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ABSTRACT

The contemporary debate in Papua New Guinea (PNG) over forms of regional autonomy and decentralisation has its roots in the period prior to independence in 1975. At that time, the consultative exercise that led to the development of PNG’s independence constitution revealed much about the way that Papua New Guineans felt about their relationship with government. At a time when questions are still being raised about the most suitable way for this relationship to be structured, it is salutary to consider how the country’s ‘founding fathers’ envisaged it should appear.

> jonathan.ritchie@deakin.edu.au
Debates around decentralisation, provincial government, and regional autonomy have been a dominant part of political discourse in Papua New Guinea (PNG) since before the country attained independence in 1975. Similarly to many other former colonial territories, the arbitrary way in which borders were originally drawn has brought inherited tensions among the many and diverse cultural groups which together form the modern nation of PNG. In fact, with far more languages spoken than in any other nation (greater than 800 at last count), the task of forging a sense of national unity among its people was and continues to be a challenge for PNG’s leaders. In the years before independence, and afterwards, decentralisation has been recognised as one way of meeting this challenge.

The obstacle to a unified state presented by cultural and linguistic diversity continues to be manifest, as people in all parts of the country explore new and different ways of articulating their relationship with the state. In Bougainville, the years of civil war have resulted in an agreed – if still shaky - outcome of autonomy within the boundaries of the Papua New Guinean state; there are continuing attempts at reshaping the relationship through provincial autonomy in places including East New Britain and New Ireland; and in the Highlands, two new provinces, Hela and Jiwaka, will come into being in 2012, nearly four decades after independence. The issues are clearly far from being satisfactorily resolved.1

In the light of all this, it might be of some help in the current policy debate to return to the origins of the establishment of provincial government in Papua New Guinea, at a time when many and varied challenges were facing the nascent nation’s leaders as they worked to manage the transition from colony to independent state. This paper will address the matter of how the idea of provincial government came to be expressed as one of the ways in which the new state was to be constituted, through an examination of the work of the Constitutional Planning Committee and the contributions made by the Papua New Guinean people during 1973, leading to the Committee’s recommendations in its interim reports to the Papua New Guinea House of Assembly in September and November of that year.

**The Constitutional Planning Committee**

In 1972, shortly after successfully forging a governing coalition the then Chief Minister (and, in 2010, Prime Minister) of Papua New Guinea, Michael Somare, announced the establishment of a committee of Members of the House of Assembly, with the task of developing a constitution for the coming self-government and independence of the new nation. The constitution it developed, Somare insisted, was to be ‘home grown’ and consequently the Constitutional Planning Committee, or CPC, was directed to consult widely with the Papua New Guinean people, by conducting visits to every District and inviting submissions from people throughout the Territory. Chief among the matters to be considered by the CPC was the issue of central-regional-local government relations and district administration;2 signalling the importance even then given to the question of how best to bring together into a nation the highly decentralised elements of the country.

From the outset, the CPC did not operate in a policy vacuum. While it had the task of finding a constitution for a self-governing, and later independent, Papua New Guinea, a parallel exercise was going on whereby elements of the Australian administration of the Territory were being transferred to Papua New Guinean control, a process that had been continuing since before the House of Assembly elections earlier that year. The CPC, through its Deputy Chairman and de facto leader, Father John Momis,3 was deeply concerned that its task of developing a constitution through fully consulting with the people would be made redundant by the transfer of powers program, including the vital matter of relations between levels of government.4
At the same time as the CPC was beginning its deliberations and the transfer of powers process was gearing up, the issue of how best these relations were to be articulated was being played out in actuality, in two parts of the Territory with deeply entrenched movements for regional autonomy, on the Gazelle Peninsula in East New Britain and on the island of Bougainville. In the latter case, opposition to the resumption of land by the colonial administration had begun in 1969, and the Napidakoe Navitu movement which had arisen from this unrest talked openly of secession from Papua New Guinea. In the 1972 elections, three members of the movement had been successful and took their seats in the House of Assembly; one of these was the CPC’s de facto chairman, Momis. In early 1973, the Bougainville Special Political Committee (or BSPC) was established, taking over from the Napidakoe Navitu, and with an explicitly pro-autonomy agenda. Again, Momis was influential in the affair.

Similarly, in East New Britain three of the four seats in the 1972 elections were taken by members of the Mataungan Association, including John Kaputin, later to become one of the CPC’s leading lights. While not as avowedly pro-secession as some in the Napidakoe Navitu, the Mataungans were widely considered to be in favour of large-scale devolution of authority from the central administration to the local or regional level. By the time the CPC was established, the Gazelle Peninsula Affairs (Temporary Provisions) Bill had been introduced by Somare to the House of Assembly, which attempted to answer the Mataungans’ concerns as far as was possible, and when it was passed, in September 1972, Somare said that its proposals ‘may indeed set the precedent’ for the future resolution of similar issues.

A further factor that complicated the matter was the establishment during this time of Area Authorities, which comprised representatives from local government councils within each District, as set out in the Local Government (Authorities) Ordinance 1970. These Authorities were slow in being established, however, and the first did not come into being until July 1972, in New Ireland, followed later in the year by Authorities in the Western and Northern Districts. More advisory bodies than organs of representative government, they were not the ‘significant third tier’ that some hoped would address the concerns of people in East New Britain and Bougainville, and neither of these Districts took the opportunity to establish Authorities during their short-lived existence, awaiting instead a more extensive devolution of powers. By the end of June, 1973, thirteen Authorities had been established. The Area Authorities, too, were caught up in the transfer of powers process, thus also adding to the CPC’s concerns.

While these events were unfolding, the CPC concentrated on the issue that the events encapsulated – the articulation of the relationship between levels of government. Under its initial work program, the Committee had hoped to have proposals ready by the middle of February, 1973. However, by December 1972 it had adopted a considerably more far-reaching program of consultation, meaning that this deadline would be impossible to achieve. In this program, it was envisaged that small groups of people would be set up across the Territory, to talk about CPC proposals contained in the series of Discussion Papers prepared by the Committee and its staff, and report on their findings. The decision to do this led to great delays in the CPC’s program but also meant that large numbers of Papua New Guineans had the chance to contribute their thoughts to the constitutional development exercise.

The matter had been listed for preliminary discussion by the Committee in early October 1972, but a more sustained consideration awaited the December meeting. By the time of that meeting, it was confidently expected that the establishment of some form of regional level of government would be imminent. Area Authorities, for all their failings, were being created, bringing together groups of local government councils into bodies that broadly coincided with the Districts; the Gazelle
Peninsula Affairs (Temporary Provisions) Bill had been introduced into the House; and the demands of the Napidakoe Navitu were well-known.

At the meeting, one of the CPC’s staff of consultants and advisors, the Australian political scientist Ted Wolfers, introduced a paper he had prepared for discussion. ‘The most important point’, he began,

is that if we are going to talk about central, regional and local government in Papua New Guinea we should be careful not to start off thinking in terms of the formal legal question … this paper does not say you have to have any particular system of central, regional or local relations or that you must choose among a set of systems. What it says is you must look at what people in different parts of this country want to control … it is asking you about how you want to distribute power in this country.13

There was a government at the national level, he told the Committee, and at the other end there was a system of government at village level that regulated such matters ‘which the central government does not have anything to do with’ – such as pig feasts and marriages. The central government had delegated some powers to the local government councils, and in recent times Area Authorities had been set up, ‘which also get powers from the central government and some from the local government’. The questions the Committee needed to decide, Wolfers continued, were
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A discussion was still necessary over what should constitute the middle-level governments’ powers, and what would continue to be the preserve of the central and local governments. Wolfers reminded members that this did not just involve ‘moving whole powers like the health power or the road power’ but instead ‘there are some roads that are national roads, some that are or will be regional roads and some local roads,’ and so on.\(^{19}\)

At the end of the discussion, it was hardly surprising that the Committee agreed on a strengthened form of regional (or middle) level government. Wolfers and Nigel Oram, a Fellow of the University of Papua New Guinea and ‘long-term resident critic of the Australian administration’,\(^{20}\) were asked to develop proposals which would explore some of the issues involved, and after further consideration by the Committee, a Discussion Paper would be prepared, before being released to Discussion Groups.

By this time, the CPC had accepted a proposal made to it by the Government Liaison Branch of the Chief Minister’s Department that these Groups should be established, comprising ‘councillors, village leaders, church and business groups, public servants, and any other interested bodies or organizations’. The Groups would be asked to discuss and report to the Committee their views on the range of constitutional issues put to them. They would be assisted in their deliberations through the distribution of educational material to public servants, teachers, Mission personnel, ‘and other suitable persons’, who would explain and further the CPC’s work. The Discussion Groups would ‘aim at maximum participation’ with ‘the leader motivating and guiding discussions stimulated by a skilful and varied use of aids and techniques’. Each Group was to appoint ‘its own reporters who will communicate the full range of views expressed at the discussions in writing’ to the CPC.\(^{21}\)

The Groups would be invited to consider the series of Discussion Papers that the Committee developed; the first of these dealt with the question of determining citizenship requirements, while the matter of relations between levels of government formed the second Discussion Paper. Despite many difficulties in coordination and communication, most Discussion Groups were ready to meet by late February 1973.

Wolfers and Oram’s proposals for a middle-level government were developed as requested, and by the end of January 1973 the issue was almost ready to be put to the Groups for consultation. It was proposed that the middle-level government, or as it was expressed in Tok pisin, ‘namel gavman’, was to be the third tier, between the central and local levels. Deferring to the caution felt by some CPC members, they made it clear that ‘conditions in different parts of Papua New Guinea differ greatly … while it was desirable that a framework should be designed for the whole country, individual differences must be recognized’ between the Districts.\(^{22}\) They canvassed the ways that the assembly of the ‘namel gavman’ might be chosen, including direct election, appointment by the central government, indirect election by local government councils, and so on; and looked at what might be the optimal size of such an assembly. The issues of public servants working for the ‘namel gavman’, its ceremonial, political, and functional head, and ways that the ‘namel gavman’ would interact with local government councils, especially regarding taxation, were all examined. This last point was of special interest to those for whom, they noted, ‘one of the main causes of discontent is the need to pay personal tax for which no direct benefit is received’.\(^{23}\)

The Discussion Paper, entitled ‘Relations Between The Central Government and Other Levels of Government’, when finally released was long and detailed, appearing more as an omnibus questionnaire than a concise survey of Discussion Group opinions. Taking up the concerns raised by Wolfers, much of the Paper was devoted to finding out which level of government would be the appropriate provider of a range of functions; but it also asked for responses on broader questions, such as ‘what should be the future of personal tax?’. Elsewhere, the questions sought the people’s
views on the administrative arrangements that would be required if District-level government was established: one, for example, asked ‘should district governments look after the large equipment, trucks and machinery that the council use?’ They were also asked about how they thought district governments should be elected, who should work for them, and what role the existing Department of District Administration should play following the establishment of district governments.

However, to most observers the question of greatest importance was the first: should the system of government at District level be changed? An extended explanation of the issues preceded the question in the Paper, aided by sketches. ‘Long plenti yia i go pinis’ (In days gone by), the Tok Pisin version of the Paper explained, there were three kinds of government in the Territory: the central, personified by the Administrator, the District, in the person of the District Commissioner, and the local, illustrated by the luluai or village constable. Following a ‘bikpela senis long gavman’ (big change in the way of government), the concepts of central, district, and local government were now to be seen in the shape of the House of Assembly, the District Advisory Council, and the Local Government Council, personified by the Cabinet, the District Commissioner (still), and the President of the Local Government Council. In some Districts, the Paper added, Area Authorities had been set up to help the District Commissioner; but ‘insait long sampela distrik’ (in other Districts), this job continued to be done by District Advisory Councils. Then the question was put: should there be a change to this existing system?

The Discussion Groups’ response

By and large, as the CPC noted in its Final Report, the Groups agreed that a change should be made to the system of government at District level. There was some ambiguity concerning this, however. For some Groups, change meant moving away from the existing situation of dependence on the District Administration, and some Districts were better organised and more efficient than others. A vote for change to the system, therefore, did not necessarily imply a desire for district government. In general, the more remote the District, the less likelihood there was that Groups would seek change to the current situation. The effectiveness of District authorities varied according to the strength of communications with Port Moresby: the more tenuous the communication link, the more opportunity for the District to operate as an autonomous fief, and the stronger the likelihood that people in the District would be content with existing arrangements. This was not simply a function of distance from the centre, however. Communication was more difficult in the Southern Highlands or Chimbu, for example, than in East New Britain or New Ireland, although these Districts were further away from Port Moresby. This was reflected in some of the responses from Groups.

An example of this propensity to resist change is demonstrated in the response of the Ialibu Natives Group, from the Southern Highlands, who told the Committee that ‘we will not change ... reason. Because the District Commissioner will be looked after local Government Councils and look after government work at local level’. At Mendi, also in the Southern Highlands, the Vocational Centre Group reacted strongly: 26 Discussion Group members who attended the meeting rejected this idea. They said that if we change the system of government at district level, it is going to be very hard and people might be confused. They said that they do not want changing a lot of things in the Territory. They asked me to write to the Chief Minister not to change the present system of government in Papua New Guinea. 26

Seven out of ten Discussion Groups in Chimbu District felt that the system should not be changed. The corollary was seen most clearly in the Central District, surrounding Port Moresby, where the
proximity of the administrative hub meant that there was very little identification with the District among the Groups: all voted for change.

While most Groups supported change, there was difference about what exactly was wrong. The Eastern Highlands Educated Group recognised that the problem was with the time that decisions took to be communicated to and from Port Moresby (‘Communication channels made easier rather than waiting for the results from House of Assembly’); while in East Sepik, the Saussia Group considered that ‘the present Government of District Administration doesn’t do much to help the village people and other rural areas’. The Wau Group in Morobe District thought that local government councils were not able to carry out development work sufficiently; however, if the matter was placed in ‘the warm hands of the District Governments it will make things much faster’. In the Western District the communication problems were particularly serious, as the Adviser to the East Kiwai No. 3 Group mentioned: ‘the Central Government is far out to reach as for contact and too slow to do what the people in the District wanting to do’. On the other hand, some Groups saw nothing wrong in the way Districts were administered. The Adviser to the Sinei Group (in Papua) dwelt upon this at some length:

The system of government at district level shouldn’t be changed quickly because some areas are rich and some areas are poor. In New Guinea side they have rich country and Papua is a poor country. Not enough money, coffee, cocoa cannot grow properly in some areas. We want to know exactly what is bad about the old system of government properly before we change quickly, it should wait until we know it properly. If we change quickly will the country run properly? If it becomes law where will the money come from to look after all the areas, from the House of Assembly, from the local or District Advisory Council or where, we want to know. If my 8 children get sick and I take them to the hospital how can I do to get treatment, I will pay or not if it becomes law. What will central government bring is will it provide all the areas with money for those areas which have no money. Some areas have good land for growing crops and what about the poor people because they can’t do anything to earn money. If that is so or wanted to change quickly then your people can help them or provide them with money if you change quickly.

The introduction of Area Authorities was an additional complication for some people. The Bewani Group in the West Sepik noted that ‘the fact that there are lots of governments at the moment eg Central, DC, Area Authority, local Government’ was ‘causing a lot of confusion’. In the Eastern Highlands, the Gadsup Group told the Committee that the ‘three types of government in the district confuse us … expressed similar sentiments, telling the Committee that ‘we need one district government to be set up to replace other district governments’.

In many instances the Groups were so challenged by the question that they felt unable to arrive at a consensus. The debate was unresolved in a Group representing villages in the Morehead Sub-District in the Western District:

Councillor Daram said in our meeting that we worked through the Administration and the Central Government for a long while, therefore I taught to change the Government and to form the District Government Assembly. This idea was supported by the Councillor Maio and the village people. They want to have ‘The District Government Assembly’ every where in Papua New Guinea. The Central Government will remain as it is now. A village man named Gima was on opposition side, He said that he doesn’t want to change the system of the Governments. He was supported by six people. He said that there’s no difference in the work of the Government in Papua New Guinea.

At the Catholic Mission at Tari in the Southern Highlands, Sister Maureen Mahon, advising the Catechists Group, wrote that ‘14 of the 20 men present would like to see the system of government changed at the district level. They definitely would like to see the people in their own area to have more say in the government’. However, she continued, ‘six men opposed this strongly. They want
the old form of government with the DC in full charge. In Morobe, the Nabak Discussion Group was divided almost equally:

About 137 people said that it must not be changed. It must stay as it is but some of the things like dividing budget to sub-districts and so on must be changed. About 127 people said that it must be changed, and a new district government must set up.

While not the resounding majority that the CPC claimed, more than sixty per cent of responses supported a change, even if uncertainty remained about what the present system involved and what kind of system should be adopted. But, as Wolfers had pointed out in the December discussions, other factors needed to be considered in working out the move to district government, and the remaining questions put to the Discussion Groups concerned some of these. The logistics of forming governments at the District level provided the material for several questions, as did the matter of public servants who worked for the governments, and the important issue of the new government's relationship with local governments.

The Discussion Paper asked Group members to address these issues directly, and used examples that characterised what this relationship should look like. The examples were especially relevant to people in the Districts, and covered items such as roads, health care, and education, all basic issues. It is doubtful, however, whether this was particularly helpful to the Committee. In the case of responsibility for education, for example, there was no unanimity about where this should rest: many Groups considered that all three levels of government – central, district, and local – should share in the delivery of primary and secondary education. Responsibility for roads, on the other hand, presented a more stratified picture. Most of the Groups considered, for example, that construction and maintenance of large roads and highways (defined in the questionnaire as roads longer than one hundred miles, and including the 'Highlands Highway' that linked regional centres such as Kainantu and Mt Hagen with the port of Lae) should be the responsibility of the central government, perhaps working with the district government as well; although the Cape Rodney Group (Central District) expressed their view that 'all levels input; local, district & central should pay; district & central should maintain'.

A similar approach was seen in views on health services. Most considered that the larger the institution, the higher up in the organisation it should belong: thus, the general hospitals situated in large towns were considered to be the responsibility of central and sometimes district governments, while rural health centres and aid posts, dispensing medicines and primary health care, should belong to district and local governments (although, as might be expected, there were exceptions, with some Groups in Chimbu District expressing the view that the central government should also have a say in the administration of aid posts). The other area of responsibility had to do with support for farming (including veterinary and agricultural science) and here a similarly mixed picture presented itself, with the more sophisticated services being seen as the responsibility of the central and district governments (an exception being the Chuave Group, which felt that veterinarians should belong to the local government).

When it came to a consideration of how district governments might be selected, led, and supported, there was not much less disagreement. Most Groups favoured elections of members by all eligible voters in the District, rather than election by Local Government Council members, or appointment by the Central Government. As the members of one Eastern Highlands Group put it, ‘the people in district must elect some one who has good knowledge of running the district’. But many Groups preferred the second or third options. At Kanggri, the Discussion Group members pondered this matter for some time:
All the members in our group discussion were all present. For this question it took one full hour to find out from the three ways to be elected from. This have given a very long discussion to find out. In fact all members come with the conclusion of decision. And that was given to the second way. LOCAL GOVERNMENT COUNCILS, all agreed. Groups also varied on how leaders of district governments should be chosen. Most thought that the members of the District assembly should choose the leader, but a substantial number considered that the leader of the district government should be a public servant, similar in many ways to the District Commissioners (the Group from Kandrian in West New Britain put the question to the vote, with the majority choosing the first method, but nine members opting for the second). Some also wanted the House of Assembly to make the decision, as the best way to ensure that local rivalries were disregarded. The majority of Groups felt that district governments should be supported by their own public servants, and should also be able to employ other staff themselves.

Questions on taxation – who should collect it and what should be done with its proceeds – revealed the Groups’ understanding of a wider polity than their own area. Most were happy to continue paying some form of tax, but there was a degree of disagreement over what should be done with the money raised. One Group agreed that taxation should continue, but that it ‘has to be spend on local level. In order to encourage the tax payers to pay the tax joyfully’ Others agreed, but a substantial number of Groups favoured at least some sharing of the revenue from taxation, although this was usually envisaged only among neighbouring areas. The Kakuma Group explained that ‘Councillors from each Sub-District [should] help each other with the tax money that they collect’ revealing a perception of the state that extended only to the District.

Overall, many Groups found the questions and the process of consultation extremely demanding. One Group, from Nipa in the Southern Highlands, wrote in response to questions concerning the composition of the levels of government and taxation issues simply that they were ‘difficult to answer’ while the people attending the Kamano No. 1 meeting thought that there were ‘too many questions on the one paper and many people lost interest and fell asleep.’ The complexity of the task was reflected in the comments made by the Adviser to the Watabung Group:

According to the reactions of the Group the reporter, president and the adviser felted that the paper is too long, and some of the questions are too vague. They are referring to the question one. 2. The Group commented that these sort of things should be carried out by the councillors in their wards with the help of the CPC and its officers in the district. This is because we come to one place and talked too much and wasted time.

Despite this, and several similar assessments, enthusiasm for the exercise remained high, and the Discussion Group reports were seen reinforcing the CPC’s views on district government.

Between May and September 1973 the CPC embarked on a wide-ranging tour of the country, in which every Sub-District was visited and a series of public meetings were held, to gauge people’s views on this and other subjects. Based on the feedback received from this exercise, the reports of Discussion Groups, as well as many submissions from individuals and groups, the Committee felt justified in making recommendations in favour of district government when it tabled its First and Second Interim Reports in the House of Assembly on 27 September and 27 November 1973.

In summary, then, it is always salutary to return to the documentary evidence when considering current issues and challenges, and any contemplation of the case of provincial government in Papua New Guinea can be enlightened by a study of what was said, thought, and done when the issues were still alive and new, in the years before independence. This study demonstrates the
important role played by personalities within the Constitutional Planning Committee, and the ways that Papua New Guineans interpreted some of the conceptual, and practical, considerations associated with the matter.

There is little doubt that the origins of today’s provincial governments owe much to the separatist activities in Bougainville and East New Britain, as the Mataungans and the BSPC reinforced the importance of decentralisation as a way of maintaining Papua New Guinea's unity. Responding solely to these demands, however, would have been contrary to the search for consensus that was characteristic of Somare and the CPC. By allowing the people the opportunity to share in the decision, they helped to guarantee support for the institution of district governments in coming years.
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