

香港金鐘添美道  
政府總部  
勞工及福利局



立法會CB(2)1160/13-14(01)號文件

LABOUR AND WELFARE BUREAU  
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT

Central Government Offices  
Tim Mei Avenue  
Admiralty  
Hong Kong

本函檔號 Our Ref.:

電話號碼 Tel No.: 2810 3298

來函檔號 Your Ref.:

傳真號碼 Fax No.: 2804 6509

香港中區  
立法會道 1 號  
立法會綜合大樓  
福利事務委員會秘書  
徐偉誠先生

徐先生：

**福利事務委員會**  
**2014年2月10日會議的跟進事項**

在2014年2月10日的福利事務委員會會議上，委員就「為低收入家庭護老者提供生活津貼試驗計劃」(試驗計劃)的建議，提出了寶貴的意見，並要求當局在關愛基金專責小組向扶貧委員會提交建議時，將有關的討論文件抄送事務委員會，供委員參閱。

關愛基金專責小組已於2014年3月10日的會議上，支持把試驗計劃的建議內容提交扶貧委員會。扶貧委員會將於2014年3月24日的會議上討論該建議。現隨函附上當局提交扶貧委員會的討論文件(只夾付有關試驗計劃部份)，供委員參閱。

勞工及福利局局長

(陳吳婷婷



代行)

2014年3月21日

項目建議：  
為低收入家庭護老者提供生活津貼試驗計劃

目的

本文件旨在向扶貧委員會建議由關愛基金撥款推出試驗計劃，為低收入家庭護老者提供生活津貼(試驗計劃)，並就計劃內容提出建議，供委員討論。

背景

**現時為護老者提供的支援**

2. 政府充份了解急速老齡化將為香港帶來巨大挑戰。政府將堅守目標，促進長者在各生活層面的健康發展，包括透過提供各類的支援服務，盡力讓長者可居家安老，並在有必要時，提供院舍照顧服務以切合長者不同的需要。在這過程中，政府除會充份顧及為長者提供有尊嚴選擇的需要外，亦會希望延續社會一向珍惜的自強不息和家庭支援的美德。

3. 很多居於社區的長者由其家人照顧（統稱「護老者」）。社會福利署（社署）一直提供不同的支援服務，提升護老者的能力和減輕他們的壓力。目前，全港各長者地區中心和鄰舍中心、家居照顧服務隊及長者日間護理中心／單位為護老者提供支援服務，包括資訊、培訓和輔導服務、協助成立護老者互助小組、設立資源中心，以及提供復康器材示範及借用服務等。此外，社署亦提供長者住宿及日間暫託服務，讓護老者在有需要時可稍作休息。

**建議的護老者津貼試驗計劃**

4. 除了有實質服務和心理支援需要外，來自低收入家庭的護老者可能需要一些經濟上的支援，以補貼其生活開支。在香港為護老者以發放現金模式提供生活津貼，將是一項嶄新的嘗試，推行為期兩年的試驗計劃以研究這模式的可行性、影響和成效，是適當及審慎的做法。就此，政府建議的試驗計劃內容載列於下文第 5 至 14 段。在擬訂試驗計劃時，政府

參考了其他地區類似計劃的安排，亦考慮了早前由關愛基金專責小組主席及有關當局徵詢本地非政府機構和關注團體（包括安老事務委員會和護老者支援團體等）所得的意見。政府的相關建議在 2014 年 2 月 10 日提交立法會福利事務委員會，該事務委員會委員對建議的意見，載於由立法會秘書處提供的會議討論記錄草擬本（見附錄一）<sup>1</sup>。有關建議其後於 2014 年 3 月 10 日提交關愛基金專責小組討論。該專責小組提出的意見載於下文第 15 段。

## 試驗計劃內容建議

### (a) 申領資格

5. 政府建議申領資格如下：

#### (i) 照顧經社署“安老服務統一評估機制”(評估機制)評定為身體機能中度或以上程度缺損的長者

在試驗計劃下，護老者是指照顧經評估機制評定為身體機能中度或以上程度缺損，並正在中央輪候冊輪候資助長期護理服務（即院舍照顧服務及／或社區照顧服務）而沒有使用任何院舍照顧服務的長者的人士。

#### (ii) 最低照顧時數

有些地區在推行類似計劃時，會規定領取津貼人士須最少照顧其長者達某指定時數。例如，澳洲的護老者津貼計劃規定護老者須每日照顧長者，並提供一星期不少於 20 小時的個人照顧；在英國，護老者每星期須提供不少於 35 小時的照顧，並須由受其照顧的長者簽署確認有關的照顧時數。

---

<sup>1</sup> 立法會福利事務委員會秘書處只擬備了英文版的會議記錄擬稿，而該擬稿並未經福利事務委員會相關委員參閱。

政府建議在試驗計劃下採用一個較具彈性的安排。護老者每月提供不少於 80 小時的照顧<sup>2</sup>，並須採用社署指定的表格，書面記錄其照顧長者的服務及時數。護老者提供的照顧時數達到或超過上文提及的最低要求時數，社署會向護老者發放津貼（請參閱下文第 6 段）。另外，護老者須親自確認該書面記錄，但受其照顧的長者則無需就記錄進行確認。倘若有需要覆核護老者提交記錄內容的準確性，政府可向受該護老者照顧的長者進行查詢。

### (iii) 有能力承擔照顧的責任

在其他地區，有些護老者津貼計劃就護老者的身分設有準則，包括年齡限制，及/或其他要求，例如規定護老者須為其照顧長者的家人。政府建議無須在試驗計劃下訂立這些硬性規定，但須確保下文第 8 段提及的服務提供單位會在參考社署發出的指引後，確定有關的護老者合身適及有能力擔當護老者。一般而言，被評估機制評為身體機能中度或嚴重缺損的人士，或正在中央輪候冊上輪候資助長期護理服務的人士，或傷殘津貼受助人，將不會被視為合適及有能力作為上文第 5(i)段所指的護老者，亦不符合資格申領津貼。

服務提供單位會就護老者適合參加的培訓課程作出建議，有關課程包括照顧長者的基本技巧及知識，例如與長者的溝通技巧、日常照顧技巧等。服務提供單位亦可因應被受照顧的長者的情況，建議護老者參加一些特定培訓課程，例如照顧患老人癡呆症長者的技巧等的課程。護老者受訓的時數亦可計入上文第 5(ii)段所述的最低照顧時數內。如護老者報讀由服務提供單位建議的課程而就此須支付費用，政府可在護老者完成課程後發還相關費用。由於大部份護老者將會接受由非政府機構提供的培訓，而這些機構一般亦只會收取低廉（甚至不收取）費用，在試驗計劃下，社署建議發還相關培訓課程費用會以 1,000 元為上限。

---

<sup>2</sup> 由護老者提供給長者的照顧指日常生活的獨立活動，例如膳食、家務、藥物管理、購買日常生活必需品及接送服務等，及/或長者日常生活中所需的個人照顧及協助，例如協助長者走動、穿衣、如廁及個人衛生等。

(iv) 須為香港居民，並與其所照顧的長者沒有任何僱傭關係

參加試驗計劃的合資格護老者須為香港居民，並與其所照顧的長者沒有任何形式的僱傭關係。

(v) 來自家庭每月入息中位數 75% 或以下的低收入家庭

現時領取護老者津貼的人士不能同時領取綜合社會保障援助或長者生活津貼<sup>3</sup>。由於試驗計劃會在關愛基金下試行，政府建議護老者的家庭收入為在家庭每月入息中位數 75% 或以下，以符合大部分關愛基金項目所採用的入息評估規定。

(b) 津貼額

6. 政府建議每名合資格的護老者可每月獲發 2,000 元津貼。如服務提供單位認為護老者有確切需要及有能力適合同時照顧超過一名長者，而該護老者能每月提供不少於 120 小時的照顧時數，則該護老者每月可以最多申領 4,000 元的津貼。按上文第 5(ii) 段所述，合資格護老者會在每月月底獲發津貼。

(c) 銜接資助社區照顧服務

7. 參與試驗計劃的護老者所照顧的長者，可以申請或繼續輪候資助社區照顧服務。資助社區照顧服務的提供者會在考慮個別個案的情況和護老者可提供的照顧支援後，就有關長者所需的服務組合作出專業評估。顧及長者在家已有護老者照顧，服務提供者很可能會建議減少對該名長者的個人支援服務(例如家務、膳食和接送服務等)，或不會建議該名長者使用全日制的日間護理照顧服務。

---

<sup>3</sup> 政府在籌劃低收入在職家庭津貼(低收入津貼)的推行細節時，會研究低收入津貼與為低收入家庭護老者提供生活津貼的銜接安排。在今年 10 月會全面檢討鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃(交津計劃)，政府會考慮交津計劃與擬議護老者津貼的銜接安排。

#### (d) 服務提供單位

8. 政府建議可委託長者地區中心和鄰舍中心擔任試驗計劃的服務提供單位，為試驗計劃下的護老者提供資訊、服務轉介、輔導等支援服務。服務提供單位會負責評估參與試驗計劃的護老者照顧長者的能力、為護老者安排培訓課程、進行家訪和檢視有關長者的情況。由於有關長者正在輪候資助長期護理服務（見上文第 5(i)段），所以該名長者會有一位「負責工作人員」<sup>4</sup>正在跟進其個案。服務提供單位會與接受護老者照顧的長者的「負責工作人員」保持緊密聯絡。社署會向有關的長者地區中心／鄰舍中心就上述建議提供的工作發放服務費，費用按每名護老者計算，每月的服務費為 350 元。

#### (e) 試驗計劃的實施安排

9. 試驗計劃如得到扶貧委員會通過，社署最快在今年第二季末開始發信給在指定日期前已在中央輪候冊上登記輪候資助長期護理服務而沒有使用任何院舍照顧服務的長者，邀請其護老者申請參與試驗計劃。負責跟進有關長者的「負責工作人員」會協助社署向長者及其護老者解釋及說明這試驗計劃的詳情。

10. 截至 2013 年 12 月底，中央輪候冊上共有約 18 000 名長者申請人居於社區，並正輪候資助院舍照顧服務及/或合資格接受資助社區照顧服務。社署沒有備存任何有關中央輪候冊申請人的護老者資料，未能估計擬議的津貼可惠及多少名護老者。在試驗計劃下，政府建議向 2 000 名合資格護老者發放津貼。推行為期兩年的試驗計劃所需發放護老者津貼的費用預計合共約為 1 億 80 萬元。

11. 社署會在推出試驗計劃前，與擔任為服務提供單位的長者地區中心及鄰舍中心商討工作細節。社署並會制定服務指引，包括服務提供單位應向護老者提供的支援、檢視受照顧長者的情況、以及與其他相關服務單位協作等。

---

<sup>4</sup>每名在中央輪候冊上的長者，均有一名負責工作人員跟進其長期護理服務申請。負責工作人員的職責包括就轉介社區照顧服務的申請、留意正輪候長期護理務的申請人的情況和福利需要，並提供合適的服務，以及向申請人解釋評估的結果，並相應跟進他們的福利需要。

(f) 評估及檢討

12. 在兩年試驗計劃推行期間，政府會評估試驗計劃的成效及對照顧者政策的長遠影響。成效衡量指標可包括受惠的人數、發放的資助金額、訂定的申請準則，以及透過收集護老者、受照顧長者、服務提供單位及其他相關人士所得的意見等。此外，評估研究亦需探討體弱長者在有護老者照顧的情況下，對其所接受的社區照顧服務的項目及用量所產生的變化，希望更了解不同長者的長期護理服務需要。同時，亦想了解領取津貼的護老者與被照顧長者的關係，從而檢視護老者津貼對家庭支援模式可能產生的變化。由於試驗計劃透過關愛基金推行，政府建議在擬定該計劃的準則時盡量跟隨其他現有關愛基金項目的做法，但社署會在進行評估時檢討這些準則。社署會委託研究小組進行評估研究，預計可於 2015 年年底完成。就此，政府希望關愛基金能撥款 140 萬元。

(g) 行政安排

13. 社署負責執行該試驗計劃，所需的行政開支為 460 萬元，用於支付有關公務員的薪酬、聘請非公務員合約員工及其他開支。有關行政開支詳細分目請參閱附錄二。

(h) 項目預算撥款

14. 預算關愛基金須為這項試驗計劃建議提供的總撥款額為 1 億 2,600 萬元，分項如下：

類別	預算	受惠人數
為合資格護老者提供生活津貼	1 億 1,960 萬元(約 1 億 2,000 萬元) (包括： (i) 發放生活津貼金額 1 億 80 萬元 <sup>5</sup> ；	2 000 名

<sup>5</sup> 每名合資格護老者照顧一名長者每月可獲發 2,000 元生活津貼，預計當中 5% 需照顧兩名長者，所涉及發放津貼金額約 1 億 80 萬元(即 [2,000 元 x 2 000 名護老者 x 24 個月] + [2,000 元 x 100 名護老者 x 24 個月] = 1 億 80 萬元)。

	(ii) 服務提供單位服務費 1,680 萬元 <sup>6</sup> 及 (iii) 護老者培訓費用 200 萬元 <sup>7</sup> )	
社署行政開支	460 萬元 <sup>8</sup>	
成效評估研究	140 萬元	
<b>總計</b>	<b>1 億 2,560 萬元 (約 1 億 2,600 萬元)</b>	<b>2 000 名</b>

### 立法會福利事務委員會及關愛基金專責小組的意見

15. 關愛基金專責小組的成員在其 2014 年 3 月 10 日的會議上，備悉/討論上述試驗計劃的建議及立法會福利事務委員會的意見（見上文第 4 段）後，普遍支持推出試驗計劃，並提出以下幾點意見：

(a) 有意見認為試驗計劃不宜限制受惠人數或設定過多申請條件，讓有需要的照顧者都能受惠。但亦有意見表示，試驗計劃的本質在於測試照顧者津貼的可行性及其可能帶來的影響，故此有需要設定受惠人數上限。此外，申請條件亦不宜太寬鬆，以儘量確保領取津貼的人士為真正護老者，防止濫用。

現時就試驗計劃所建議設定的申請條件，其實已較其他地方推行類似計劃的要求為寬鬆。另外，在香港以現金模式發放生活津貼予護老者是一個新嘗試，其成效及影響，有待社署進行的評估研究去探討。為試驗計劃設定受惠人數上限，並訂立可行的申請條件，是務實的做法。如上文第 12 段所述，政府會從多方面評估試驗計劃的成效、影響，以及檢討計劃

<sup>6</sup> 服務提供單位每為一名合資格護老者提供支援服務可每月獲 350 元服務費用，所涉及及服務費用約為 1,680 萬元(即 350 元 x 2 000 名護老者 x 24 個月=1,680 萬)。

<sup>7</sup> 以資助每名護老者上限為 1,000 元計算，所涉支出為 200 萬元(即 1,000 元 x 2 000 名護老者)。有關資助會按實報實銷形式發放。

<sup>8</sup> 詳情見附錄二。



下的各項安排，包括適用範疇及申請要求，以制定未來發展路向。就防止濫用方面，上文第 11 段所述的服務指引會包括在發現有濫用、涉及以欺騙手段取得本津貼或懷疑長者受到虐待等情況時的處理機制。

(b) 有意見認為不宜限制參與試驗計劃的護老者不能同時申領長者生活津貼。但亦有意見表示護老者生活津貼和長者生活津貼，兩個現金津貼計劃的本質均為低收入家庭中有需要人士提供生活津貼，減輕該等家庭的經濟壓力，目的相同。在善用公帑的原則下，在試驗計劃下要求護老者不能同時申領該兩項生活津貼，是審慎的做法。

(c) 有意見提出現時未有就服務提供單位需要向護老者提供的支援服務及相關工作作出詳細說明，故此難以評定建議的服務費是否足夠服務提供單位應付相應增加的工作量。另外，處理個案初期的工作量應該相對較大，服務提供單位因而需要投入較多人手和時間去跟進，故建議可考慮增加首月的服務費用以協助服務提供單位處理相關工作。就此，社署會在稍後時間與服務提供單位就工作內容及所需服務費用進行商討（見上文第 11 段）。

## 徵詢意見

16. 請委員就上述建議提供意見，並考慮通過有關建議。

關愛基金秘書處

2014 年 3 月

*(Draft)*  
**立法會**  
*Legislative Council*

附錄一

LC Paper No. CB(2)xxx/13-14

Ref : CB2/PL/WS

**Panel on Welfare Services**

**Minutes of meeting  
held on Monday, 10 February 2014, at 10:45 am  
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC  
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon WONG Yuk-man  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH  
Hon TANG Ka-piu

**Member attending** : Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

**Public Officers :** Item III  
**attending**

Miss SHEA Wing-man  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare  
(Welfare) 1  
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Mr KOK Che-leung  
Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions)  
Social Welfare Department

Miss Ophelia WONG, JP  
Deputy Director/District  
Planning Department

Items III and IV

Miss Annie TAM, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Labour and Welfare  
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Mr LAM Ka-tai  
Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services)  
Social Welfare Department

Item IV

Mrs Elina CHAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare  
(Welfare) 3  
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Miss Cecilla LI  
Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Elderly)  
Social Welfare Department

**Clerk in** : Mr Colin CHUI  
**attendance** : Chief Council Secretary (2) 4

**Staff in** : Ms Catherina YU  
**attendance** : Senior Council Secretary (2) 4

Miss Maggie CHIU  
Legislative Assistant (2) 4

Action

---

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

**IV. Pilot scheme on the provision of living allowance to carers of the elderly from low income families**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)799/13-14(04) to (05)]

At the invitation of the Chairman, Permanent Secretary for Labour and Welfare ("PS(LW)") briefed members on the proposed features of the pilot scheme on living allowance for carers of the elderly persons from low income families ("the Pilot Scheme").

Additional resources for service delivery agents

2. While expressing support for the Pilot Scheme, Mr Gary FAN was concerned that if no additional resources were allocated to service delivery agents (i.e. District Elderly Community Centres ("DECCs") and Neighbourhood Elderly Centres ("NECs")) to cope with the extra workload brought about by the Pilot Scheme, the Pilot Scheme might not be easy to administer to enable an early start. He enquired whether the Administration would include the additional resources required by the service delivery agents in the relevant funding proposal.

3. The Deputy Chairman was wary of the service capacity of the service delivery agents as they would not be given additional manpower for providing support services for carers under the Pilot Scheme. In order not

Action

to overload them, the Administration should limit the number of carers to be served by a DECC or NEC and adjust the services to be provided by the DECC or NEC concerned under the Funding and Service Agreements ("FSAs"). The Administration should also make withdrawal arrangements for the service delivery agents when the scheme had become a regular programme.

4. PS(LW) responded that the Pilot Scheme would be funded by the Community Care Fund ("CCF") and a service fee, on a per-carer basis, might be provided by the Administration through CCF to the service delivery agents for their service so that the arrangements under the Lump Sum Grant Subvention System would not be affected. The Administration would discuss with the service delivery agents the level of service fee.

*(The Deputy Chairman took the chair in the temporary absence of the Chairman.)*

Maintaining the provision of subsidized community care service

5. Dr Fernando CHEUNG criticized that the proposed requirements of the Pilot Scheme were too harsh. The Administration had suggested that if an elderly person was being taken care of by a carer at home, his/her service provider might recommend less personal support services or might not recommend any full-time day care services. Such proposal ran counter to the Administration's objective of enabling the elderly to remain members of the community for as long as possible. In his view, home care services and subsidized community care services should complement each other so that there would not be any service gaps for the needy elderly.

Action

Opining that the Administration lacked the concept of long-term care in designing the Pilot Scheme, he urged the Administration to set afresh the parameters of the Pilot Scheme.

"Double benefit" restriction

6. Mr TANG Ka-piu and Mr Albert HO enquired about the reasons why the recipients of carer allowance could not at the same time receive Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA") or Old Age Living Allowance ("OALA") (hereinafter referred to as "doubled benefit restriction"). The Deputy Chairman said that the "double benefit" restriction would force the carers to give up certain financial assistance.

7. PS(LW) responded that as OALA was a form of financial assistance aiming to supplement the living expenses of eligible needy elderly and was of a similar nature vis-à-vis the carer allowance, recipients of carer allowance should not at the same time receive OALA.

8. Mr TANG Ka-piu worried that, according to the Administration's rationale, recipients of carer allowance might also not be eligible for work incentive transport subsidy ("WITS") and low-income working family allowance ("LIFA"). PS(LW) said that due consideration would be given to the interface of the Pilot Scheme with the proposed LIFA and the WITS Scheme.

9. Mr TANG Ka-piu reiterated his concern that disallowing the needy to receive different kinds of financial assistance at the same time would become a principle of the Administration's financial management.

10. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that it was the Administration's

Action

responsibility to meet the elderly's need for care services and carers had, in effect, alleviated the Administration's burden in this regard. In his view, all carers should be entitled to the allowance and yet the Administration had imposed unfavourable conditions to prevent many carers from benefiting from the Pilot Scheme. The hourly rate of the allowance proposed for carers was even lower than the statutory minimum wage rate, and worse still, recipients of the carer allowance were not allowed to receive CSSA or OALA. He called on the Administration to increase the amount of allowance and do away with the "double benefit" restriction.

11. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that the proposed conditions and eligibility criteria for the Pilot Scheme had made many carers not eligible for the allowance. The parameters should be relaxed when the scheme had become a regular programme. He also suggested that the pilot period should be shortened to one year. Mr TANG Ka-piu suggested that the Administration produce a manual for carers.

*(The Chairman took the chair at this juncture.)*

12. The Chairman said that the "double benefit" restriction was unacceptable and the Pilot Scheme had too many restrictions. If "double benefit" restriction was due to financial constraints, the Government should explore new sources of income by introducing new taxes, such as capital gains tax.

13. PS(LW) responded that an evaluation would be conducted during the two-year pilot period to assess the implications and effectiveness of the Pilot Scheme. As the Pilot Scheme would be launched under CCF, the Administration had proposed to largely follow the prevailing practices in other CCF projects when designing some of the parameters of the Pilot

Action

Scheme. The Administration would review these parameters in the context of the evaluation and consider making changes to the parameters, if necessary, during the two-year pilot period.

Quota of eligible carers

14. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr Albert HO were of the view that the scale of the Pilot Scheme should be expanded to benefit more carers. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung called on the Administration to remove the ceiling on the number of beneficiaries of carer allowance.

15. Mr POON Siu-ping said that the Administration should collect information during the pilot period to facilitate its estimation of the number of carers eligible for the allowance. He suggested that no cap should be imposed on the number of beneficiaries when the scheme was launched after the pilot period.

16. PS(LW) responded that whether changes to the parameters of the Pilot Scheme should be made would depend on the outcome of the review of the Pilot Scheme.

Allowance for carers of persons with disabilities and carers of persons with chronic illness

17. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung expressed concern about the timetable for the provision of allowance to carers of persons with disabilities and carers of persons with chronic illness.

18. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that given the extent of care required by persons with disabilities and persons with chronic illness, their carers were



Action

also under great stress and in need of support. The Administration should not exclude these carers from the Pilot Scheme. The Chairman shared the view that carers of persons with disabilities should also be eligible for the allowance as many persons with disabilities were in great need for carers.

19. PS(LW) responded that the Administration would consider the way forward on the provision of allowance for carers of persons with disabilities and carers of persons with chronic illness having regard to the experience gained from the Pilot Scheme.

20. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that the Administration should commit in principle the provision of allowance for carers of persons with disabilities and carers of persons with chronic illness.

Income assessment

21. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that the allowance was only a small amount of financial supplement for carers from low-income families and would not have any adverse impact on the sense of family obligation or virtual of filial piety. A lenient approach should therefore be adopted in providing the allowance. The Administration should consider relaxing the income limit or removing the income assessment requirement in the long run.

22. PS(LW) responded that unlike some of the carer allowance schemes in other places, the conditions proposed for the Pilot Scheme were more lenient. The Pilot Scheme did not require that a carer must be a family member of the elderly person being taken care of. Neither did the elderly person concerned need to sign and confirm the hours of care-giving. The proposed minimum hours of care-giving under the Pilot Scheme would also

Action

be less than those of similar schemes in the United Kingdom ("UK") and Australia. She further said that many other places including UK, Canada and some states in the United States of America had also adopted a means-test for carer allowance schemes. To enable effective use of limited public resources, the Administration considered that carers under the Pilot Scheme should be subject to income assessment.

Amount of the allowance

23. In response to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's enquiry about the maximum allowance a carer could claim per month, PS(LW) said that the amount of allowance was proposed to be set at \$2,000 per month for each eligible carer. For each of those carers who took care of more than one elderly person at the same time might claim up to \$4,000 per month, subject to the hours of care-giving being no less than 120 hours per month.

24. In response to Mr POON Siu-ping's enquiry about the allowance arrangements for two carers giving care to the same elderly person, PS(LW) said that the Pilot Scheme had not provided for such scenario.

25. Mr POON Siu-ping sought information regarding the Administration's assessment of whether the proposed level of allowance would weaken the sense of family obligation or diminish the virtual of filial piety. PS(LW) responded that according to the information provided by the University of Hong Kong, no study in this regard had been conducted in Asia. She hoped that the experience gained from the Pilot Scheme would enlighten the Administration on this aspect.

Launching a regular scheme on allowance for carers

26. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that instead of launching the scheme

Action

on a pilot basis, the Administration should regularize the scheme and conduct a review two years after its implementation.

27. Mr Albert HO said that the Administration's thinking that providing allowance for carers would weaken the sense of family obligation and diminish the virtual of filial piety was wrong. He considered pilot run for the scheme unnecessary having regard to the extensive discussion in the community on the subject matter. He urged the Administration to implement a carer allowance scheme on a regular basis swiftly.

Verification of hours of care-giving

28. Mr Albert HO said that as many carers were family members of the elderly persons being taken care of and were living with the elderly persons concerned, it did not make sense to require them to keep a record of the number of hours of care-giving. It would also be difficult for the Administration to verify the correctness of such records. He said that as long as the persons were playing the role of carers, they should be eligible for the allowance.

Follow-up action

29. Expressing concern that the number of eligible carers might be far below the targeted number because of the rigid criteria of the Pilot Scheme, Dr Fernando CHEUNG suggested that the Administration should conduct an early review of the Pilot Scheme, say, three months after its implementation. The Panel should then discuss the subject matter again. Echoing that the Panel should follow up the matter, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung requested the Administration to provide a paper incorporating the Administration's response to members' views on the Pilot Scheme to facilitate the Panel's discussion later.

Action

30. PS(LW) responded that the Administration would submit the proposed Pilot Scheme for consideration by the CCF Task Force under the Commission on Poverty ("CoP") in March 2014. Subject to the views of the CCF Task Force, the Administration would put the proposal to CoP for endorsement, with a view to launching the Pilot Scheme by the end of the second quarter of 2014. If the Administration were to come back to the Panel, the implementation schedule might be affected. The Administration would relay members' views to the CCF Task Force.

31. The Chairman said that the efforts of carers gave a positive message of caring for the elderly to the community. She opined that the Administration had included unnecessary restrictions in the Pilot Scheme. She called on the Administration to improve the Pilot Scheme taking into account members' views, and provide the Panel with a copy of the paper on the pilot scheme to be submitted by the CCF Task Force to CoP.

Admin

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
March 2014

## 附錄二

### 關愛基金援助項目 「為低收入家庭護老者提供生活津貼試驗計劃」

#### 預算行政開支詳細分目

分目		預算開支 (萬元)
<b>1.</b>	<b>行政開支 (人手)</b>	
(a)	公務員	313
(b)	非公務員合約員工	82
	<b>行政開支 (其他)</b>	
(c)	宣傳	2
(d)	電腦系統	1
(e)	其他營運開支	2
(f)	備用金	60
	<b>行政開支 (小計)</b> (佔預算津助總額的百分比)	<b>460</b> <b>(3.8%)</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>成效評估研究</b>	140
	<b>1 + 2</b> (佔預算津助總額的百分比)	<b>600</b> <b>(5%)</b>