

Updates on Complaints<sup>1</sup>  
(Position as at 12.10.2011)

A. Complaints dealt with by the Broadcasting Authority Complaints Committee and considered by the Broadcasting Authority covering the period from July to September 2011

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
Radio Programme "Free as the Wind" (講東講西)  RTHK Radio 2 1 May 2011	1	- A member of the public complained about the captioned radio programme. The substance of the complaint was that the host uttered a term which sounded like a foul expression.	- The BA noted that in a chat about agricultural developments of Britain and China at the time around the Opium War, a host uttered a phrase containing a Cantonese foul expression at around 10:53am while the other hosts were also talking. - The BA, having regard to the relevant facts of the case, considered that the foul expression was clearly audible and definitely offensive to the average listeners. Thus, the programme was in breach of paragraph 15 of the Radio Programme Code which stipulated that expressions that were definitely offensive were prohibited from use on radio. - The BA considered that the complaint was <b><u>substantiated</u></b> . - The BA decided that RTHK should be <b>advised</b> to observe more closely of the relevant provision in the Radio Programme Code.

<sup>1</sup> Content of this paper is extracted from the homepage of the Broadcasting Authority: <http://www.hkba.hk/en/complaints/archives.html>.

**B. Complaints dealt with by the Television and Entertainment Licensing Authority falling under Section 11(1) of the Broadcasting Authority Ordinance<sup>2</sup> covering the period from July to August 2011**

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
<i>Accuracy</i>			
<p>Hong Kong Today (晨早新聞天地)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 1 9.5.2011</p>	1	<p>– an anchor wrongly reported the time as 8:30 am at 8:00 am</p>	<p>– RTHK submitted that an anchor rounded up the programme at around 7:59 pm by saying that it was approaching half past eight, that the mistake was a slip of the tongue, and that the correct time, 8:00 am, was announced immediately in the following programme</p> <p>– complaint classified as a <b><u>minor breach</u></b></p>
<p>Open Line Open View (自由風自由Phone)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 1 8.6.2011</p>	1	<p>– a host’s mention of Article 159 of the Basic Law in a discussion about the interpretation of the Basic Law was inaccurate as the interpretation of the Basic Law was provided in Article 158 rather than Article 159</p>	<p>– RTHK admitted that when a legal expert shared his opinion on the interpretation of the Basic Law, the host incorrectly quoted Article 129 in passing (not Article 159 as quoted by the complainant). RTHK explained that the lapse was a slip of the tongue and the correct provision, viz. “Article 158”, was clearly mentioned five times in the programme</p> <p>– complaint classified as a <b><u>minor breach</u></b></p>
<p>Happy Daily (開心日報)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 1 15.7.2011</p>	1	<p>– the hosts’ chat regarding discussion on the Internet about how to castrate a Government official was of bad taste</p>	<p>– light-hearted talk show (10:20 am – 12:00 noon)</p> <p>– a hostess briefly described a live broadcast on the Internet of a castration ceremony (去勢大會) held by protestors to express their discontent about a Government official. She said that there was a full-length photo of the official, the lower half of which was covered by a red cloth, and the process of the</p>

<sup>2</sup> Section 11(1) of Broadcasting Authority Ordinance (Cap 391) provides that BA shall refer to the Complaints Committee complaints about contravention of the said Ordinance, Broadcasting Ordinance (Cap 562), Part III A of Telecommunication Ordinance (Cap 106), terms or conditions of a licence or Code of Practice.

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
			<p>ceremony included erection (勃起), use of scissors, ejection of liquid, wound treatment and putting up of a feather duster (雞毛掃). The hosts remarked that though creative, the ceremony was of bad taste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the hosts' remarks, including the brief depiction of the ceremony, would unlikely be considered of bad taste or unacceptable for broadcast in a programme not targeting children</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Discrimination &amp; Denigration</i>			
<p>Crazy and Happy (瘋Show快活人)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 2 2.6.2011</p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the complainant alleged that in a skit broadcast within the programme : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the host's use of the term “阿星” (Ah Sing) to refer to a South Asian who won the first prize of Mark Six was in breach of the Race Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 602)</li> <li>(ii) the host's remark that “比大人物” “大班” ”更加可信” (more creditable than the celebrity “大班”) amounted to inappropriate use of the radio frequency for personal purpose since “大班” had recently criticised the host in the press</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- radio drama about occupational safety (職業安全廣播劇), with information provided by the Labour Department, and produced by and broadcast within the concerned programme</li> <li>- the host and the hostess played the role of a husband and a wife respectively in the drama</li> <li>- when consulting a fortune teller, the host used the alleged term in passing to refer to the South Asian who had bought Mark Six at the same time with him but it turned out that the South Asian won the first prize. Nothing amounting to discrimination or denigration was found</li> <li>- when the hostess queried the fortune teller for talking nonsense, the host remarked that the fortune teller was more creditable than those “大人物” and “大班” (tycoon) without making specific reference to any person</li> <li>- the alleged contents in context would unlikely be considered discriminating, or amounting to</li> </ul>

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inappropriate use of radio frequency</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Disgusting Material</i>			
Crazy and Happy (瘋Show快活人)  RTHK Radio 2 8.3.2011	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the complainant alleged without specific details that the hosts' remarks were disgusting, obscene and outrageous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- light-hearted talk show (10:00 am – 1:00 pm)</li> <li>- the hosts chatted about which gender was more environmentally friendly by comparing the ways of living of men and women. One of the hosts explained why men did not need to use tissue after urination by drawing analogies with a tap and a hose</li> <li>- though carrying mild innuendoes, the hosts' jocular remarks were not considered disgusting, obscene or unacceptable for broadcast in a light-hearted talk show</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Horrifying &amp; Unnerving Material</i>			
Gimme 5  RTHK Radio 2 23.6.2011	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the programme about supernatural stories was unnerving and horrifying and should not be broadcast at the scheduled time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a light-hearted talk show for youth broadcast at 5:00 pm – 7:00 pm with different themes every day</li> <li>- the segment about supernatural experience began at about 5:40 pm. Listeners were invited to talk about their encounters with ghosts and vote for the most horrifying</li> <li>- the segment was delivered in a light-hearted manner and the hosts gave jocular remarks or comments from time to time. It was not overly horrifying, unnerving or unacceptable for broadcast</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Impartiality and Misleading</i>			
Open Line Open View	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the hosts' negative remarks about the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- personal view programme (PVP)</li> </ul>

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
(自由風自由Phone)  RTHK Radio 1 15.6.2011		difficulty in making medical insurance claims successfully, the unclear definitions in insurance policies and the self-regulation of the insurance industry were partial and misleading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the host mentioned the complaint cases published by the Consumer Council about medical insurance claims, including a case that a hospitalisation claim was rejected on the ground that the hospital in question did not meet the definition of “hospital” in the policy</li> <li>- the hosts remarked that the policy holders were in a disadvantageous position as the insurance companies had the right of final interpretation of the terms in the policies and the hostess called for speedy setup of the independent Insurance Authority (保險業監管局) for regulation of the insurance sector so as to increase the public’s confidence</li> <li>- ample opportunity was given to a delegate of the Medical Insurance Association of the Hong Kong Federation of Insurers (香港保險業聯會醫療保險協會), an industry association of the insurers, to respond to the hosts’ questions</li> <li>- the hosts’ personal views were not unacceptable in a PVP covering different views</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Inappropriate Segment</i>			
Headliner (頭條新聞)  RTHK (TVB Jade) 17.6.2011	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the segment on assassinating a Mainland official was inappropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- personal view programme</li> <li>- in a skit, a host played the role of a sniper targeting a Mainland official who visited Hong Kong. He reported the interesting scenes he saw during the official’s visit through his gun. No shooting act was depicted</li> <li>- the jocular portrayal in a skit would unlikely be taken seriously or considered unacceptable for broadcast</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
<i>Indecency</i>			
Crazy & Happy (瘋Show快活人)  RTHK Radio 2 17.1.2011	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the complainant alleged without specific details that the remarks of two male hosts were of bad taste, indecent, and unsuitable for broadcast at the scheduled time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- light-hearted talk show (10:00 am-1:00 pm)</li> <li>- investigation revealed that the hosts chitchatted jokingly with the hostess about two gifts to lovers as reported in the press, namely, miracle underpants for men and herbal push-up bra for women. They described the plastic pad inside the miracle underpants as a big bag of rice (“大苞米”), lychee (“荔枝”) and bird nest (“鳥巢”) while the herbal push-up bra was referred to as brown sugar rice pudding (“砵仔糕”), toilet pump, coconut shell (“椰子殼”) and nets for handling the big rampion (“大桔的網”)</li> <li>- though carrying sexual innuendoes, the remarks were not indecent or unacceptable for broadcast in the programme not targeting children</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
Crazy and Happy (瘋Show快活人)  RTHK Radio 2 15.7.2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a host’s remarks “不要近女色” (refraining from having sex with women) and “搞得多啲, 好瘦嘅人” (persons having much sex would become skinny) were indecent and unsuitable for broadcast as children might have listened to the programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- light-hearted talk show (10:00 am – 1:00 pm)</li> <li>- the host jokingly remarked that musclemen needed to refrain from having sex with women as he heard that some persons attributed the skinniness of a man to having too much sex (搞好多)</li> <li>- though carrying mild sexual innuendoes, the remark was not unacceptable for broadcast in the programme not targeting children</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Insult, Bad Influence on Children &amp; Sexual Harassment</i>			
Open Line Open View (自由風自由Phone)	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the repeated remarks that Government officials should be hit at</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- personal view programme (PVP)</li> <li>- alleged remark found in both editions when callers</li> </ul>

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
RTHK Radio 1 14 & 20.6.2011		the buttocks were insulting, exerted a bad influence on children, would invite children's imitation and amounted to sexual harassment to the officials	expressed their dissatisfaction with the Government's policy on subsidised public housing and elimination of illegal structures – the passing remark in context would unlikely be considered insulting, amounting to sexual harassment, having a bad influence on children or unacceptable for broadcast – complaints <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b>
<i>Insulting Remarks</i>			
Finance New Concept (一桶金之財經新思維)  RTHK Radio 1 4.1.2011	1	– the term “廢柴” (dead wood) uttered by a host was insulting and inappropriate	– programme on financial issues (4:47 pm-5:00 pm) – the alleged expression “廢柴” was not found – complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b>
<i>Language</i>			
Happy Daily (開心日報)  RTHK Radio 1 3.12.2010	1	– the expression “契弟” (silly guy) uttered by the hostess was crude	– light-hearted talk show (10:20 am-12:00 pm) – the alleged expression was not found – complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b>
Gimme 5  RTHK Radio 2 6.6.2011	1	– a host uttered a foul expression at around 5:41 pm – 5:42 pm when mentioning the dominance of women nowadays (現時D女仔大晒)	– the host remarked that women were bolder than men nowadays (依家D女仔仲大胆過D男仔). The alleged foul expression was not found – complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b>
<i>Law &amp; Order</i>			
Talkabout	12	– a host encouraged the drivers to	– personal view programme (PVP)

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
<p>(千禧年代)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 1 14, 15.7.2011</p>		<p>sound horns and boo to express their discontent about blocking of the traffic by the protestors. In response to the reminders of another host and some callers that use of the horn in such circumstances would contravene the law, the host claimed that the Police would not take enforcement action and even if prosecuted, the drivers could prove themselves not guilty by hypocritically using the defence that the horns were sounded to warn the protestors of danger</p> <p>– the host’s remarks promoted illegal act, disturbed social order, incited conflicts, caused pollution to environment and was partial. The host was not suitable for being a host of phone-in programmes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– on 14.7.2011, when commenting on a temporary closure of the downhill lane of Garden Road after some protestors suddenly rushed into the road from the pavement, the host remarked that the drivers might sound the horns or boo in order to let the protestors and the media know the drivers’ dissatisfaction</li> <li>– another host disagreed with the host and clearly remarked that according to Regulation 43 of the Road Traffic (Traffic Control) Regulations (Cap. 374G), no person shall use any audible warning device on a vehicle on a road except to warn any person on or near a road of danger and that it was not justifiable to sound horns for expressing dissatisfaction. He also considered it inadvisable to boo at the protestors as this might result in conflict</li> <li>– the host asked a retired inspector whether the police would issue summons once he found a driver sounding the horn and the retired inspector replied that a policeman would normally give a verbal warning first. The host did not say that the Police would not take enforcement action</li> <li>– on 15.7.2011, the host discussed with another host on whether it was a reasonable defence to argue that the horns was sounded to warn the protestors on the road of danger. He did not suggest that one should be hypocritical in the court</li> <li>– all remarks were clearly identified as personal views, not unacceptable in a PVP</li> <li>– it was unlikely that the host’s remarks in a PVP covering different views would encourage contravention of the law or cause public disorder</li> </ul>

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- complaints <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> <li>- the allegations on pollution to environment and choice of host were outside section 11(1) of the Broadcasting Authority Ordinance</li> </ul>
<i>Personal View Programme</i>			
<p>Open Line Open View (自由風自由phone)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 1 11.5.2011</p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- during the discussion on political issues, a guest hostess always disrupted or overlapped callers' speech, which was in breach of the code of practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- personal view programme (PVP) on current affairs around the time specified by the complainant (5:30 pm), a caller queried about a guest hostess' stance towards the Civic Party. The hostess was eager to respond and spoke at the same time with the caller. The other host had invited the caller to express his views</li> <li>- the caller with different views was given ample opportunity to express his opinions, in compliance with the requirement of a PVP</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Sex</i>			
<p>Crazy and Happy (瘋Show快活人)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 2 24 &amp; 25.5.2011</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a complainant was dissatisfied that the hosts likened yawning to orgasm, exaggerated, joked about sex and discussed figures of women</li> <li>- a complainant was dissatisfied that the programme always discussed about sex-related matters like orgasm and moaning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- light-hearted talk show (10:00 am – 1:00 pm)</li> <li>- the host quoted a finding in a scientific paper that orgasm was similar to yawning and sneezing in nature as they could all enable a person to relax. The two hosts then made jocular remarks by using the terms “orgasm” and “yawning” interchangeably</li> <li>- the hostess talked about a software which could filter pornographic contents on the Internet based on the sound of the web contents. The host jokingly responded that the software was not reliable as the sounds made by some tennis players and fitness trainers were similar to those of pornographic contents and he mimiced such sounds</li> </ul>

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the hosts did not discuss women's figures at the alleged time</li> <li>- though carrying mild sexual innuendoes, the remarks were not unacceptable for broadcast in the programme not targeting children</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> <li>- choice of programme material was outside section 11(1) of the Broadcasting Authority Ordinance</li> </ul>
<p>Crazy And Happy (瘋Show快活人)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 2 25.5.2011</p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the complainant was dissatisfied that the hosts talked about sexual moans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- light-hearted talk show (10:00 am – 1:00 pm)</li> <li>- when chatting about a porn filter software which blocked adult web content with sexual moaning sounds, a host queried that the software might also block internet materials with grunts of athletes or roars of estrous animals. The hosts made such sounds several times. The host also jokingly remarked that the inventor of the software had no interest in sex</li> <li>- though carrying sexual innuendoes, the jocular chit-chat was not unacceptable for broadcast in a programme not targeting children</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Triad Theme and Violence</i>			
<p>Money Program (一桶金)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 1 5.4.2011</p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a triad member phoned in to promote triad and violence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the alleged phone-in programme segment was not found at the specified date and time</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Truthfulness &amp; Fairness</i>			

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
<p>Open Line Open View (自由風自由Phone)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 1 24.6.2011</p>	1	<p>– the host’s remarks that officers of the Immigration Department did not inspect Mainland pregnant travellers who concealed their pregnancy by wearing loose-fitting garments or carrying handbags were untrue, unfair to, defamed and damaged the reputation of the Immigration Department</p>	<p>– personal view programme (PVP)</p> <p>– in a phone-in segment about the imposition of quota on the number of Mainland pregnant women giving births in local hospitals, the host remarked that the pregnant women tended to wear loose-fitting garments when they crossed the border at late night. A caller then remarked that no officer proactively inspected the pregnant women or noticed anything suspicious. Even women with up to 8-month pregnancy could pass the immigration check points by covering their bellies with handbags and were not required to present relevant medical certificates</p> <p>– the hosts did not make any assertive remarks, and the caller talked about her own observation</p> <p>– all remarks were clearly identified as personal views, and would unlikely be considered unfair or unacceptable for broadcast in a PVP</p> <p>– complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></p>
<i>Violence, Insult &amp; Impartiality</i>			
<p>Morning Suite (晨光第一線)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 2 2.3.2010</p>	1	<p>– the hosts’ remarks that (1) the Chief Executive (CE) was making a mountain out of a molehill and wasted public money on body check after being attacked, and that (2) the Chairman of the Hospital Authority (HA) supported the government indiscriminately, such as his saying that the Financial Secretary (FS) was respectful as he revised the Financial</p>	<p>– light-hearted talk show (6:00 am – 10:00 am)</p> <p>– in a segment, the hosts remarked that the Chairman of the HA was keen on supporting government but sometimes he would do it wrongly. They queried his saying that the FS was brave and respectful after he had proposed to revise the Financial Budget in view of the public opinions as this might imply that people could do something wrong and then rectify the mistake to earn respect. They also considered that it was disturbing for escorting the CE to undertake body</p>

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
		Budget after considering public opinions, and his escort of the CE's body check, promoted violence, insulted the Chairman of the HA, and were biased	<p>check after the attack especially the CE's conditions were in fact not too bad and the issue should actually be kept in a low profile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the host's personal views in a light-hearted talk show would unlikely be considered to have the effect of promoting violence, insulting any person or unacceptable for broadcast in a talk show</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Impartiality</i>			
<p>Talkabout (千禧年代)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 1 6.5.2011</p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the hosts commented that it was strange that the department issuing death certificates did not inform other government departments of one's death to protect privacy. The complainant considered that the above comments were made without thorough inquiry and would mislead listeners that government departments did not carry out their duties and there were drawbacks in their policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- personal view programme (PVP)</li> <li>- when talking about a court case of an old woman covering the death of her husband for 20 years in order to stay in the same public housing flat, the hosts commented that it was strange that when a death certificate was issued, the simple task of informing relevant government departments was not done as if the government protected privacy very well. A host then remarked that when a person died, his privacy was no longer an issue and he asked the government to check with the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data if informing relevant departments about the death of a person was a breach of the provisions on privacy</li> <li>- the above remarks were clearly the hosts' own views and were not unacceptable for broadcast in a PVP</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>
<i>Impartiality, Language &amp; Performance of Hostess</i>			
City Forum	9	- the hostess was partial, unfair, biased	- livecast of a public forum on current affairs (12:05

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
(城市論壇)  RTHK (TVB Jade) 22.5.2011		against the Democratic Alliance for Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB), unprofessional and not able to control the scene - the expressions "食屎" and "吹咩" were crude, indecent and unnerving, and exerted a bad influence on children	pm – 1:00 pm) - regarding the proposal to fill mid-term vacancies in the Legislative Council, guests including Legislative Councillors who were members of the DAB, Civic Party and People Power respectively, and a government official, and some floor audiences with different views were given ample opportunity to express their opinions. The hostess had not expressed any of her views - though unrefined, the alleged expressions were not unacceptable for broadcast in a public affairs programme not targeting children - complaints <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b> - the allegations on the hostess's performance was outside section 11(1) of the Broadcasting Authority Ordinance
<i>Indecency</i>			
Crazy and Happy (瘋 Show 快活人)  RTHK Radio 2 17.11.2010	3	- the hosts uttered indecent expressions, such as "吹雞毛" (to blow onto chicken feather) and "食蛋撻" (to eat egg tarts)	- light-hearted talk show broadcast at 10:00 am – 1:00 pm - in a segment, the hosts chatted about Prince William's strong affinity for his fiancée's hips and how he was attracted to her during an undergarment fashion show. A host jokingly remarked that he should not come to Hong Kong's market as it would cause disturbance to chickens, and uttered in passing that "...彭定康就食蛋撻，我就 Fu (puffing sound) ...吹 pat pat...". No further elaboration was given - the alleged expression "吹雞毛" was not found - the concerned expression in context was not indecent,

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
			and would unlikely be considered unacceptable for broadcast - complaints <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b>
Crazy and Happy (瘋 Show 快活人)  RTHK Radio 2 23.5.2011	1	- the frequent and explicit references to sex organs were indecent - the programme should be restricted to audience of certain age group	- light-hearted talk show broadcast at 10:00 am – 1:00 pm - when chatting about buttock enhancement surgeries, the hosts jokingly described women's buttocks as "後面嘅事業線" (rear cleavage) and coco de mers, and relayed a listener's view that a Chinese birthday bun also looked like buttocks and was called "pat pat 包" (buttock bun in Cantonese) - during the chit-chat about abbreviation of terms, the hosts played on a pun on the term "大空人" (the pun on people with big breasts in Cantonese) as the abbreviation of "偉大的太空人" (great astronaut) so as to satirise the typo in the Mainland textbooks which mistook "林陰道" (the words "陰道" might mean vagina) for "林蔭大道" (avenue) - though carrying mild sexual innuendoes, the hosts' jocular remarks were not indecent or unacceptable for broadcast in a programme not targeting children - complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b>
<i>Indecency, Blasphemy &amp; Disgusting Material</i>			
Crazy and Happy (瘋 Show 快活人)  RTHK Radio 2 14.4.2011	1	- the complainant alleged that the hosts put Jesus in some indecent jokes, which were disgusting, vulgar and blasphemous - the hosts' attitudes were problematic,	- light-hearted talk show broadcast at 10:00 am – 1:00 pm - before recounting the news about the archaeological find of two nails in a tomb in Israel said to be used to nail Jesus on the cross, a host quoted two jokes about

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
		crazy and disgusting	<p>the nails driven into Jesus on the cross. In the first one, during the prayer of a man selling stinky bean curd, a nail came out because the bean curd was so stinky that Jesus had to cover his nose with his hand. The other was about a woman praying in the bathroom. A nail came out because Jesus had to cover his eyes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- before telling the jokes, the host declared that they were just jokes and asked the audience to forgive him</li> <li>- the fun-provoking jokes were not about religion at all, and would unlikely be considered blasphemous, indecent, vulgar, disgusting or unacceptable for broadcast</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> <li>- the allegation on the attitudes of the hosts was outside section 11(1) of the Broadcasting Authority Ordinance</li> </ul>
<i>Indecency &amp; Unsuitable for Children</i>			
<p>Crazy and Happy (瘋 Show 快活人)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 2 27.5.2011</p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the frequent and explicit references to sex and sex organs, particularly at around 10:35 am, were indecent and unsuitable for children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- light-hearted talk show (10:00 am – 1:00 pm)</li> <li>- nothing indecent or about sex was found at the alleged time when the hosts recounted a news item about a counterfeit website for Inland Revenue Department</li> <li>- in a chit-chat, the host drew an analogy between choosing a girlfriend and a car. He remarked that both had to be young, new, good-looking and frugal, and had not been changed hands for so many times</li> <li>- when chatting about a woman's attempted suicide, the hosts mentioned the G-spot in passing</li> <li>- though carrying mild sexual innuendoes, the hosts' jocular remarks were not indecent or unacceptable for</li> </ul>

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
			broadcast in a programme not targeting children - complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b>
<i>Misleading</i>			
Investment Era (投資新世代)  RTHK Radio 1 19.3.2011	1	- the host's remark that nuclear waste at the Fukushima nuclear power station in Japan was recycled for manufacturing nuclear weapons was unverified and would cause unnecessary fear	- finance talk show - the host tried to analyse the possible impact of radiation leak in Fukushima on Hong Kong's financial market by examining possible causes leading to the nuclear crisis. He was sceptical about why the first and second generations of reactors, which were costly and dangerous, were widely used in Japan and why so many nuclear power stations had to be built in a relatively small country. He remarked that a possible explanation for these questions was to make nuclear weapons by recycling the nuclear waste - the hosts had reiterated that they were only giving their own views and providing general information about nuclear energy, that they might not be correct and were for reference only - it was unlikely that the personal remarks would be taken as fact or considered unacceptable - complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b>
<i>Misleading &amp; Defamation</i>			
Open Line Open View (自由風自由 Phone)  RTHK Radio 1 18.5.2011	1	- the host's assumption that a Government official had deliberately violated the law in building illegal structures in her village house was made without giving evidence, misled listeners into believing that the official	- personal view programme (PVP) - when talking about a Government official avoided answering whether the illegal structures already existed when she bought the village house, the host remarked that if the unauthorised additions were built by the official after she joined the Government, she should

Title	No. of Complaints	Substance of Complaint	Decision
		was guilty and amounted to defamation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- confess and apologise to the public for such illegal acts</li> <li>- the host's personal view in context was unlikely to be considered misleading or unacceptable in a PVP complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> <li>- the allegation on defamation was outside section 11(1) of the Broadcasting Authority Ordinance</li> </ul>
<i>Sex Discrimination</i>			
<p>Crazy and Happy (瘋 Show 快活人)</p> <p>RTHK Radio 2 7.4.2011</p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the discussion at 12:10 pm promoted sex discrimination and sex selection of children to expecting parents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- light-hearted talk show at 10:00 am – 1:00 pm</li> <li>- the hosts talked about the results of a survey on the best family combination conducted by a UK newspaper and mentioned that the combination ranked last was a family with four daughters. The hosts then talked about a family of eight daughters in a Hong Kong walled village with all the daughters' names bearing the meaning of hoping for a son, and remarked that it was poor of them for being treated as back-up members of the family</li> <li>- it was unlikely that the factual account of the survey in the UK or the hosts' remarks would be considered promoting sex discrimination or sex selection of babies</li> <li>- complaint <b><u>unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>