

# 立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(2)451/14-15(04)

Ref : CB2/HS/1/12

## **Subcommittee on Poverty**

### **Updated background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat for the meeting on 16 December 2014**

#### **Poverty line**

##### **Purpose**

This paper provides background information and summarizes the discussions at meetings of the Council and its committees on poverty line.

##### **Background**

2. As recommended by the former Commission on Poverty ("CoP") which was dissolved in 2007, the Government has adopted a set of 24 multi-dimensional poverty indicators for monitoring the overall poverty situation in Hong Kong. This set of indicators has been designed to provide a broad picture of how the poverty situation has been evolving and help identify areas for further study.

3. In his Election Manifesto, the Chief Executive ("CE") pledged to reinstate CoP to undertake an overall review of the forms and manners by which poverty is manifested and their underlying causes. CoP was reinstated in December 2012, with the setting of a poverty line as one of its main tasks. In its last term, CoP formed the Social Security and Retirement Protection Task Force ("Task Force") to conduct an in-depth study on the setting of a poverty line, and give advice and make recommendations to CoP. In its current term (i.e. 1 December 2014 - 30 June 2017), CoP has been merged with the Task Force to enhance the efficiency of deliberation on poverty situation, social security and retirement protection issues.

## **Past discussions by Members**

### Measuring poverty

4. When the Subcommittee on Poverty ("the Subcommittee") under the House Committee was briefed on the work of the Preparatory Task Force on CoP and the key areas of work of the new CoP at its meeting on 5 November 2012, members noted that a poverty line would be drawn up for gauging the poverty situation and assessing the effectiveness of poverty alleviation policies. Meanwhile, the Administration had continued to monitor Hong Kong's poverty situation using the set of 24 poverty indicators. Members called on the Administration to solicit views from different strata of society in drawing up the poverty line.

5. At its meeting on 14 November 2012, the Council passed a motion on alleviating poverty urging the Government to, among other things, expeditiously draw up a poverty line, so that the Government and the society might compile statistics on the number of people in poverty and assess the effectiveness of poverty alleviation measures by means of objective and open criteria, and set up an evaluation mechanism to examine the possible impact of all policies and measures of the Government on the disparity between the rich and the poor before their introduction.

### Basis for setting poverty line

6. The Subcommittee received public views on poverty line at its meetings on 11 December 2012 and 27 April 2013. Deputations had different views on how the poverty line should be set. Some were in support of following the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development to set the poverty line at 50% of the median monthly household income. Some others were in favour of following the European Commission to set the line at 60% thereof. And yet some others considered that the line should be set at a range from 40% to 70 % of the median monthly household income.

7. The Administration advised that the Task Force agreed, at its meetings on 28 January and 18 March 2013, to adopt the concept of relative poverty and set the main poverty line at half of the median monthly household income. The Task Force considered that setting the poverty line in this way was easy to understand, but noted that there were also limitations such as only household income was counted while assets were not; and there would always be some people statistically below the poverty

line. With due regard to these limitations, the Task Force accepted that the poverty line could not be directly linked to the eligibility criteria of various means-tested social welfare schemes. In other words, even if the poverty line was set, the Administration would not automatically offer subsidies to individuals or households whose income was below the poverty line. On the contrary, even if the household income of some groups was slightly above the poverty line, they would be eligible for government subsidies subject to their being able to meet the means test of individual social welfare schemes.

8. Some members of the Subcommittee considered that it might be difficult to measure the effectiveness of poverty alleviation by merely adopting the concept of "relative poverty". On the contrary, the concept of "absolute poverty" would be conducive to the setting of a specific indicator of poverty alleviation. They shared the views of some deputations that apart from adopting the concept of "relative poverty" to set the poverty line, the concept of "absolute poverty" should also be adopted to set the subsistence living protection line, so as to delineate the minimum standard of basic subsistence recognized by the community.

9. The Administration stressed that adopting the concept of "relative poverty" could enable the poverty line to serve better its purpose of identifying target groups, analyzing and monitoring the effectiveness of government policy interventions, though CoP and the Task Force acknowledged that the concept had its own limitations as mentioned in paragraph 7 above.

10. At the Subcommittee meeting on 8 May 2013, members noted that CoP had endorsed the Task Force's recommendation under which an income-based approach would be adopted to set the main poverty line at 50% of the median monthly household income. Some members of the Subcommittee considered it more desirable to delineate the poverty line at 60% rather than 50% of the median monthly household income. They pointed out that the poverty line would be on the low side if it was delineated at 50% of the median monthly household income because for a one-person household, 50% of the median monthly household income would be \$3,650, far lower than the average Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA") payment (\$4,351) for such households. They considered that 50% of the median monthly household income was already the level of absolute poverty, and the poverty line should not be delineated below this level.

11. The Administration responded that it had been a common practice, both internationally and locally, to delineate the poverty line at 50% of the median monthly household income. The Administration reiterated that the setting of a poverty line did not mean that people in need but with income level above the poverty line would be deprived of the opportunity of receiving government assistances. Currently, even if the household income of some groups was above the poverty line, they would be eligible for government subsidies subject to their meeting the means test of individual assistance schemes. Poverty alleviation measures would continue to be considered by the Government based on the needs of different under-privileged groups.

12. Members of the Subcommittee were of the view that the Administration should adopt the disposable cash income as the basis for setting the subsistence living protection line. The Administration explained that data of the disposable income were not collected by the Census and Statistics Department ("C&SD")'s General Household Surveys. To take into account the full expenditure pattern of households, up-to-date expenditure data would be required which would only be available in the Household Expenditure Surveys conducted by C&SD every five years (with the next one to be conducted in 2014-2015). This would make it impossible for the Administration to compile poverty statistics on an annual basis for regular monitoring of the effectiveness of government policy interventions.

#### Number of poverty lines

13. Members of the Subcommittee shared the views of some deputations that several poverty lines should be set in order to monitor the situation of people in different degrees of poverty and the changes in their situation. As regards how the poverty lines should be delineated, the following approaches had been suggested –

- (a) Two poverty lines should be drawn up. One line was to be drawn up as a subsistence living protection line based on the concept of "absolute poverty", while the other line was to be drawn up based on the concept of "relative poverty" and set at 50% or 60% of the median household income;
- (b) There should be at least three benchmarks to measure poverty. The lowest benchmark should be a subsistence living protection line corresponding to an income level that maintained subsistence living. The middle benchmark, representing the

poverty line, should be set at 60% of the median household income. The highest benchmark should represent a poverty prevention line, possibly set at 70% of the median household income;

- (c) The poverty line should be set at 60% of the per capita median household income, with reference indicators set at 50% and 40%. Adjustment for household size was not necessary, and the calculation was based on the per capita median household income; or
- (d) Four poverty lines should be drawn up. The concept of "relative poverty" would be adopted for three of them, taking 40%, 50% and 60% of the median household income of different household sizes as thresholds. For the last one, the concepts of "absolute poverty" and "relative deprivation" would be adopted to set the subsistence living protection line for determining the CSSA level.

14. According to the Administration, apart from setting the main poverty line at 50% of the median monthly household income, it did not rule out the option of taking data corresponding to other percentages, such as 40%, 60% and 70%, as reference in the future. On the other hand, the Government Economist and C&SD would analyze the data based on the framework agreed by CoP, which included adopting the concept of "relative poverty" based on an income-based approach, and setting the main poverty line at half of the median monthly household income, so as to identify the various characteristics (e.g. social, economic, housing conditions and district characteristics) of households below the poverty line, and conduct detailed analysis on specific groups such as the working poor, poor elderly, households receiving CSSA, single-parent families, new arrivals, etc. This would facilitate the Administration's formulation of targeted poverty alleviation initiatives.

Measures that should be counted in "post-policy intervention household income"

15. According to the Administration, the Government currently had different cash-based and non-cash based social welfare measures (such as CSSA, student finance assistance and public housing, etc.) to assist people in need and improve their living standard. The Task Force discussed in detail and formed an initial view on what measures should be counted in the "post-tax and post-social transfer household income", which would

serve as a quantified indicator measuring the impact of poverty alleviation measures of the Government.

16. Members of the Subcommittee did not support incorporating public housing benefits as part of the cash income in the calculation of the poverty line, because given that the location of the public housing had a considerable bearing on its market rent, if the public housing benefits were evaluated with this approach, the poverty rate of public housing tenants in urban areas would be substantially underestimated. Some members considered that if CoP incorporated public housing benefits in the calculation of the poverty line, the size of the poor population would be substantially reduced, thus begging doubts about CoP tempering with the figures to understate the poor population.

17. The Administration stated that one of the functions of the poverty line was to assess the effectiveness of the Government's policy interventions on the poverty situation of Hong Kong, and the public housing policy was one of the most important intervention points and most effective policy for assisting low-income families. CoP was exploring the methodology to quantify public housing benefits. CoP would exercise great care in handling the issue and make careful consideration. It had not yet made any decision on this matter. In addition, upon the setting of the poverty line, the Administration would release to the public the figures before and after policy interventions by the Government. Therefore, there was no question of CoP understating some figures. Nevertheless, the most important point was what methodology could best measure the effectiveness of the policy. Although the effectiveness of the policy could be reflected in quantitative changes, what the Administration pursued was not increase or decrease in quantity, but really helping the underprivileged and the low-income people in Hong Kong.

18. At its meeting on 8 May 2013, the Subcommittee passed the following motion in relation to setting the poverty line –

"That the poverty line should be set with the ultimate goal of helping members of the public get out of poverty and improving their quality of living, instead of hiding the problem of poverty. This Subcommittee considers that a poverty line setting at 50% of the median household income is too low, and does not support incorporating public housing benefits as part of the cash income in the calculation of the poverty line. This Subcommittee further considers that the concept of disposable income should be used to set the subsistence living protection line for the purposes

of alleviating and eliminating poverty."

The Subcommittee's recommendations on the setting of poverty line

19. The Subcommittee deliberated its draft report on setting the poverty line at its meeting on 24 May 2013 and recommended that CoP should –

- (a) set the poverty line with the ultimate goal of helping members of the public get out of poverty and improving their quality of living, instead of hiding the poverty problem, and should set specific targets for the elimination of poverty;
- (b) set three benchmarks for the poverty line. The lowest benchmark should be a subsistence living protection line based on the concept of disposable income. The middle benchmark should be a poverty line set at 60% of the median household income. The highest benchmark should be a poverty prevention line, set at 70% of the median household income;
- (c) not incorporate public housing benefits as part of cash income in the calculation of the poverty line;
- (d) consult the public before making a decision on the framework for setting the poverty line; and
- (e) make public the documents and records related to the meetings held by CoP and its Task Forces, as well as relevant study reports and data.

The report was presented to the House Committee for information at its meeting on 31 May 2013 and then forwarded to CoP on 5 June 2013 for consideration and response.

First CoP Summit

20. The first CoP Summit chaired by CE was held on 28 September 2013. At the Summit, a briefing was given on the work progress of CoP and its Task Forces in the past 10 months, including the setting of a poverty line and analysis results on the poverty situation in Hong Kong. According to the Administration, CoP had agreed to adopt the concept of relative poverty and set the poverty line at 50% of the median monthly household income before tax and social benefits transfers (i.e. before government policy intervention), and the analysis of the poverty line would

be updated annually. Taking into account the data analysis for the poverty line, CoP considered that the working poor would require priority concern and employment was the best way to tackle poverty. CoP briefed the Subcommittee regarding the Summit and work progress of CoP and its Task Forces at the meeting on 29 October 2013. The Administration advised in December 2014 that it was making preparation to convene the second CoP Summit in the near future.

### **Latest development**

21. On 29 November 2014, CoP held a meeting to review the poverty situation in 2013. The Subcommittee will be briefed thereon at its meeting to be held on 16 December 2014.

### **Relevant papers**

22. A list of relevant papers on the Legislative Council website is in the **Appendix**.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
10 December 2014



## Appendix

### Relevant papers on poverty line

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Paper</b>
Subcommittee on Poverty	5 November 2012 (Item II)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Legislative Council	14 November 2012	<a href="#">Official Record of Proceedings</a> <a href="#">Pages 222 - 370</a>
Subcommittee on Poverty	11 December 2012 (Item III)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
House Committee	22 March 2013	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Subcommittee on Poverty	27 April 2013 (Item III)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Subcommittee on Poverty	8 May 2013 (Item I)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Subcommittee on Poverty	24 May 2013 (Item III)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
House Committee	31 May 2013 (Item V (b))	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Subcommittee on Poverty	29 October 2013 (Item I)	<a href="#">Agenda</a> <a href="#">Minutes</a>
Subcommittee on Poverty	28 October 2014 (Item I)	<a href="#">Agenda</a>