara kita sudah banyak mengadakan kerjasama dengan negara luar terutama dalam bidang ekonomi,jadi apa salahnya sekiranya kita mengalihkan fokus kita kepada masalah sampah pula.Biarpun perkara ini dilihat senagai satu perkara yang pelik dan jarang dilakukan namun bagi mencapai tahap negara maju,kita perlu melihat dari setiap sudut keadaan negara agar negara menjadi maju dalam keadaan yang stabil.

Sekian, terima kasih Tun.

By mohammed a h Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 2:55 AM

YAB Tun,

7 million tons to my mind gross underestimation. By how much? I personally don't know. But what little I know is that there are much more rubbish or garbage which the DBKL contractors are supposed "to collect and clean" as required under their respective "MULTI MILLION RINGGIT" contracts with the DBKL, but these garbage are left uncollected. So there is "pilferage" of public fund and job not satisfactorily done. Attempts to get these contractors to perform and comply with their responsibilities have failed. They will continue collect their monthly DBKL payments despite shoddy service. Why? Wallah hu 'alam. As mentioned by Saudara Kamal Ahmad, garbage disposal is "exclusively" big business with DBKL.

Yes, most local authorities in Malaysia have basic working systems for garbage collection and disposal. However the system will have to be reviewed to improve its accountability and transparency before we may even talk about addressing the other issue relating to greater public awareness and participation in campaigns to promote general cleanliness.

Like many other community-based issues, participation of individual families (as the smallest unit in a given society) is the most crucial part of the chain and should be mobilised. A committed family can be generated through knowledge and education. School curriculum must come in support of the societal objective with appropriate civic subject and co curriculum activities.

Likewise local community associations and NGOs should be empowered to take the lead in activities relating to cleanliness awareness campaigns on continuous basis.

Correspondingly, hefty penalty accompanied with unyielding enforcement should be able to help curtail errand defaulters (be it individuals or corporations).

Experience in many countries especially Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Scandinavian and other European countries could be easily used as reference or benchmark. It is entirely up to us to decide on how to emulate them for our own betterment. In this regard, it is in our best personal interest to serve the society interest first. Wassalam.

Mohammed A H

Saturday, 11 December, 2010

By amin tan Author Profile Page on December 11, 2010 2:54 AM

Dear Tun,

It is very clever of you to provoke the topic on rubbish disposal. Your point number 6 about rubbish mountain reminds me of Bukit Jalil rubbish dump and the daily scavengers of treasure hunt. I wonder where have they relocated.

Point number 8. incinerator location always bring about political problems as opposition parties would exploit the issue. I think using incinerator is the best long term option.

I am sure the city council must have sent their councillors to Tokyo, London, Shanghai to study how these cities cope with their rubbish.

My humble suggestion is we use the rubbish as landfill in ravine where we think we want to make double track fast train from KL SENTRAL to KOTA bharu. Make it a 5 years or 10 years targets. I believe the expensive part of the track is crossing the ravines and shortened the tracks. I will continue to dream how to build a double track bullet train to Kota Bharu from K.L.SENTRAL even though they will never do it. If I were the Prime Minister I would start the feasibility study now.

amin tan

By HafizAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 1:02 AM

Dear Tun,

You are 100% right that authorities will lose their votes because their KPI is actually (KEY POPULARITY INDICATOR).

I was in Japan recently and was really amazed on how they managed their rubbish. Rubbish are separated into 5 containers (Paper, plastics or PET, glass, aluminum and food waste). They even washed the bottles, cans and plastic bottles before throwing into the containers to be collected and recycled. With more than 120mil population and almost equal the land mass of Peninsular Malaysia, they managed their waste really well.

I see no point of Malaysia become a fully developed nation with a GNI of USD15,000 per capita by 2020 when majority of Malaysians are still trapped in the "third-world country" mentality.

By Sahabat dari ChicagoAuthor Profile Page on December 11, 2010 12:42 AM

In Chicago (suburb), we have to pay us\$15 per month for trash and recycling pick up. There are 2 trash bins (green) for recycling and (brown) for gabbage. It's a once a week pick up and residence has an option for twice a week pickup with additional fee. Our street and surrounding is very clean and I strongly believe people have to pay for this type of service. This service needs to be privatised for efficiency.

Regards

By HajarAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 11:30 PM

Dearest YAB Tun,

1. I suggest we build an incinerator a bit further away from KL in an area where not many people live. Of course we cannot please everyone.

2. To cover the cost of transporting the rubbish, a small amount of SERVICE CHARGE can be imposed (quarterly may be). If we want a comfortable life, we must be willing to pay for the service. I AGREE to pay.

3. But then, I guess no one is willing to lose votes over this matter. Nanti KENA HUKUM oleh mereka yang gemar mengugut untuk menukar Kerajaan cuma kerana perkara kecil seperti pembayaran perkhidmatan/yuran yang kadang-kadang tidak seberapa kalau dibandingkan dengan keselesaan yang kita dapat.

Thanks Tun.

\*\* May Allah SWT bless Tun & family \*\*

By shahnanAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 11:28 PM

dear tun.

recycle is the practical answer. maybe not the best but the most practical. instead of thinking about tonnes of rubbish, it can be converted into tonnes of opportunity. we just need the doers who can segregate the rubbish seriously with one giant company who can handle the recycling of the rubbish on a major scale. to outline the flow process from scratch ie: separation of paper and plastic and the rotten food can be converted to fertilizer ( have to ask jakim about the halal issue ). or in other case it can be converted into an

energy source with some alchemy expertise to turn the rubbish into synthetic charcoal or in other effects. in this case conservationist expertise plays a major role which we have locally. i really hope we can take a step forward after disposing the rubbish by pursuing in a positive proactive manner. maybe in 10 years or even 20 years time it could be a reality or maybe not....but its worth a shot.

By shahnanAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 11:21 PM

dear tun.

recycle is the practical answer. maybe not the best but the most practical.instead of thinking about tonnes of rubbish, it can be converted into tonnes of opportunity. we just need the doers who can segregate the rubbish seriously with one giant company who can handle the recycling of the rubbish on a major scale. to outline the flow process from scratch ie: separation of paper and plastic and the rotten food can be converted to fertilizer ( have to ask jakim about the halal issue ). or in other case it can be converted into an energy source with some alchemy expertise to turn the rubbish into synthetic charcoal or in other effects. in this case conservationist expertise plays a major role which we have locally. i really hope we can take a step forward after disposing the rubbish by pursuing in a positive proactive manner. maybe in 10 years or even 20 years time it could be a reality or maybe not....but its worth a shot.

By citycrawlerAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 10:59 PM

Salam Tun,

No need to go far to solve this problem. The solution is in our own backyard and it has been operational since 2006. We have our very own locally developed waste treatment and processing facility in Semenyih. It can process up to 1,000 tons/day of garbage and produce more than 8MW of electricity which are used internally and about 5MW are exported to the grid. The whole plant is privately funded. Please support our local initiative, maybe then instead importing incinerators, we could be exporting our expertise. Thank you Tun.

By andrewtayAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 10:37 PM

Incinerate rubbish. Its not the same as burning rubbish.

Some of the smog can be trapped so that it doesnt pollute the atmosphere.

By chewchewAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 10:19 PM

salam tokdet.

1. google this keyword "garbage biofuel","garbage solution", or any keywords that will lead to garbage matters.

2. dont allow ministers to go abroad anymore to study something from other countries. utilize the internet.

use the google wisely,soon they will realize that going abroad using taxpayers money is an ultimate waste for the rakyat.

3. knowledge of people who's using the internet everyday is a lot more better than the ministers in the parliament. why waste money sending ministers & their wives to go meet other countries leaders to learn something that has already in the internet?

4. google.even if you want to know how to go to space,

or if you want to escape from hungry crocodile,all you can find it in the internet.so use google everyday.

By Rimba EmasAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 10:00 PM

SALAM BUAT TUN BERDUA MOGA DIRAHMATI ALLAH S.W.T

1) SALAH SATU KERJA HARIAN RIMBAEMAS IALAH TERPAKSA MEMBUANG SAMPAH SEPELASTIK SAIZ BESAR KE TONG SAMPAH MILIK MPSP. PADA PEMERHATAN RIMBAEMAS LONGGOKAN SAMPAH INI MENJADI TERCEMAR PADA PANDANGAN BILA IA LAMBAT DI AMBIL LORI-LORI SAMPAH. ITU SAHAJA DAN IA TETAP DIAMBIL SETIAP MINGGU. MASAAHNYA SAMPAH DILONGGOKKAN DIKAWASAN YANG TIDAK ADANYA TONG-TONG SAMPAH, INILAH YANG MENJADI PERSOALAN.

2) BILA TUN TANYA BAGAIMANA MENGATASI TIMBUNAN YANG TELAH MENJADI BERBUKIT SEHINGGA TIDAK CUKUP KAWASAN-KAWASAN UNTUK MEMPROSESNYA, TERINGAT RIMBAEMAS DULU KETIKA MENYERTAI KURSUS DI FMM MENCARI IDEA PELUANG PERNIAGAAN YANG BOLEH DITEROKAI.

3) DALAM 'BRAINSTOMING' ADA YANG MENGUTARAKAN PERNIAGAAN 'RECYCLE'. SALAH SATUNYA PELUPUSAN SAMPAH. SELIDIKAN TELAH DI BUAT SEHINGGA KE NEGARA-NEGARA LAIN DIDUNIA AKAN MASAAH LAMBAKAN SAMPAH INI.

4) BANDINGAN DENGAN NEGARA KITA DIDAPATI BAHAWA KITA AGAK KETINGGALAN DALAM MENCIPTA MESIN-MESIN PEMROSESAN SEHINGGAKAN TERPAKSA MENGIMPOT DARI NEGARA LAIN. ADA JUGA IDEA MEMULAKAN PERNIAGGAN MENGGUNAKAN TEKNOLOGI MESIN DARI KOREA SELATAN MEMPOSES MENJADI BAJA, MALAH NEGARA-NEGARA SEPERTI PAKISTAN DAN BEBERAPA NEGARA LAIN (BOLEH DAPATI DARI PAKAR ALAM SEKITAR)MENCIPTA KAEDAH TEKNOLOGI YANG BOLEH DIGUNA PAKAI.

5) MALAH TEKNOLOGI INI BOLEH MEMBAWA HASIL SAMPINGAN UNTUK INDUSTRI-INDUSTRI YANG LAIN SEPERTI PERTANIAN. WALAU BAGAIMANA PUN DIDAPATI TEKNOLOGI INI TIDAK DAPAT MEMPROSES KESELURUHAN BAHAN BUANGAN HANYA MEMILIH BAHAN-BAHAN TERTENTU SAHAJA. PERNAH MENYAKSIKAN SATU RENCANA AKAN SATU TEKNOLOGI DI NEGERI CHINA YANG BOLEH MEMPROSES KESELURUHAN SAMPAH INI(SILA RUJUK NEGARA CHINA AKAN TEKNOLOGI INI).

6) BAYANGKAN KALAU ADA YANG MAHUKAN SISA MAKANAN YANG TERBUANG DAN ADA YANG SANGGUP MENDAPATKAN DARI RUMAH-RUMAH SETIAP HARI ATAU SISA YANG LAIN MAKA KEBERANGKALIAN RIMBAEMAS MEMBUANG SAMPAH AKAN BERKURANGAN. DARI SINI KITA TAHU BAHAWA UNTUK MENGGURANGKAN SAMPAH PERLUKAN 'PEMINTAAN' ATAU BANYAK TEKNOLOGI MEMPROSES BAHAN BUANGAN INI, LEBIH-LEBIH LAGI YANG DAPAT MENUKARNYA KEPADA HASIL YANG MENGUNTUNGGAN MANUSIA INI.

7) MAHAKAYA ALLAH S.W.T MAHAPEMURAH MENKURNIAKAN REZEKI UNTUK DINIKMATI OLEH MANUSIA INI.

WALLAHU'ALAM

By JuliaAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 9:49 PM

94k million of rubbish is a big volume. one needs to understand this rubbish are accumulation of millions and millions of small rubbish. so it no point to find solution at the mess but rather at the source.

In the UK plastic bags have become chargeable. so meaning people have to reuse plastic bags. obviously in malaysia our people will be sceptical of such measures and shopping outlets will be scared of losing customers. So again the government could provide some kind relief for shopping outlets that uses less plastic bags. this could reduce the usage of plastics to start and i am sure there could be more such creative measure brought in.

I also like the idea where councils should not collect rubbish bags that are not sorted. this will be taught on council but they have to educate people. Meaning tins, cans, bottles has to be separated. Council will provide color coordinated containers to public and people to put this things. This way council can earn few bucks and there is no need to increase the current council tax.

througing rubbish in longkang. this is because public have no place to put their rubbish and this places are not being cleaned by the council. I am sorry to blame all on council, i think they are to held responsible for the mess.

By milshahAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 9:41 PM

Assalamualaikum Tun,

I think we should really look at recycling the rubbish in a big way. I was watching this documentary about one developed country which has a very efficient recycling system particularly paper recycling.

Everyday tones and tones of yesterday's used newspapers and magazines are sent to this very big plant and recycled into newspapers and magazines the very next morning. I forgot the details from which country it was but I think I was watching the discovery channel.

Anyway, I was impressed how efficiently they managed and recycled old news papers. They have a very efficient distribution system of getting the used papers from each house and sending the used papers to the recycling plant.

There are other "rubbish" items that can be recycled like aluminum tin cans, plastic bags, plastics and scrap metals.

I would suggest we fully utilise used items that can be recycled to be recycled. To make this a success, everyone need to chip in, i.e the government as well as society at large.

It's time we take recycling seriously and do it on a mega scale. I think most of the rubbish are recyclable.

Maybe we have should have three pilot cities for this project? Penang, Putrajaya and KL maybe? If it is successful it can be implemented around the country as well.

It may not solve the rubbish problem, but it is a start.

By Mr BennyAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 9:24 PM

Its an age old problem which some nations manage to move forward and bite the reality.. and some like (sad to say )us here are still having that "hmm... why should I bother if its out of my house" attitude. Seldom we hear.."I pay already the cukai pintu, cukai bla bla bla without fail, so local authority punya responsible lah".. but they fail to realise that their cukai pintu divided by number of days per year comes to what? and that cukai also have to repair the roads, repair the lights, cut the grass, korek the longkang.. and so on.

Anyway, way forward is to make recycling compulsory, or perhaps putting a cap on the amount of garbage dispose by households... and for restaurants... perhaps should start charging the wastage of foods by customers...

but all takes an effort of enforcement, and a clear unbiased stand of those involve directly...

and what most important i think is.... not to be scared of votes losing.

laws are made to be broken some say.. but laws are needed because we know that human cant be guided by himself.

cheers Tun,

By dzulAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 9:13 PM

Salam hormat Ayahanda Tun yang di kasehi dan yang di sanjung.

Sooner or later we will need to have the incinerator after all. I remembered this idea was mooted some years ago.

For the rubbish originated from KL, I think the incinerator could be built somewhere in Beranang area or some areas north of Selayang before Rawang, of course it must be away from housing area. Just like many dump sites currently located away from housing areas. For the rubbish originated from other areas in Klang Valley, such incinerator can be built somewhere in Bukit Cerakah area.

The government MUST take the responsibility to build these incinerators. After all its the tax payers money.

It wont be fair for the tax payers to pay another cost for rubbish disposal. We were told that there are only 1 million plus of the whole population who pay tax out of 27 million Malaysian population, not including foreign nationals who could be accounted for more than 3 million of them staying in Malaysia, where most of them are staying in Klang Valley, which probably by more than 50%. So its just not fair to ask the tax payers to pay additional cost for rubbish disposal. Too few tax payers against the total number of population

The savings of RM1.8 billion a year from fuel and sugar price increase recently by the government could be used to build, manage, and maintain those incinerators.

You see, in every way the tax payers are bleeding our ringgits... yet we don't see the government is considering to reduce income tax for the tax payers although the tax payers are getting less and less by paying more and more resulting from price increase in daily goods. This is the reality faced by the employed tax payers.

The government on the other hand could generate more income by imposing higher corporate tax, but not from individual income tax.

Of course someone or several people close to the minister in-charged or somebody connected to high ranking person will make millions of money from commission in this project. We just hope this would not happen. Let see whether the present government is serious about their policy of People First, Performance Now..in such a way to avoid this phenomena happens.

In my view, incinerators is the solution. Too often we hear issues about illegal dump sites,

and rubbish disposal related matters are aired on TV, and reported in the media but we never see the government is really looking into solving the matters. In deed the government must make their eyes wide open and go ahead to build these incinerators.

Kalau ade someone or several people making a lot of money out of this project, what can we as the ordinary people say, but as long as it solves peoples problem, people will eventually accept it. People will see that the government is solving peoples problem.

Itu lah pendapat peribadi saya Tun.

Maaf sekira nye pendapat saya ini tidak membantu. Sekadar menyuara kan keluhan hati rakyat biasa macam saya.

Wassalam...

By Syameer FirdausAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 8:42 PM

Salam Tun,

Well, this problem is a very big problem that exist in every country in this very challenging world. Personally, this problem cannot be solve easily. What we need is to change the way of our people thinking. Most people don't realize that recycling is the best way to solve this problem. If one person recycle let say a 2kg of recyclable waste a day, if 1 million people do the same thing, we can recycle 2 million kg of waste a day. It's the basic concept that most people take for granted because of their self-fishiness. Through the practice to separate between non-recyclable and recyclable waste, we can save the recyclable waste for a new products.

A better solution for this problem is to practice the Anaerobic digestion method which is a series of processes in which microorganisms break down biodegradable material in the absence of oxygen, used for industrial or domestic purposes to manage waste and/or to release energy. ref= [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anaerobic\\_digestion](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anaerobic_digestion)

Thank you Tun for spending your most precious time reading just my 2 cents thought here. Thank you very much.

-Syameer

(<http://syameer.blogspot.com>)

By sriAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 8:03 PM

I missed the good old days when the interest of the nation is far more greater than anything or anyone else for that matter. Maybe this is the bad side of democracy. Let say that 80% of the population is dumber than the 20% but far more prouder and oblivious of what's going to happen out of their ignorance? Should majority rule? I think we should put 'the iron fist' as a viable option for those who prefer to run with the crowd without thinking just to show that their voice has weight.

But one solution I think would be possible, recycle the non-organic materials (been there, done that) and turn the organic garbage into fertilizers. Where is all our Scientists? Can't they think of producing a 'magic' bin that could help the bacteria somehow processes the garbage or something? I'm not seeing any Malaysian going for the Nobel Prizes any time soon. We prefer big beautiful buildings to make ends meet for the 'poor' contractors. Maybe we should be focusing on producing great thinkers and researchers instead. Perhaps a

yearly competition on focusing how to deal with garbage in a creative and productive way would change the view of the majority.

Another solution, stop the regulation of garbage and see if they still oppose the incinerator. Interestingly, my friend had submitted the proposal of using incinerator in one of the beautiful island in Terengganu. Wonder how that turn out, if he's telling the truth that is.  
By HamalAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 7:43 PM

Rubbish should be used as new type of fuel for TNB electric generator. It is cheap and people don't want rubbish in their area for a long time.  
By owlzAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 7:40 PM

Assalamualaikum Tun and hye to others too.

We are facing two problems... Firstly, the waste which is rubbish, trash, refuse, garbage, or junk. Then second one - wowh!! In living organisms, waste is the unwanted substances or toxins that are expelled from them (us, and animals)... Have to be disposed also, right..? Knowing this, feels like the Greater KL will die with all of the seven million tons of rubbish with population of about 5.5 million...

NIMBY (not-in-my-back-yard) is a popular term used to describes the opposition of residents to a proposal for a new development of waste management close to them... That's Malaysian rite..? Ahahhaahhhaaa... Incinerator - involves the combustion of organic substances contained in waste materials with high temperature. Denmark and Sweden have been leaders in using the energy generated from incineration for more than a century, in localized combined heat and power facilities supporting district heating schemes...

So, are we Malaysians too stupid to produce our own engineering graduates which can build ANYTHING TO develop recycle technology..? Why dont we use our own brain that we call it as a first class neuron..? For God sake, please dont expect or ask anything from our ministers or politicians... They dont understand anything about waste disposal, lower greenhouse gas emissions, reuse of biodegradable or even "garbage archaeological" studies.

Just let them wasting our tax-payers money also is no use (useless?)... I hope that any brave leaders can rise to lead Malaysia from those ugly politicians. Dear Tun I love you because you WERE a good politician and minister previously...

- Mohammad Shafiq, ex-University of Malaya, Electrical Engineering Department -

Salam and hye to lilmissAuthor, kamal ahmad, Syameer Firdaus, Raziz, fbm, wajaperak, themalaypress, musato, penggila perang, HHilmi, mazlan, checker, boleng, Rimba Emas, parameswara 2, Jamal, Jaquar, jalil7, golami, Jo, MoMan, Peiseh, water, nswamy, ingat, HBT, faudzi and others...

May Allah bless you all.

By maaAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 7:09 PM

Assalamualaikum,

Masalah sampah ini sebenarnya dah menjadi budaya. Jika ingin mengatasi, kena didik dari sekolah tadika sehingga tamat belajar tinggi. Perlu diserapkan dalam kurikulum. Tidak perlu subjek yang berbeza, boleh diamalkan semasa mengajar dalam subjek Moral misalnya.

Kerajaan Tempatan di Malaysia dipusat mahupun daerah, kenalah bergerak aktif. Jika ketua-ketua berkenaan melawat ke luar negeri, cuba pergi lawat sekali Council mereka dan belajar macam mana mereka uruskan.

Jika tidak, sibukkanlah diri melawatlah laman web misalnya Charnwood Borough Council, UK. Council ini menyediakan perkhidmatan free untuk membunuh tikus/serangga, meracun & memotong rumput setiap bulan, membuat pagar, mengutip barang-barang recycling ie sofa, peti sejuk rosak, mesin basuh rosak etc, pengasingan plastik Merah (paper & adik beradiknya) & Hijau (selain dari sampah jenis paper, pengutipan berkala 2 minggu sekali utk sampah recycle & sampah basah.

Sampah-sampah yang telah dikutip, sepatutnya macam sampah recycle kita boleh kitar semula. Di sini University & industry kena buat research nak jadikan apa ie buat beg recycle shopping ke, toilet paper ke, perhiasan ke, packaging barang-barang bagus juga, tak yah guna plastik. Mekap lebih sikit biar cantik packaging tuu. Buat utk komersiallah pulak. Dah orang Malaysia pun berlumba-lumba membeli.

Di UK, kereta buruk & besi discrap dan diacu balik untuk dijadikan kenderaan yang cantik dan dijual kembali untuk dibeli pengguna yang suka design yg cantik.

Sampah-sampah basah, proses jadi baja binatang ke, pokok ke. Jadi, kurang lalat bermaharajalela. Jika semua ini dibuat, saya percaya payah nak jumpa sampah di Malaysia. Cuma itulah, nak atau pun tak nak buat aje. Poster-poster ni kadang membazir aje. Mesejnya tidak sampai. Rakyat Malaysia kena di didik.

maa

By daniel noorAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 6:58 PM

Just follow like Kapan. The incinerators are actually part of a housing complex. But the way the incinerators are design and built..nobody are complainig bcos it is built in such a nice and pleasant to look at.

No smell, no smoke..nothing actually.

Why cant Msians think positive and think out of the box. Why are majority Msians so hypocrites.

Why are Msians still have that 30-40 years ago thinking. Japanese are modern and yet they still maintain their thousands year old rich cultures. They still want to improve their standard of living and if there is anything that can make their lives and living more comfortable they will always willing to try it out. The Japanese are practical and functional

people. Yet they still practice their rich cultures..not like us..especially the Malays..everything seems Haram now..

By Old FartAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 6:49 PM

In North Shore, a suburb of Auckland, New Zealand, there is a collection station within an industrial/residential area. All solid waste goes here. 24/7 they separate the waste here into recyclables, reusables and what not. Garden waste gets shredded and composted. All these are sold right there at the site. My own household waste, which included old mattresses and what not, I took by car and dumped there. They weighed the car going in and going out on a weigh bridge and I paid for the difference for dumping. It is only the final waste from here that eventually ends up in an incinerator. The suburb level waste station is privatised. Municipal waste in the district too ends up here.

There are systems that are in place that can easily be employed in Malaysia. But then you see, UMNO interferes in everything and until some crony benefits nothing happens. So, why I am telling all this, I don't understand myself.

By nazrimalikAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 6:38 PM

tun; di new zealand masyarakat kena buang sendiri sampah ke tapak pembuangan sampah;

kita akan kena marah kalau kita buang sampah ke dalam tong sampah jiran atau org lain;

walaupun keadaan ini agak kelako bagi saya sekurang2nya org di sana xdimanjan2kan dan penjimatan kos pengangkutan lori sampah bolehlah digunakan utk perkara yg lebih berguna;

pity malaysians-

By YSLimAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 6:26 PM

Reduce, Reuse, Recycle. All this is achievable by way of education. if the "rakyat" is learned..... we don't have to worry about rubbish. sadly Malaysian are generally not educated.....

sadly majority of Malaysian leaders are too snobbish to tackle this rubbish issue..... sadly majority of malaysian leaders not able to lead by example.... to be a lead in "no more rubbish"... sadly this are the majority of malaysian leaders..... IT IS TIME FOR CHANGE

SADLY IT IS NOT ONLY RUBBISH PER SE... WHAT ABOUT ELECTRICTY.. WHAT ABOUT WATER..

DEAR MALAYSIAN... CHANGE WE CAN..... WE CAN CHANGE.... BRING DOWN THE MAJORITY OF MALAYSIA'S LEADERS

By Anak JantanAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 6:09 PM

Salam Tun.

I do remember it was in your era where this idea come out. 'The Incinerator'. Yes, buy that time lots of people is object about it. Now the time has change and people must change too. There is no free in this living world. Even is some of the people in Selangor said it is free actually it is not. I think we should go on with incinerator. Pay! Yes, we must pay for our environment. For our living tomorrow children's. When I was young we go for toilet for free. Now we have to pay. When people do something for us of course we must pay. This rubbish came from us. We produce the garbage so we must pay. The question is how much we

willing to pay? How much the charge is? My suggestion is we build this incinerator under the 100th floor tower or on the any island we have. The point is we build.

Take care of your health, Tun. So we can chat always. I don't believe this. I chat with Tun.  
By QalAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 6:04 PM

Salam Dr.M

Mungkin kita boleh buat penyelidikan untuk menukar sampah menjadi bahan bakar menggantikan arang dan petrol.

Terlanjur bercakap tentang sampah saya nka sentuh satu hal lagi majlis perbandaran harus memandang serius tentang segala aspek contohnya lori yang digunakan untuk mengangkut sampah.Kadang-kadang saya tengok lori ni dah tak macam lori dah, 99 peratus dah macam sampah(maaf cakap).Mungkin kita boleh tukar yang lebih baik sikit macam kat jepun atau australia.Kan lebih terurus. Kemudian pekerja yang ditugaskan seperti sambil lewa terhadap penjagaan kebersihan.Mereka tak pakai alat-alat kelengkapan seperti sarung tangan semasa mengangkat sampah dan sebagainya. Harap semua pihak ambil kira semua aspek, kurangkan lepak berjam-jam di warung atau kedai makan pada waktu kerja dan jalankan tanggungjawab yang diberikan kerana kita mendapat rezeki daripada hasil titik peluh kita, barulah berkat(bagi mereka yang betul2 amanah dan komited pada kerja).

By MalaysiaAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 5:51 PM

Dear Tun,

I've been flirting with this issue ever since I'm having difficulty of disposing bulk items and this is a problem faced by everybody especially in urban areas. In kampong, we simply burn them. I remember a friend of mine used to cut the furnitures he was disposing into small pieces, packed them in the waste bag, and only then the municipal council will pick up. Recycle is key, and without public awareness it will not work. Money would be the motivator for the public to recycle. If we study the composition of domestic waste, 50% are recycleable. It's just that we're too lazy to sort the items.

I do believe there is a large business opportunity in this, try google Subra Plastic & Metal Sdn Bhd for example. Check out their end products. I'm not sure if there is any scheme from the government to produce more entrepreneurs in this field. If we have more operators, it will be easier for the public to send in their recycleable items and get paid for it.

By TalibAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 5:29 PM

Sending the rubbish to landfills (designated areas as mentioned by Tun in para 5) seems the solution adopted by most local authorities in Malaysia. Apart from problems of health hazards and pollution to the air, land and water, the landfills also generate methane which is a greenhouse gas. In fact, the greenhouse effect of methane is 20 times worse than carbon dioxide. However, some landfill operators are taking advantage of the methane to generate electricity and probably earn some carbon credit too.

There are other solutions too. One of them is to turn the organic part of the rubbish liquid hydrocarbon which is identical to diesel. I have read this in one of Tun's blog before. I have also seen how this technology works. Typically, municipal rubbish contains about 80% organic. This technology when installed together with a proper material recovery facility can maximize value extraction from the landfills. It can be demonstrated that this solution is sustainable and it is practically pollution free. There are companies which can provide this solution in Malaysia and take away the financial burden of managing the rubbish in the local authorities.

By bunkmushAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 5:15 PM

salam tun  
tajuk yg menarik...  
saya menunggang motosikal saban hari ke tmpt kerja  
jika kalian semua tunggang motosikal akan dpt melihat sampah sarap  
merata rata di mana saja...  
mudah didapati dipinggir kuala lumpur.  
bagi saya kuala lumpur adalah bandaraya sampah setelah  
ramai pendatang yg tinggal disini.

syor saya kempen dari pbt seperti dbkl dan majlis perbandaran  
harusla berterusan seperti recycle barang<sup>2</sup> plastik, botol dan kertas  
beg beg plastik di market harus ditukar ke paper bag.  
pendekatan weekend tiada beg plastik harusla diteruskan  
walaupun ade rungutan dari pelanggan. mediamasa boleh berkempen supaya para  
pelanggan digalakkan membawa bakul sendiri apabila membeli-belah.

bagi saya televisyen byk pengaruh pada penonton  
jadi kerajaan harus la bijak bagaimana utk membuat iklan  
yg boleh mendidik. saya puji iklan henti merokok di tv  
byk pendekatan yg boleh menyedarkan penonton bahayanya merokok.  
secara tak langsung anak anak dapat mendidik ayah dan ibu mereka yg merokok. malukan  
bila anak anak menegur.

saya dapati botol minuman plaktik paling byk menyumbang jadi sampah  
bertan-tan. mungkin kerajaan ambil pendekatan pada pembuat minuman agar  
membukusan yg senang lupus.

longgokan sampah seperti bukit (jinjang kepong)  
tidak sesuai lagi utk melupuskan sampah...pencemaran bau amatla  
kurang menyenangkan. negara<sup>2</sup> maju seperti jepun telah lama menggunakan incinerator  
tapi tidak di malaysia byk bantahan.  
compress sampah menjadi kiub<sup>2</sup> dan dijadikan tambak tanah mungkin menjadi pendekatan  
yg ade/diterima.

kesimpulan disini kempen kitar semula amatlah bagus  
dan terbaik utk mendidik rakyat malaysia.  
dan saman pada pembuang sampah.  
mungkin malaysia boleh belajar dgn singapura  
By majinbuuAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 5:14 PM

salam tun,

dear goverment, u can build the incinerator behind my house.. but pay me RM10mil first... i  
need to drive a ferrari before i die..haha  
By faudziAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 5:01 PM

Salam TUN dan semua

Inilah Masalah dengan Malaysia ini, sebab sudah biasa dapat free dan subsidi. Untuk  
menjadikan ia lebih teruk apabila ada pihak lain pula yang menjanjikan bulan dan bintang.  
Pihak yang satu lagi pulak takut hilang undi.. jadi hujung semua orang tidak dapat apa2.

Semua benda dipolitikkan oleh pihak yang berkenaan. Kadang kadang rakyat pun jadi keliru: Saya ada cadangan:

1. Penjelasan tentang isu ini hendaklah dibuat berterusan supaya orang semua faham dan boleh menerimanya dengan baik.
2. Bayaran yang dikenakan hendaklah berpatutan (how much is patut?)

Kalau tidak boleh selesai juga, maka kita tidur dalam sampah la.

<http://pantausblog.blogspot.com>

By KennAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 4:53 PM

Dear Tun,

Saya tak nak komen pasal "rubbish" tapi saya amat tertarik kepada ayat Tun yang ini:-

Frankly I think the authorities are scared to apply any solution because we are a democracy and no one wants to lose votes.

Hinggakan saya update artikel terbaru saya hari ini (walaupun tidak sama tajuk perbincangan) dgn ayat tersebut.

KAKI PEROSAK INTEGRITI (KPI)

Salam sejahtera.

By noorfaizaAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 4:51 PM

Salam Tun,

My idea is every household must have a complete garbage disposal system in their house. A complete disposal system would be a waste disposal located at kitchen sinks, a garbage compactor, a worm bin and a recycle bin. Thats it. That is what I am going for anyway.

By adi5707Author Profile Page on December 10, 2010 4:26 PM

Salam Tun,

Kat Osaka, Jepun ada incinerator, beroperasi kat tengah bandaraya.

<http://www.city.osaka.lg.jp/contents/wdu020/kankyo/english/others/others03.html>

Bukan saja besar, cantik pulak tu. Macamana orang Jepun boleh setuju buat incinerator kat situ? Setahu saya diorang lagi cerewet pasal environment nih. Orang Malaysia pulak takut sangat nak buat incinerator, walaupun jauh di kampung. Takut asap sampah lah konon, tapi tiap2 hisap rokok boleh pulak. Tak paham saya....

Kalau kerajaan nak tahu macamana nak bina incinerator kat Osaka tu, hantar la beberapa pegawai ramai2 ke Osaka, Jepun ni, study. Kan biasa org kerajaan buat lawatan sambil belajar nih, macam budak sekolah. Sambil tu boleh singgah Universal Studio Japan.

Dulu masa isu 16 Sept ada beberapa wakil rakyat gi Taiwan nak belajar pasal pertanian apa tu, apa cerita?

By ikanbilismohAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 4:25 PM

Ayahanda Tun,

Cadangan saya,

1) Cadangan saya supaya kita menggunakan kemudahan landasan keretapi berkembar yang sedia ada untuk mengangkut semua sampah di KL untuk dilupuskan di tapak cadangan yang jauh dari KL iaitu di tempat pembinaan incinerator tersebut.

2) Bina laluan landasan keretapi baru untuk ke pusat incinerator tersebut.

3) Cari lokasi yang bersesuaian untuk mengumpul semua sampah seluruh KL untuk dibawa dengan lokomotif yang direkabentuk (special design) untuk mengangkut sampah-sampah tersebut.

4) KTMB akan boleh menambah pendapatan dari kerja-kerja mengangkut sampah ini dan boleh menjana keuntungan berpanjangan.

Harap cadangan ini boleh diketengahkan oleh Ayahanda TUN.

Sekian.

By lilmissAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 3:54 PM

Dear Tun,

I seriously don't know how to handle the 7 million tons of rubbish. The least I can do on my part at this moment, is to produce less garbage. It is a simple step..for a start.

By HBTAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 3:51 PM

Ayahanda Tun,

1. Will Housing Ministry, KL Authority, NGO and political parties comment since they've oled forgotten their responsibility to clear that messy "Rubbish"?

2. They are now so busy in preparing dollar war (general election 13) to win the war so that they can rest in peace for 5 years.

3. Then, as rakyat, the comment By Sarip on December 9, 2010 1:13 PM will be "In peace prepare for VOTE, in VOTE prepare for peace." (Sun Tzu Art of War).

Take care Ayahanda Tun.

By kamal ahmadAuthor Profile Page on December 10, 2010 3:35 PM

Salam kasih dan salam hormat Ayahanda Tun.

Well Tun sir, I don't quite know really. I mean, seriously putting things here; rubbish disposals are big money - just ask any KL Datuk Bandar. Anyway, in all the years, in all the pages, what's with the recent RON95 increase, the LPG increment and sugar pricing increase, I reckon that we as a nation at large have been feeding on rubbish all along already. I say the most credible solution to this problem is to increase another 20 cent RON95, another 50 cent Diesel hike and another 20 cent sugar climb (for good measure; why not throw in the new TNB FiT tariff too). That way more rubbish would be eaten and

less to worry about already. You see, don't worry about rubbish; make more rubbish? Just make them eat more for less. As you can see, we are effectively recycling ourselves to a state of higher efficiency. Someday even the Italians would be praising our innovations and foresight. The PM is in very good hands. Thank you Tun.

Source : <http://chedet.co.cc/chedetblog/2010/12/rubbish.html>