

**Marking Scheme & Suggested Answer**

**(a) Describe two trends of Hong Kong's housing development as reflected in Source A. Support your answer with relevant clues from Source A. (4 marks)**

**Marking Scheme**

- One trend max. 2
- e.g. - Increasing number of people living in government-subsidized housing.  
- Decreasing number of people living in temporary housing.

**Suggested Answer**

The first trend was that more and more people lived in government-subsidized housing. From the Source, the number of people living in subsidized housing was about 450 thousand in 1961 and it surged to approximately 1.8 million in 1972. Apparently, the growth rate of people living in subsidized housing exceeded that of private housing and that of temporary housing.

The second trend was that fewer and fewer people lived in temporary housing. In 1961, the number of people living in temporary housing was more than 1 million, but it decreased to 910 thousand in 1967 and dropped further to 375 thousand in 1972. Clearly, the number of people living in temporary housing decreased continuously and became the lowest among the three types of accommodation in 1971.

**(b) According to Source B, what was the nature of David Trench's administration? (3 marks)**

**Marking Scheme**

One mark for valid nature and two marks for valid explanation

Nature:

- e.g. - Reformist and progressive (Lines such as 'Late in his term of office, he started reforming Hong Kong's labor law' and 'Apart from continuing to build low-cost housing, he greatly fostered the development of tertiary education' show that David Trench was an active reformer in labour, housing, education and other aspects.)

**Suggested Answer**

His administration was reformist and progressive in nature.

From the Source, he ‘approved the eight-hour workday and 48-hour workweek, granted female workers maternity leave, and increased the amount of compensation for industrial injury’. Reforming the labor law, he improved the social welfare policy and showed that his administration was progressive in nature.

From the Source, ‘apart from continuing to build low-cost housing, he greatly fostered the development of tertiary education’ by ‘making primary education compulsory’ and adopting other measures. His administration greatly promoted housing and education development, demonstrating its reformist nature by promoting social progress.

**(c) Do you agree that the 1967 riots led to drastic changes in the governing policies of the Hong Kong government? Explain your answer with reference to Sources A and B, and using your own knowledge. (8 marks)**

### **Marking Scheme**

- L1 Vague answer, ineffective in using both Source and own knowledge. [max. 2]
- L2 Lack in balance, effective in using Source or own knowledge only. [max. 4]
- L3 Sound and balance answer, effective in using both Source and own knowledge. [max. 8]

Drastic changes:

- e.g. - In terms of labor rights, the government used to ignore workers’ rights and there were factories exploiting workers and dismissing them unreasonably. However, after the riots, the government started improving labor rights by regulating the hours of work, granting maternity leave and raising compensation for industrial injury. (Source B)
- After the riots, the government set up the Independent Commission Against Corruption and endeavored to combat corruption. (Own knowledge)

Without drastic changes:

- e.g. - In terms of housing, there was government-subsidized housing before the riots (Source A) and David Trench only continued to build more subsidized housing units after 1967 (Sources A and B).
- In terms of education, David Trench started promoting the development of tertiary education in the early 1960s and further imposed compulsory primary education after the 1967 riots (Source B).
- The government had started absorbing the Chinese elite into the system before the 1967 riots and it only went further after that. (Own knowledge)

**Suggested Answer**

I agree to a small extent.

In terms of labor rights, Source B states that ‘the management exploited the workers and laid off nearly 100 of them without justifiable reasons’ and ‘a strike took place as a result’. Clearly, the government policy at that time did not take into account and protect labor rights.

However, from Source B, the disregard for workers’ rights was a cause of the 1967 riots. For this reason, David Trench started improving labor law by ‘approving the eight-hour workday and 48-hour workweek, granting female workers maternity leave, and increasing the amount of compensation for industrial injury’. Therefore, the 1967 riots changed the government from ignoring to emphasizing labor rights, leading to some changes.

In terms of anti-corruption policy, from my own knowledge, the government’s anti-corruption policy used to be inefficient before 1967. Although an Anti-Corruption Branch was established in 1952, it was not very useful and corruption in the government remained a serious problem.

However, since public discontent with the problem of corruption was a cause of the riots, the Hong Kong government set up the ICAC in 1974 that was accountable directly to the Governor to combat corruption with great determination. Therefore, the riots were the turning point when the anti-corruption policy changed from lenient to strict.

However, no drastic changes were shown in certain aspects.

In terms of housing, from Source A, the government had started building subsidized housing before 1967. In 1961, there were already 450 thousand people living in government-subsidized housing. After the riots, the government kept building more subsidized housing units and there were as many as 2.22 million people living in government-subsidized housing in 1972. Therefore, the government’s housing policy did not change at all and remained to be putting huge efforts to build subsidized housing units.

Source B also states that David Trench ‘continued to build low-cost housing’, showing that he was just following the old policy instead of reforming it. There was continuity rather than drastic change.

---

In terms of education, the government had started education reform before 1967. From Source B, David Trench ‘established the Special Committee on Higher Education and University Grants Committee in 1964 and 1966 respectively’ to promote the development of tertiary education.

After the riots, the government extended the reform to elementary education. The governor ‘announced that he would make primary education compulsory in 1971’ to further promote the generalization of education. Since the government had emphasized the importance of education reform before 1967 and just extended it to elementary education after the riots, there was continuity rather than drastic change in this aspect.

Politically speaking, from my own knowledge, the government had absorbed the Chinese elite into the system before 1967. For example, in 1962, there were three Chinese Executive Councilors and five Chinese Legislative Councilors to help the British rule Hong Kong.

The policy continued after the riots. In 1974, the numbers of Chinese Executive and Legislative Councilors increased to 19 and 23 respectively. Apparently, the government only further absorbed the Chinese elite into the system without making drastic changes to its policy.

In conclusion, there were drastic changes in the government’s labor and anti-corruption policy, but its policies on housing, education and politics remained the same as they used to be before the riots. These policies went further but their directions did not change much. Therefore, I agree with what the question suggests to a small extent only.