



放眼世界

「流動」變「不流動」王維基博懵不成罵政府

中英社評

「香港電視」牌照問題再起風波。該公司原擬今年七月開播流動電視服務，通訊事務管理局要求其必須申請電視牌照，「港視」主席王維基指為「被政府針對」及「走投無路」，事件引起各方關注。

王維基之前在政府增發電視牌照的爭奪戰中落了空，早已口出怨言，今次開辦流動電視服務又再觸礁，「罵街」是可以想像的；但是，當日爭取電視新牌之役，輸給有線「奇妙台」及NOW娛樂台，是實力不如人，今次流動電視服務，則因制式問題觸及《廣播條例》而受阻，如果不問青紅皂白，只因達不到自己的目的便認為人家搞針對、「搬龍門」，把自己打扮成一副被迫害的可憐樣子，而且把問題上升到政治化層面，挑動社會矛盾博取支持，這豈是公平的做法和正當營商者所應為？

事實是，王維基此次就流動電視牌照問題對政府提出的指控，在理據上都是不能成立的，事情的實質在於依法辦事而不是其他，更不涉及什麼不歡迎投資或對營商環境不利。

王維基「指控」之一，是政府在二〇〇八年發出的《流動電視服務發展框架》文件中，曾言明流動電視不在《廣播條例》規管之列。這確是事實。但問題是王維基現在提供的流動電視服務，已經不是一個「流動」的服務，而是與無線、亞視一般可以進入千家萬戶的DTMB制式服務，市民在家中或任何固定場所、包括酒店房間，只要打開電視機就隨時隨地都可以收看，這與必須受到《廣播條例》規管的免費或收費電視還有什麼分別呢？

就在同一文件中，已經清楚列明：流動電視服務的定義，是「泛指以無線方式傳送影音內容，供流動電話或其他手提器材接收的電視節目服務，……為用戶提供具備流動性和個人化的影音內容，與傳統電視服務不盡相同。」

如此王維基準備提供的流動電視服務，一不「流動」、二不「手提」、三不「具備流動性和個人化」，又有那一樣符合流動電視服務，又怎能不受《廣播條例》規管和需要申請電視牌照？

王維基的「指控」之二，是為什麼服務在「中移動」手上時，政府不管，到他買了過來，政府就要管了，那還不是搞針對嗎？此一說法，也是明顯的歪曲和誤導。

事實是，「中移動」之前提供的流動電視服務，屬CMMB制



▲現行《通訊條例》和《廣播條例》已經訂立多年，內容顯然有需要與時並進之處；但王維基企圖鑽「法律罅」，「流動」變「不流動」，逃避領牌和規管，則是不可以被接受的

式，只能在手提電話或電腦上收看，根本不能放大，畫面一到大屏幕就會變成模糊一片，因此根本入不了屋，是名副其實的「流動電視」，但王維基購買之後改為使用DTMB制式，與大電視看齊，牌照問題也就出現了。

因此，在這一問題上，王維基的做法是相當「蠱惑」的，他故意不提兩者在制式上的區別，只是強調「中移動」不管、王維基就要管，故意突出內地企業在港有「特權」和所謂對他個人搞「政治性針對」，企圖挑起一些人的反政府情緒，用心也可謂陰險矣。

當然，通訊廣播科技包括制式問題日新月異，現行《通訊條例》和《廣播條例》已經訂立多年，內容顯然有需要與時並進之處；而主管的商務及經濟發展局已經承諾今年內會就兩個條例作出檢討，但王維基企圖鑽「法律罅」，「流動」變「不流動」，逃避領牌和規管，則是不可以被接受的。

2014-03-13

Ricky Wong curses government after his trick fails

New dispute arises over the licensing of Hong Kong Television Network (HKTV). HKTV has been planning to launch its mobile-TV service in July, but now the Communications Authority requires the company to obtain a free-to-air TV license first. HKTV chairman Ricky Wong Wai-kay has come out to accuse the government of purposefully scuttling his plan, saying: "We've come to a dead end." The incident arouses wide attention.

Not long ago, Ricky Wong was defeated in competition for a new free-to-air TV license issued by the government and became discontented and spoken resentfully. Now his plan to launch mobile-TV service again **hits a snag**, so it is no surprise he would "curse without naming names". However, in the competition for a new free TV license, HKTV had **lost to** i-Cable's Fantastic TV and PCCW's HK Television Entertainment Company because of its weaker competitiveness, while this time its plan to launch mobile-TV service is held up because its transmission system should be **subject to** the Telecommunications Ordinance. Now, just because of his failure to achieve his aim, Ricky Wong – without distinguishing between right and wrong and posing himself as a pitiful bullied person – asserts that the government is against him and changes the rules of the game arbitrarily, in an attempt to solicit support by escalating the issue into a political one and instigating social antagonism. Is this fair and something an honest businessman should do?

As a matter of fact, Ricky's accusations of the government this time over his mobile-TV license are unreasonable and ungrounded. In essence, this is a matter to be dealt with by the law, and that's all – nothing to do with not welcoming investment or damaging our business environment.

One of Ricky Wong "accusations" is that the Framework for Development of Broadcast-type Mobile TV Services in Hong Kong, a document released in 2008 by the government, says mobile TV is not subject to the Broadcasting Ordinance. This is true. But the problem is that Ricky Wong's planned mobile-TV service is not really "mobile" as it wants to use the same DTMB (Digital Terrestrial Multimedia Broadcast) technology like TVB and ATV to broadcast to households, so that citizens will be able to watch its programmes by turning on a TV set at home or in any other fixed place including a hotel room. In this way, how different is it from a free-to-air TV or pay TV that should be subject to the Telecommunications Ordinance?

In the same document, it is clearly stated that "The expression 'mobile TV services' generally refers to the provision of television programme services by wireless transmission of audio-visual content for reception by mobile phones or other portable devices. The inherent characteristics distinguishing mobile TV services from conventional TV services are mobility and personalised consumption."

The mobile-TV service Ricky Wong plans to provide is neither "mobile" nor "portable" nor having the characteristics of "mobility and personalised consumption". In which way can it be called a mobile-TV service? And why should it not be subject to the Telecommunications Ordinance? How can it be launched without a license?

Another of Ricky Wong's "accusations" is that mobile-TV service previously provided by a China Mobile subsidiary had not been bound by the Broadcasting Ordinance, but the Government changes terms after he has bought the mobile-TV license. Isn't this an act of antagonism against him? Such assertion is also obviously a distortion and misleading.

The fact is that the mobile-TV broadcast by the China Mobile subsidiary used the CMMB (Converted Mobile Multimedia Broadcasting) standard, which could only be received on a mobile phone or computer and the picture could not be zoomed out and thus

would become blurry when shown on a big screen. As such it could not be viewed directly from households TV sets and was "mobile TV" in every sense of the term. But after buying the license, Ricky Wong has switched to DTMB standard to **measure up** to big-screen TV. As a result, the issue of licensing crops up.

On this issue, Ricky Wong's reaction is quite "devious". He has deliberately made no mention of the difference between the two standards, but stressed that China Mobile had been left alone but Ricky Wong is obstructed. In this way, he deliberately **points up** that Mainland enterprises enjoy "privilege" in Hong Kong and he is a target of political antagonism, in an attempt to instigate some people's anti-government sentiments. His intention could be said really mean.

Surely, as every day sees new development in telecommunications technology including transmission standards, the content of the current Telecommunications Ordinance and Broadcasting Ordinance, which have been in effect for many years, need to be updated. The Commerce and Economic Development Bureau has already promised to conduct a review of the two ordinances this year. However, Ricky Wong attempts to make use of legal loopholes to switch his "mobile" TV into a "non-mobile" one and evade licensing and supervision, which is by no means acceptable.

13 March 2014

WORDS AND USAGE

Hit a snag (idiom) – To encounter an unexpected problem or obstacle –the word "snag" is used hers in the sense of "a sharp or rough projection." (遇到意外的問題或障礙)

*Examples: 1. We've hit a snag with the building project.
2. Our plans for Sally's surprise party hit a snag when we discovered she would be away that weekend.*

Lose to sb/sth (phrasal verb) – To be defeated by someone or something. (輸給…，敗於…)

*Examples: 1. I don't know why I often lose to Ping-pong players who are actually worse than I.
2. Our team lost to the for the seventh year in a row.*

(Be) subject to sth (idiom) – Be under the control or authority of something. (受…規管，受…約束)

*Examples: 1. All citizens in this nation are subject to the law.
2. Violators will be subject to a fine.*

Measure up (to sb/sth) (phrasal verb) – To reach a standard that is as good as someone or something else. (達到…的標準，與…一樣好)

*Examples: 1. The math skills of the majority of children in this school measure up to the national standards.
2. Too often computer software fails to measure up to expectations.*

Point sth up (phrasal verb) – To emphasize a problem or fact, so that people notice it more. (強調，顯示)

*Examples: 1. This points up what I've been telling you.
2. It was a badly researched documentary that glossed over important questions while pointing up trivial ones.*



時人名句

港視開台須領「免費牌」



◀通訊事務副總監劉光祥表示，不論港視採取何種制式「開台」，只要有理據顯示多於5000戶能自動「追台」接收港視訊號，即等同觸犯《廣播條例》。

「香港電視」牌照問題再起風波。該公司原擬今年七月開播流動電視服務，通訊事務管理局要求其必須申請免費電視牌照，否則違反條例。「港視」主席王維基指為「被政府針對」及「走投無路」，事件引起各方關注。

通訊事務副總監劉光祥：

其部分質疑缺乏事實根據，不論港視採取何種制式「開台」，只要有理據顯示多於5000戶能自動「追台」接收港視訊號，即等同觸犯《廣播條例》，通訊辦會嚴加執法。營辦商有責任採取措施，確保廣播制式符合法例標準，通訊辦歡迎王維基隨時與他們開會討論，但拒絕公開對話，雙方「鬧交冇用」。

中移動董事長奚國華：

當年向政府申請牌照時，當局已說清楚，利用手機營運流動電視是可以，但若果超過5000戶接收到，就必須有免費電視牌照。

前任工商及科技局局長王永平：

中移動採用的多媒體廣播標準（CMMB）制式，同樣可以「入屋」，只是質素不佳，而政府一直未有執法，因此予人感覺是政府「搬龍門」、更改政策，但通訊局亦有其法律依據，只是法例已經落伍。

無線行政主席梁乃鵬：

香港是依法辦事的。現在最好了，這件事上我們和香港電視（HKTV）都是受通訊事務管理局（通訊局）監管，這件事的始末由通訊事務管理局解釋最清楚，根本都不需要我參與，對我來說靜觀其變。你怎麼可說是做流動電視，但實際做出一個免費電視，這是無可能。香港是法治之區，就是咁簡單。

行政會議成員羅范椒芬：

港視無法如期開台感到遺憾，因很多港視員工早前離職後再「回巢」，現在又面對不明朗的前景。通訊事務管理局是以專業角度去處理事件，而港視之前是否有做足法律諮詢才是關鍵問題。

立法會議員謝偉俊：

我本身是律師，只是議題上看到有問題才提出來，總好過做了才發現會更大件事。這好過開了台才犯法，王維基會明白情況，也是澄清條例，這提議無論對王維基或對香港人也是好事。王維基是個聰明人，總會有路行，萬事也有商量，只要障礙能釐清，也會有多些選擇。

香港互動市務商會會長方傑倫：

原本持有流動電視牌的中移動子公司所用的制式是CMMB，質素如同VCD，而收購該流動電視的港視採用DTMB，即與無線及亞視的數碼電視制式相同，相信觸發了現有電視台的神經。

藝人曾志偉：

其實（開台受阻）對業界來講係唔想見到的，多一個競爭對手都係好事。

藝人梁榮忠：

開到台不知有無人睇，為何不留給市場決定？為何未來到已幫它決定？但我不覺得港視走投無路，因絕處可逢生。



時事英語

來自中文的英語詞彙

一種有生命力的語言必定是開放，且不斷地吸收其他語言的詞彙來豐富自己。英語能成為國際語言，重要原因之一在於她不排斥別的語言，並不斷吸收其他語言的詞彙，以增強自己的表達能力，因此，英語有許多外來詞（loanword）。近年，英語新聞報道也選用漢語拼音（pinyin）的中國特色詞彙。例子包括「兩會」（lianghui），即一年一度在北京召開的全國人民代表大會和全國人民政治協商會議的年會。如用英語翻譯就是：the annual sessions of the National People's Congress and the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference，即使以縮略語表達也略嫌偏長：the dual meeting of NPC and CPPCC。直接用lianghui就簡單得多。

▲「戶口」(hukou)是中國特有的名詞，英語沒有直接對應詞語，只能勉強意譯為 household registration system



又例如「戶口」(hukou)，這是中國特有的以戶為單位的人口管理制度，英語沒有直接對應詞語，只能勉強意譯為：household registration system。不過，此譯法未能完全表達出hukou的全部含義，「戶口」不限於「登記」，更重要在管理。還有，「人民幣」是中國的法定貨幣（fiat currency或legal tender），所以英文一般直接用renminbi來表示，簡稱為RMB。而RMB也成為人民幣的代稱，類似HKD（港元）或US\$（美元），如一千元人民幣就是RMB 1000。當然，也有人把人民幣說成Chinese yuan（中國元），簡稱CNY。目前，RMB和CNY都是人民幣的代稱。但隨着人民幣的進一步國際化（internationalized），將來國際間可能會採用二者之一作為統一代稱。

大英帝國在鼎盛時期，殖民地（colony）遍布全球各地，英語也從殖民地語言中吸收了不少詞彙。如karma（命運）一詞來自印度語。香港曾是英國殖民地，廣東話的一些詞彙也被英語吸收，如kowtow（叩頭）、Yum-cha（飲茶）、Dim-sum（點心）等；一些英國沒有的蔬果，也直接借用廣東話名稱，如白菜（Bok choy）、荔枝（lychee）；還有，香港人過年會派的「利是」，英文就是Lai See。

亦然