

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(2)534/10-11(02)

Ref : CB2/PL/WS

Panel on Welfare Services

Background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat for the special meeting on 18 December 2010

Retirement protection for needy elderly

Purpose

This paper summarizes the major concerns raised by the Panel on Welfare Services ("the Panel") and its Subcommittee on Elderly Services on social security assistance and retirement protection for the needy elderly.

Background

2. According to the updated projections released by the Census and Statistics Department in July 2010, the proportion of the population aged 65 and over is projected to rise markedly, from 13% in 2009 to 28% in 2039. The pace of population ageing is projected to be gradual up to around 2019 (when the proportion will reach 17%), then accelerating in the following 10 years (where the proportion will be 25% in 2029), and moderating in the last 10 years of the projection period. The ageing trend is also revealed by the increasing median age of the population, from 40.7 in 2009 to 47.6 in 2039.

3. According to the Administration, the three-pillar model for retirement protection advocated by the World Bank has been adopted in Hong Kong, viz. the Mandatory Provident Funds ("MPF") Scheme, the non-contributory social security system (including the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA") Scheme and the Social Security Allowance Scheme), and voluntary private savings.

Members' major deliberations and concerns

4. The Panel had not discussed the proposal of introducing a universal retirement protection scheme per se. Members gave views on the proposal in the context of discussion on the social security assistance for the needy elderly. Members' major concerns are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

Social security system

5. The Panel had all along been concerned about the financial assistance for the needy elders. Some members pointed out some needy elders were ineligible for applying for CSSA simply because of the requirement for elders to apply for CSSA on a household basis. Under this requirement, elders could not apply for CSSA on an individual basis if their family members declined to make the statement on non-provision of financial support or provide documents to prove that their income was unable to support their parents even though they were living together.

6. Some members considered that although the nature of Old Age Allowance ("OAA") was a token of respect to the senior citizens, this had in effect turned into a form of relief money for those poor elders who lacked family support or retirement protection and who, although being aware of CSSA, had not applied for various reasons. Members had time and again urged the Administration to increase the OAA rates to \$1,000 and relax the permissible limit of absence from Hong Kong to 360 days in a year. The latter would obviate the need for OAA recipients to return to Hong Kong to continue to receive the allowance. The OAA rates had since January 2009 been increased to \$1,000.

7. The Administration advised that the CSSA Scheme provided a safety net of last resort for those who could not support themselves financially. Elderly recipients received a higher standard payment covering their basic needs. In addition, they could also receive special grants and supplements for various items to meet their special needs arising from old age. The self-occupied property of an elderly or a family with an elderly member was also totally disregarded from the CSSA asset test.

8. On the absence limits for OAA, the Panel was briefed at the meeting on 8 November 2010 of the Administration's proposal to reduce the minimum residence requirement from 90 days to 60 days in a payment year. According to the Administration, elderly people could enjoy greater flexibility in taking up residence, travelling or visiting relatives in the

Mainland under the new arrangement. The Administration would seek the approval of the Finance Committee in December 2010, with a view to implementing the new arrangement in February 2011.

Introducing a maintenance allowance

9. In the 2010-2011 Policy Address, the Chief Executive also stated that as the relationship between Hong Kong and Guangdong grew closer and some senior citizens wanted to retire in Guangdong, he had asked the Secretary for Labour and Welfare to study further the feasibility of such arrangements.

10. When the Panel was briefed on the policy initiatives under the 2010-2011 Policy Address, members were advised that the Administration was aware of a proposal suggested in the community for the introduction of a maintenance allowance for elders who chose to retire on the Mainland. The Administration was open-minded on it and would embark on a feasibility study to examine in detail the merit of introducing such a proposal having regard to the legal, financial and technical issues involved. It was expected that the study would be completed in about one year's time.

11. Some members considered that as the community had already made clear the request for introducing a maintenance allowance for elders, they did not see the need for the Administration to carry out a study on the matter. In the absence of a universal retirement protection, they urged the Administration to roll out the implementation details as early as practicable.

Setting up of an Old Age Pension scheme/universal retirement protection scheme

12. At the Panel meeting on 13 June 2005, most members and deputations urged the Administration to re-consider the establishment of a mandatory contributory pay-as-you-go Old Age Pension ("OPS") scheme to provide better retirement protection for all elderly in Hong Kong. At the meeting on 8 June 2006, most members and deputations urged the Administration to set up a universal retirement protection scheme. They pointed out that the MPF Scheme could not benefit the current cohort of older persons, and did not cover people not participating in the workforce, such as housewives. For those with low income, the benefits with MPF were limited even in the longer term.

13. The Administration considered that it was highly doubtful whether the public would support the implementation of a universal retirement protection scheme whereby half of an individual's personal savings under the MPF Scheme would be pooled and re-distributed to the current generation of elders regardless of the means of the elders. It was also questionable whether such a scheme could be sustained in the long run, as seen from some overseas experience, because of the ageing population, lower fertility rate and increasing life expectancy.

14. The Administration pointed out that during the discussion in the mid-1990s over the possibility of setting up an OPS scheme, while some members of the public gave support to the proposal, others considered it unfair because of a lack of relationship between benefits and contributions. Some also claimed that the OPS scheme would shift the burden of old age protection from individual/family to society. There was also concern that the OPS scheme did not target assistance at those in need, involving also a question of inter-generational equity. Against the aforesaid background and given that the MPF Scheme was intended to be one of the two mandatory pillars recommended by the World Bank, and had only been implemented for a short period of time, the Administration considered that the priority in the next few years should be placed on developing the second of the mandatory pillars, i.e. a sustainable safety net for needy elders. The Administration further pointed out that although the World Bank's three-pillar model was used as a framework for providing financial protection to elders in Hong Kong, it would continue to adopt an open mind on any viable options which could be sustainable in the long run.

15. The motion on setting up a universal retirement scheme was negated at the Council meeting on 26 April 2006. Some members took the view that the motion should have been carried if it was a Government's motion as a majority of Members had voted in favour of it. The motion was negated simply because Members returned from the functional constituencies had voted against it. These members were of the view that it was incumbent upon the Administration to pursue the setting up of a universal retirement protection scheme for all elderly, and it was unreasonable for the Administration to insist on a consensus before implementation.

16. Some other members advised that they supported conducting studies to find out ways to provide better retirement protection to all older persons, but would not support the proposal of scrapping the MPF Scheme, which, despite its deficiencies, had been in place for quite some time and could serve its purpose to a certain extent.

17. A motion urging the Administration to, among other things, immediately implement a sustainable universal retirement protection scheme to enable all older persons to get immediate basic financial security was passed at the Panel meeting on 8 June 2006.

18. The Administration was requested to revert to the Panel on how it would provide better retirement protection to the current and future generations of older persons. The Administration advised that in light of the ageing population, it was aware of the need to look into various issues concerning the elderly. The profiles of the future elderly might also change with higher education and changing family pattern. As some of the issues involved considerations of not only welfare policies, such as retirement protection and the right balance between private and public contribution, a co-ordinated response was called for. To assess the financial sustainability of the three pillars of retirement protection, an Expert Panel on Financial Security in Old Age ("Expert Panel") had been formed in July 2004 by the Central Policy Unit ("CPU") to develop a research agenda on financial security in old age. Some research topics such as studies to look into the financial disposition of the current and future generations of the elderly and their retirement plans have been developed. The Expert Panel was expected to come up with initial findings in early 2006. The Government would consider the findings of the study in deciding the future course of action.

19. In response to concerns raised by members on various occasions regarding the progress of the CPU's study, the Administration advised that two studies on "Household Survey on the Financial Disposition and Retirement Planning of Current and Future Generations of Older Persons" and "Sustainability of the Three Pillars of Retirement Protection in Hong Kong" had been conducted as part of the research plan formulated by the Expert Panel appointed by CPU. CPU received the preliminary findings of the first study and the second study in 2007 and 2008 respectively. The Expert Panel would deliberate on the findings of the two studies, and submit a report to the Head of CPU, who would submit his considered views to the Chief Executive in due course.

20. To provide genuine assistance for the elderly in need, members strongly urged the Administration to study the feasibility of introducing a universal retirement protection scheme without further delay. They also urged the Administration to come up with a concrete timetable for publishing the findings of CPU's study on the financial sustainability of the existing three pillars of retirement protection.

Relevant papers

21. A list of relevant papers and documents is in the **Appendix** for members' reference. The papers and documents are available on the LegCo website at <http://www.legco.gov.hk/>.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
10 December 2010

Appendix

Relevant Papers/Documents

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Papers</u>
Panel on Welfare Services	13 June 2005	Administration's paper LC Paper No. CB(2)1828/04-05(03) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/ws/papers/ws0613cb2-1828-3e.pdf Minutes of meeting LC Paper No. CB(2)2203/04-05 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/ws/minutes/ws050613.pdf
	8 June 2006	Administration's paper LC Paper No. CB(2)2248/05-06(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/ws/papers/ws0608cb2-2248-1e.pdf Minutes of meeting LC Paper No. CB(2)3014/05-06 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/ws/minutes/ws060608.pdf
	20 October 2010	Administration's paper LC Paper No. CB(2)23/10-11(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/ws/papers/ws1020cb2-23-1-e.pdf

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Papers</u>
	8 November 2010	Administration's paper LC Paper No. CB(2)180/10-11(01) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr10-11/english/panels/ws/papers/ws1108cb2-180-1-e.pdf

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
10 December 2010