Hong Kong's Housing Policy
A Case Study in Social Justice

Betty Yung

香港大學出版社
Hong Kong University Press

Hong Kong University Press
14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong

Hardback ISBN 978-962-209-904-3
Paperback ISBN 978-962-209-905-0

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Secure On-line Ordering
http://www.hkupress.org

Printed and bound by Liang Yu Printing Factory Ltd., Hong Kong, China.

Hong Kong University Press is honoured that Xu Bing, whose art explores the complex themes of language across cultures, has written the Press's name in his Square Word Calligraphy. This signals our commitment to cross-cultural thinking and the distinctive nature of our English-language books published in China.

"At first glance, Square Word Calligraphy appears to be nothing more unusual than Chinese characters, but in fact it is a new way of rendering English words in the format of a square so they resemble Chinese characters. Chinese viewers expect to be able to read Square Word Calligraphy but cannot. Western viewers, however are surprised to find they can read it. Delight erupts when meaning is unexpectedly revealed."

— Britta Erickson, *The Art of Xu Bing*

Contents

1

Philosophy, Justice and Hong Kong Housing Policy

We often talk about the question of justice in its different aspects, yet we use the term with only a vague concept of its meaning. When asked to define "justice", we may struggle to do so. Of course, "what is justice" is a complex philosophical question, one without a clear answer: for centuries philosophers have debated it without reaching a consensus. Insoluble for philosophers, such a question is difficult for common people to answer, too. Yet we all have enough of a general idea of what justice is to be able to discuss the term in our daily lives. An examination and analysis of the concept seem constructive and important, enabling us to lead a more enlightened life.

Whenever confronted with injustices, we may think that something is wrong, feel angry and frustrated, and believe that the situation should be rectified. The question of social justice occurs whenever there is a clash over limited resources. Exactly how to distribute limited resources is an issue we all face in our everyday lives: whether as a mother distributing one cake among several children, or a boss awarding bonuses to his/her staff. Just as individuals confront the problem of justice every day, a government, through its policy-making, must distribute resources among different groups in society. For example, it must resolve whether free education should be available to all or only limited to the needy, and it must determine whether housing subsidies should be made accessible to potential home-owners. Thus, the discussion of social justice is highly relevant to public policy studies. Public policy injustices are of critical importance; sometimes they can result in life-and-death situations, for example, when insufficient public resources are allocated to take care of those with long-term illness. Such injustices can also create serious and widespread misery, as in the cross-generational poverty that results from the lack of social security for the worse-off. Thus, justice in public

policy remains an issue of enormous importance, not just to all policy-makers and academics, but also to all citizens, as it directly affects their interests.

Housing policy involves the distribution of housing resources among different groups of stakeholders, from waitlist households to public tenants and home-owners. Because the lack of housing resources creates other problems (diseases, limited access to job opportunities, and crime), a just distribution of housing resources should be of prime concern to policy-makers and citizens alike.

Justice plays, or should play, an important role in formulating housing policy, or indeed, all public policy. Any policy that does not take justice into consideration may be criticized as a bad policy. This book will investigate justice in public and housing policy in general, and justice in Hong Kong housing policy in particular. During my research, I found that although public and housing policy issues were well researched by many academics, justice in public and housing policy was a greatly neglected topic. This is quite surprising, given that the issue affects every member of society to a significant extent. This omission may reflect the rigid compartmentalization of knowledge into different disciplines, which are taught and researched by academics from different faculties. Philosophy is essentially an arts subject, whereas policy and housing studies are classed with the social sciences. Since cross-faculty research collaboration is rare (though such studies have increased in recent years), the question of justice in public and housing policy is quite neglected as a research topic, despite its importance to all aspects of society. This book is an attempt to bridge this gap. It is largely an application of social philosophy to policy and housing studies, employing the art of philosophizing to social science empirical research. I hope this book may throw light on the much neglected philosophical debates on housing issues, contributing both to the philosophical discussion on justice and the empirical study of housing policy.

In recent years, there has been a global trend toward privatizing public services. Governments have also promoted home ownership as an explicit housing strategy. These trends have significant impacts on the distribution of resources within a society, making the question of justice highly relevant. The time is ripe to ask whether these trends result in a just distribution in society and if not, how can we improve public policy?

Housing policy is an important public policy in Hong Kong: the government intervenes on a scale unparalleled in any other country,

except Singapore. About half of Hong Kong's population lives in public housing, either rented or self-owned. Thus, Hong Kong's housing policy will definitely serve as an interesting case for the investigation of justice in housing policy, since the question of housing subsidy distribution looms large in view of the fact that a considerable proportion of people in Hong Kong receive housing support from the government. While many studies of Hong Kong's public housing sector exists, very little has been written about how the question of justice influences housing policy. This book will endeavour to fill this gap. The problem is made more complex because Hong Kong was essentially a Chinese society ruled by the British before the transfer of sovereignty to China in 1997. It was, and is, fundamentally a place where East meets West. It therefore serves as a favourable testing ground for a hybrid of Eastern and Western concepts of justice. Examining justice in Hong Kong's housing policy study may incorporate this interesting dimension of occidental-oriental cultural integration, enriching the discussion of equity in the housing arena.

Before any fruitful discussion of Hong Kong's housing sector, it will be worthwhile to establish some background information about Hong Kong.

Background

Hong Kong is a city on the south-eastern coast of China, with an area of about 1,096 km^2 and a population of 6,708,389 in 2001[1]. Hong Kong's population is very homogeneous, with 98% Chinese in origin. Before 1997, Hong Kong was a British colony. China resumes the sovereignty of Hong Kong on 1 July 1997. Since then, Hong Kong has been a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

The immediate post-war years saw the greatest exodus of immigrants from China to Hong Kong. This influx reached its height in 1949 when the Communists took over China. The population rose nearly 400% from an estimated 600,000 in 1945 to an estimated 2,360,000 in 1950 (Hopkins 1969, p. 2; Hopkins 1972, p. 200). Since that peak, there has been continuous small-scale immigration from China (Hopkins 1972, p. 201). From 1950 onwards, natural increase has replaced immigration as the predominant source of population growth, though net migration is still considerable (Chan 1989, p. 15). Between 1951 and 1961, natural increase contributed 63% of the population growth (Chan 1989, p. 15).

Politically, the whole of Hong Kong became a British colony by stages in the nineteenth century, according to three treaties concluded between the British government and the Chinese government at that time:

1. the Treaty of Nanking, signed in 1842 under which Hong Kong Island was ceded in perpetuity;
2. the Convention of Peking in 1860, under which southern Kowloon peninsula and Stonecutters Island were ceded in perpetuity;
3. the Convention of Peking in 1898 under which the New Territories were leased to Britain for 99 years from 1 July 1898 (Ngan 1989, p. 92).

The head of Hong Kong's colonial government was the governor, who was not elected. Instead, he[2] was appointed by the British monarch, after being chosen by the secretary of state for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs (Ngan 1989). The governor of Hong Kong was directly responsible to the British Crown, not to the people of Hong Kong, who neither had the power to remove him nor had the right to exercise a vote of no-confidence over him (Ngan 1989). The governor was responsible for Hong Kong's internal affairs only, while Hong Kong's foreign relations and defence were in the hands of the British Government (Ngan 1989.)

For more than a hundred and forty years, there were few significant changes in Hong Kong's system of government. All members of the Executive and the Legislative Councils — the centre of governmental authority — were appointed upon the nomination of the Hong Kong governor. Power was concentrated with the governor himself. Elections were not held until 1985, when 24 unofficial members were elected to the Legislative Council. However, the election was not by universal suffrage, but through functional constituencies and by an electoral college (Ngan 1989, pp. 90–91). It was not until 1991 that there were directly elected seats in the Legislative Council. However, the directly elected seats in the Legislative Council only accounted for 18 out of a total of 60 seats in 1991 (Miners 1991, pp. 27–28).

From 1 July 1997, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China, enjoying a high degree of autonomy under the "One Country, Two Systems" arrangement. The life-style, social and economic system of Hong Kong were to remain unchanged until 2047, 50 years after the transfer of sovereignty. The head of the Hong Kong SAR is now called the Chief Executive. S/he is not elected by universal suffrage, but is appointed by the Chinese Central People's Government

on the basis of a "small-circle" local election by an 800-member Selection Committee (Ngan 1989, p. 92; Miners 1991, pp. 23, 81).

In economic terms, Hong Kong has been primarily an entrepôt, facilitating trade between China and the West. Entrepôt trade thrived after 1949 (when the Communist took over China) to the early 1950s as Hong Kong became China's only window to the non-socialist world. However, in 1951, when China entered the Korean conflict, the United Nations, and the United States in particular, imposed an embargo on trade between China and the Western world. Entrepôt trade (which largely involved re-exports to/from China) in Hong Kong, thus, ground to a halt as a result of the embargo that limited the flow of goods to and from China, thereby largely reducing the passing of such goods through Hong Kong (Chau 1993, p. 1; Smart 1992, p. 17). In the early 1950s, a large inflow of immigrants from China brought capital, labour and entrepreneurship. Hong Kong began focusing on export-oriented industrialization. The expanding manufacturing sector was the main engine of Hong Kong's economy throughout the 1950s and 1960s. The manufacturing labour force accounted for an estimated 36% of the working population in 1954. This share continued to grow until it peaked in 1971, when it represented about half of the working population. In that same year, the manufacturing sector contributed about 30% to Hong Kong's GDP. From 1980 onwards, more and more factories began relocating northward to China's Guangdong province, decreasing the importance of the secondary sector in Hong Kong (Chau 1993, p. 6) By 1987, manufacturing employment began declining.

With the relocation of manufacturing industries out of Hong Kong to China, Hong Kong's service industries took ascendancy. The finance and business sectors expanded rapidly throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Its proportion in the city's employment quadrupled over this period (Chau 1993, p. 6). The adoption of the open-door policy by China in 1978 stimulated economic growth in Hong Kong and entrepôt trade has become apparent to be a major activity again. In the 1980s, re-exports grew annually at a rate of 20% or more, most accounted for by trade with China (Chau 1993, pp. 20–21).

Hong Kong experienced economic growth from the post-war period through mid-1990s, changing from an entrepôt to primarily service-based financial centre. In the twenty years between 1961 and 1981, economic growth was more accelerated in Hong Kong than in any other Asian country, surpassing that of Western industrialized countries (Chau 1993). Despite a slowdown in the 1980s because of political uncertainties, the

increase in GDP still averaged more than 6% per year (Chau 1993). The rate of inflation was low, averaging less than 5% a year from 1961 until 1980, except in 1973–74 and 1979–81 because of oil crises (Chau 1993). Per capita income in Hong Kong doubled every 12 years and quadrupled in one generation during the same period (Chau 1993).

This successful story of the Hong Kong economy ended in late 1997 when the Asian Economic Crisis struck. The property market collapsed, and the economy entered a period of recession which persisted until 2004. The economy was plagued by deflation and a high unemployment rate, which reached 7.8% in mid-2002, whereas from the 1950s until the early 1990s, the unemployment rate had been negligible.

With this brief overview of Hong Kong's history complete, we will concentrate our attention on Hong Kong's housing policy; it will serve as a background for the discussion of justice in Hong Kong's housing policy in the latter part of the book.

Historical Development of Hong Kong Housing Policy

Pre-1954

Before massive government intervention in 1954, the colonial authorities mainly adopted a laissez-faire housing policy (Fong and Yeh 1987, p. 18; Fong 1986, p. 4; Kwitko 1986). Before World War II, Hong Kong's population remained small and mobile. However the post-war era saw a great wave of immigrants from China, resulting in overcrowded private tenements and widespread squatting (Chau 1989, p. 28; Hopkins 1971, p. 276). There was still no alternation to the laissez-faire housing policy on the part of the government, since it believed that once the political situation normalized in due course, the immigrants would return to China (Hopkins 1969, p. 2; Keung 1981, p. 5), thereby solving the housing problem as a consequence.

Though the government did not intervene to provide housing directly to the populace, it gave assistance by setting up agencies which directly provided housing. In 1951, the colonial authorities established Hong Kong Housing Society to provide housing to lower-middle and middle-income families. Also, the Hong Kong Settlers' Housing Corporation, partly financed by the government, was set up in 1952 (Fong 1986, p. 5; Fong and Yeh 1987, p. 19). The government also intervened slightly in 1951, through the establishment of certain "approved area" and

"tolerated areas" for squatters to build their cottages and huts (Fong 1986, p. 5; Fong and Yeh 1987, p. 19). However, these designated areas only resettled one-tenth of the total squatters by the end of 1953 because of the small scale of such intervention (Hopkins 1969, p. 2).

On the whole, the government mainly adopted a laissez-faire approach to housing before 1954. This approach was sufficient before the post-World War II period. Yet it became increasingly problematic after 1945, with the great influx of refugees from China which necessitated actions, though limited and indirect, on the part of the government, especially in the early 1950s.

1954–1972

The Shek Kip Mei squatter fire in 1953 made 53,000 people homeless (Fong 1986, p. 16; Fong and Yeh 1987, p. 19; Chan 1999, p. 177). The government responded by providing homes for the fire victims in resettlement blocks. According to the Commissioner for Resettlement, it was more efficient to resettle the fire victims in resettlement blocks than paying them direct relief subsidy (Drakakis-Smith 1979, p. 44). This started off the whole resettlement policy, with the setting up of the Resettlement Department in 1954. One of the main aims of resettling the squatter was to free land for economic development (Hopkin 1969, pp. 2–3). Thus, only squatters occupying land needed for development were resettled, while those occupying land with little developmental value were neglected (Dwyer 1970, p. 610; Hopkins 1971, p. 293; Hopkins 1969, p. 8; Chan 1999, p. 178). When a piece of land was required for development, all squatters occupying the land were resettled without a means test (Dwyer 1971, p. 46; Dwyer 1970, pp. 610, 612; Wong and Liu 1988, p. 2) in order to facilitate the taking over of the land.

The resettled ex-squatters did not live in comfort in the resettlement estates. Each adult was allocated 2.2 m^2, while children under ten were only allocated half that area. All washing and toilet facilities were communal in order to reduce cost, with no kitchen facilities provided (Fong 1986, p. 6). Thus, there were problems of overcrowding as well as poor management and maintenance on the resettlement estates.

Government intervention in this period mainly focused on squatter resettlement, neglecting the housing plight of those living in private tenements (Keung 1981, p. 6), which were often even worse than those living in squatter areas (Drakakis-Smith 1972, p. 158; Drakakis-Smith 1970, p. 115; Hopkins 1972, p. 204; Golger 1972, p. 33). This may be

explained by the fact that the slums in private tenements were less visible, while squatter areas, posed a more obvious blot.

In 1961, at last, the government provided public housing with the explicit objective of serving the poor in the form of introducing the Government Low Cost Housing Programme. However, this housing programme was extremely small when compared to the resettlement programme (Hopkins 1972, p. 204).

The government direct intervention into the housing arena was triggered by a fire disaster, and was sustained by the need to reclaim land for development. Despite such great governmental efforts, the housing plight of the people in Hong Kong remained serious in this period.

1973–1986

In 1972, the new Governor, Sir Murray MacLehose, launched the Ten-Year Housing Programme to tackle the slum and squatter problem, as well as the housing plight in resettlement estates. The target was to re-house 1.8 million people in permanent, self-contained public rental housing with good facilities and a clean environment; the project was scheduled for completion within ten years. The Housing Authority was set up in 1973 to be responsible for the policy formulation for this programme (Fong 1986, p. 12; Fong and Yeh 1987, p. 22). In 1976, the Ten-Year Housing Programme was expanded to include the Home-Ownership Scheme, which sold public housing units at a discount price to lower-middle and middle income families (Fong and Yeh 1987, p. 22)

In 1980, the government announced the failure of the Ten-Year Housing Programme. Between 1973 and 1981, it had achieved less than 40% of its intended target (Chan 1999, p. 179). This failure was due to the recession resulting from the oil crisis and the continual inflow of immigrants from China (Hong Kong Government 1981[3]; Fong and Yeh 1987, p. 23). Public rental housing after 1973 was allocated to two categories of household. The first was made up of households on the waiting list, whose income fell below a certain income limit, and who did not own any housing. The second was made up of those re-housed after catastrophes (such as fires), squatter clearance, or urban renewal. Families in the latter category were not required to undergo means-testing (Yeh 1990, p. 447; Li and Yu 1990, p. 108; Lau 1997, p. 100). During this period, once a tenant was granted a public housing unit, lifelong tenure was guaranteed, regardless of the income increase of his/her household (Li and Yu 1990, p. 110) In addition, the right of tenure was

hereditary, even though the next generation might be very well-off (Hong Kong Housing Authority 1984, p. 1; Li and Yu 1990, p. 110).

This period saw a great attempt, on the part of the government, to relocate people into adequate quarters. Yet, the efforts failed in the view of unpredictable and changing circumstances, despite being ambitious and well-intended.

1987–2002

The Long-Term Housing Strategy was promulgated in 1987. It relied mainly on the private sector to satisfy housing demand (Chan 1991, p. 181). The promotion of home-ownership was adopted as an overt aim of housing policy. The 1998 White Paper on Long-Term Housing might be fairly described as a continuation of its 1987 predecessor: home-ownership remained a target of governmental policy. The government provided various measures to achieve this aim. It introduced the Home Purchase Loan Scheme in 1988, the Sandwich Class Housing Loan Scheme in 1993, the Sandwich Class Housing Scheme in 1994 and the Home Starter Loan Scheme in 1998. The Tenant Purchase Scheme had the effect of extending subsidized home-ownership to grass-root levels, even though usually only the comparatively better-off sitting public housing tenants could afford to buy.

Another aspect of housing policy in this period was the rational allocation of public rental housing resources. The "rich-household policy", introduced in 1992 (which was subsequently slightly revised) required well-off public rental households to pay higher rents or even to vacate their flats (Lau 2002, p. 71). From 1998 onwards, the government required both income and asset means-testing for *all* public housing applicants, whereas before 1998, households re-housed due to clearance, compassionate or emergency grounds were not required to undergo means-testing. In addition, the inheritance of public housing tenancy by the next generation without means-testing was cancelled in 1998.

In short, there were mainly two trends of development of housing policy from 1987 to 2002. The first was the promotion of home-ownership, and the second was the more rational use of public rental housing resources.

2002 onwards[4]

The property market collapsed after the Asian Economic Crisis in late

1997. Housing prices decreased drastically and negative equity became widespread. In 2002, the government responded by introducing what were unofficially known as "Suen-Nine Measures", which saw the government reduce its intervention within Hong Kong's housing market. The main change was abandoning the promotion of home-ownership as a policy goal. The main focus of housing policy would be to provide subsidized rental housing to the needy. The government stopped all scheduled land auctions, and the supply of new land would only be triggered from the Application List. The production and sale of Home-Ownership Scheme flats would cease, (except for a small number of unsold flats). The Tenant Purchase Scheme was abandoned. However, the Housing Authority still provided Home Assistance Loans to eligible families to buy private property. All these measures were aimed at stabilizing and boosting the property market. Some excess Home-Ownership Scheme flats were changed into public rental housing. These moves reduced the waiting time of public rental housing to just under three years in 2002.

Thus, as the 21st century began, the government becomes less interventionist within the housing arena, as compared to two decades ago. Yet with its massive provision of public rental housing, though, it remains intrusive by world standards.

Book Synopsis

This book will attempt to answer the following research questions:

1) What is social justice?
2) What is justice in public policy?
3) What is a just housing policy?
4) Is and was Hong Kong housing policy just?
5) What are the stakeholders' views on justice in Hong Kong housing policy?
6) What should be the role of justice in public policy?

Various research methods will be used to answer these questions. For example, philosophical analysis will be used to answer question 1 ("What is social justice?"), while I will draw on policy analysis to examine justice in Hong Kong's housing policy, and use qualitative interviewing techniques to find out the common people's idea of justice. The whole

research is mainly founded upon the philosophical reasoning on the concept of "social justice" in an attempt to define it. The conclusions of such philosophical analysis are applied to build up theories and suggestion concerning just public policies and a just housing policy. The policy analysis (focused primarily on the development of justice in Hong Kong housing policy), will also hinge on the philosophical clarification of the concept of "social justice" in this book's early chapters. The social science research method of conducting qualitative in-depth interviews will be used to collect Hong Kong residents' definitions of social justice. One should distinguish between what social justice *ought to be* and what it *is considered* to be by the common people. The former is should be logically consistent, while the latter is collected by empirical methods, and may be not just inconsistent but even contradictory at times. (In an ideal world, of course, human beings would be rational and consistent in their thinking.) Data collected from in-depth interviews may or may not coincide with earlier philosophical conclusions; one of the main aims of my research was to pinpoint the degree of overlap between the philosophers' abstract world and the world as experienced by Hong Kong's residents. In this way, we may understand how far the actual world fits with, or deviates, from the theoretical world. I hope the art of philosophizing, in concert with empirical social science research methods, will bring about new enlightenments.

Chapter Outline

In order to examine justice in public policy, we should first analyze the controversial concept of social justice. Chapter 2 will treat this issue. I will examine theories of justice from the ancient (Aristotle) to the contemporary (Young and Fraser). There will be an evaluation of needs-based, rights-based and deserts-based theories of justice. The relation between equal opportunity and social justice will be discussed. Chapter 2 will conclude with a comparison between Western and Chinese concepts of justice, paving the way for an examination of justice in Hong Kong's housing policy, which involves the blending Eastern and Western cultures.

The philosophical conclusions on the concept of social justice in Chapter 2 will be applied to the discussion of public policy in Chapter 3. There are three main types of public policy: the economic, social and political. We will examine relations between social justice and these three public policy types. Privatization has been a trend in public policy. In Chapter 3, there will be an investigation of whether privatization is just

or not. Chapter 3 will end with an evaluation of the implications of Confucian concept of justice on public policy.

The aim of Chapter 4 is to examine what a just housing policy is. We will investigate the relation between the private housing market and social justice, followed by an examination of the relation between housing need and justice. Government promotion of home-ownership has become an international trend. Chapter 4 will examine whether it is just to promote home-ownership. Moreover, there will be a discussion on a just tax policy on housing. This chapter will end with by discussing how the Confucian concept of justice applies to the public housing sector.

In Chapter 5, I will discuss the chronological development of justice in Hong Kong's housing policy. Generally, the historical development of justice in Hong Kong housing policy can be divided into five periods, with different concepts of justice playing a dominant role during each period. I will further examine the interplay between Western and Chinese concepts of justice in Hong Kong housing's policy.

Chapter 6 is an account of the analysis of in-depth interviews. I will examine different views of housing justice, on the part of different stakeholders in Hong Kong's housing policy. Roughly, I have separated these into five distinct groups: representatives or members of institutions (including government officials and property developers); private renters; public housing tenants; private home-owners; and people who achieved home-ownership through government assistance. We will examine whether people holding similar stakes agree with one another on housing justice, and learn whether they believe that government housing policy has been just or unjust towards them.

Chapter 7 is the conclusion, which will discuss the philosophical implications of the interviews. Hong Kong's housing policy was and is not purely just; it requires that compromises be made with other policy objectives, such as efficiency, public acceptance, low administrative cost etc. As with housing policies outside of Hong Kong, a purely just housing policy does not and never did exist. We will close the book by discussing the question of what role justice should play in public policy.

Notes

1. Philosophy, Justice and Hong Kong Housing Policy

1 This information was provided by the Census and Statistics Department of the Hong Kong government.
2 "He" is used here since all governors of Hong Kong were male.
3 This document was obtained from the website www.cityu.edu.hk/hkhousing/.
4 Information in this section was provided in a speech made by the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands to the Legislative Council on 13 November, 2002.

2. Social Justice — An Intricate Concept

1 'He' instead of 's/he' is used here, following Hume's original text.
2 The equality principle here is a part of the just principle of rights as defined in Miller's earlier book: the citizens enjoy equal rights as an equal member of the society.
3 Freedom to select a particular life may be regarded as the opportunity to live a particular life.
4 The four principles of justice are: to each according to his/her needs, rights and deserts and equal opportunity to all.

3. Social Justice in Public Policy

1 One should take note that to date there has not been 'true' or 'pure' form of socialism implemented, though not from the point of view of the so-called "socialist" government.
2 These are meant only to be rough guidelines. One should take note that there may be difficulties in assessing what a minimum income should actually cover in the implementation of the policy in reality.
3 A regressive tax system taxes those with lower income at higher rate than those with higher income.

4 A progressive tax system taxes those with higher income at higher rates than those with lower income.
5 Translated by Roger T. Ames and Henry Rosemont; quoted by Joseph Chan (2003), p. 237.

5. Justice in Hong Kong's housing Policy — A Historical Perspective

1 The style of government remains very much the same after the transfer of sovereignty to China under "One Country, Two Systems" as stipulated in the Basic Law, which has been the Constitution of Hong Kong since 1997.
2 When the situation in China worsened, people moved into Hong Kong. When the situation in China "normalized", people returned to China.
3 This document was obtained from the website www.cityu.edu.hk/hkhousing/.
4 Under the Private Sector Participation Scheme, sites were sold to developers on the condition that the flats developed on these sites had to be sold to buyers nominated by the Housing Authority. The income limit for Home Ownership Scheme and Private Sector Participation Scheme were the same.
5 This document was obtained from the website www.cityu.edu.hk/hkhousing/.
6 This speech can be found on the website www.cityu.edu.hk/hkhousing/.
7 In 1981, the waiting list for public rental housing consisted of 160,000 households, with a waiting time of about seven years.
8 These documents were obtained from the website www.cityu.hk/hkhousing/.
9 This was obtained from the website www.cityu.hk/hkhousing/.
10 Only until 2000 was the Mandatory Provident Fund (a compulsory individual saving scheme for retirement, with 5% [of income] contribution from the employee and 5% contribution from the employer) established. However, it is still not very effective in solving the retirement problem of the general public.
11 This was obtained from the website www.cityu.hk/hkhousing/.
12 The corporate income tax rate in Hong Kong was about 15%–16.5%.
13 This information was provided by the Housing Authority in October, 2002.
14 The name of this government official was deliberately changed to protect his anonymity. The interview was conducted in Cantonese.
15 This information was provided in the speech of the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands to the Legislative Council on 13 November 2002.
16 The Home Assistance Loan Scheme was abandoned in 2004 to relieve the budget deficit.

6. Justice Conceived by the Hong Kong Community

1 The names of the interviewees in this book were deliberately changed to protect their anonymity.
2 Please refer to the section "Marxian Conception of Justice as a By-product (2002 onwards) — Policy Responses to the Asian Economic Crisis" of Chapter 5.
3 Comprehensive Social Security Assistance is a social security safety net in Hong Kong.
4 Another son has moved and lived in a Home-Ownership Scheme flat.
5 A bigger number means there are more people before you on the waiting list.
6 HOS stands for Home-Ownership Scheme.
7 PSPS stands for Private Sector Participation Scheme.
8 NGO stands for non-government organization.
9 HOS stands for Home-Ownership Scheme.

Index