

**A SUBMISSION TO THE AUSTRALIAN
GOVERNMENT**

**FOR RECOGNITION UNDER THE AUSTRALIAN HONOURS
AND AWARDS SYSTEM FOR SERVICE TO THEIR
COUNTRY IN PEACEKEEPING AND WARLIKE
CONDITIONS OF AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC SERVANTS
KNOWN GENERALLY AS PATROL OFFICERS (or locally as
KIAPS) IN THE AUSTRALIAN TERRITORY OF PAPUA and
NEW GUINEA BETWEEN 1949 AND 1974**

CONTENTS	Page
A. Purpose	3
B. Overview	3
C. The Territory of Papua & New Guinea, an Australian Territory	4
D. The Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary, an Australian Police Force and Patrol Officers as Commissioned Officers of that Police Force	6
E. Background	
(a) Administrative History	7
(b) The Australian Patrol Officer or Kiap	9
(c) Honours and Awards	13
F. Issues	16
G. Recognition	18
H. Financial Implications	19
I. Consultations	19
J. Recommendations.....	21
K. Attachments	22
Attachment 1	Book, “Australia’s Forgotten Frontier”
Attachment 2	PNGAA Book Review
Attachment 3	Canberra Times Book Review
Attachment 4	Queensland Police Union Book Review
Attachment 5	PNGAA Letter of support for recognition
Attachment 6	Police Federation of Australia Letter of support for recognition
Attachment 7	Senator Gary Humphries, Senator for the ACT, Letter of support for recognition
Attachment 8	Australian Peacekeeper and Peacemaker Veterans Association of Australia, Letter of support
Attachment 9	Ms Annette Ellis, MP, Member for Canberra Letter of support for recognition

A. Purpose:

1. To seek the agreement of the Australian Government to the formal recognition and awarding of **AN APPROPRIATE AWARD OR AWARDS** under the Australian Honours and Awards System to those Australian Public Servants who were employed through the Australian Government in the Australian Territory of Papua and New Guinea (TPNG) between 1949 and 1974 and who were Commissioned Officers of the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary (RPNGC) and generally known as Patrol Officers or locally as Kiaps.

B. Overview

1. This Submission covers the period between 1949 and 1974 during the period when the **Papua and New Guinea Act 1949** provided for the administration of the Territory of Papua and the Territory of New Guinea by Australia in an administrative union, by the name of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea (TPNG).
2. Some 8,000 Australian Public Servants were recruited to work in TPNG between 1949-1974, about 2,000 of them being Patrol Officers, many replacing those who left (Downs 1980). [The words “Patrol Officers” are used as a generic term for District Commissioners, Assistant District Commissioners, District Officers, Assistant District Officers, Patrol Officers and Assistant Patrol Officers.] At any one time there were about 1,100 Kiaps and about 600 to 700 actually working administratively in the field.
3. Many honours have been bestowed upon members of the Defence Forces, members of Australian Police Forces and civilians such as, the Police Overseas Service Medal (POSM) (including with PNG clasp), the Australian Service Medal 1945-75 and the Humanitarian Overseas Service Medal, for exemplary or routine duties overseas.
4. Honours have been bestowed upon many Australians for their work within Australia including Police Force personnel and other Emergency Services, Defence Force personnel and civilians who have been awarded; the Order of Australia awards, Australian Sports Medals, Emergency Services medals, Conspicuous Service Medals, Australian Police Medals, Public Service Medals and many others for outstanding duty for their country or community.
5. Patrol Officers or Kiaps as they were locally known, were recruited through the Department of External Territories or later through the Department of Territories (through Commonwealth Gazette), and were appointed to the TPNG Administration under Section 30 of the **Papua and New Guinea Act 1949** [see C., d), f) below] and who were Commissioned Officers of the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary and who have never been recognised under the Australian Honours and Awards System for their amazing and courageous work for their country.

6. With the Port Moresby Declaration being delivered by the Prime Minister on 6 March 2008, it is time to recognise Australia's, historical work in our former Territory of Papua and New Guinea, one of the island nations of the Pacific.
7. The Territory of Papua and New Guinea under the **Papua and New Guinea Act 1949** administered by Australia under United Nations authority was an **Australian Territory** and therefore Patrol Officers who were Australian Government Public Servants and Commissioned Officers in the Field Constabulary of the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary, an Australian Police Force created under Legislative Council Ordinance, are eligible for Australian domestic duty awards under the Australian Honours and Awards System.

C. The Territory of Papua and New Guinea, an Australian Territory

- a) Under Section 122 of the **Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia**, "*the Parliament may make laws for the government of any territory surrendered by any State to and accepted by the Commonwealth, or of any territory placed by the Queen under the authority of and accepted by the Commonwealth, or otherwise acquired by the Commonwealth, and may allow the representation of such territory in either House of the Parliament to the extent on the terms which it thinks fit.*"
- b) Papua New Guinea is a former Territory of Australia which fell under this section of the Constitution and which received independence in 1975, under the **Papua New Guinea Independence Act 1975**.
- c) Papua, a British Crown colony, was transferred to the new Commonwealth of Australia by Royal Letters Patent in 1902 and formally accepted as an Australian Territory when the **Papua Act 1905-1940** was proclaimed in Port Moresby on 1 September 1906. Hubert Murray was inducted shortly after as the Territory's first Australian Lieutenant-Governor.
- d) The **Papua New Guinea Act 1949**;

PREAMBLE

AND WHEREAS the **Territory of Papua** has been administered by Australia in accordance with the **Papua Act 1905-1940** as a Territory placed by His Majesty the King under the authority of the Commonwealth:

Section 5

FOURTH SCHEDULE

The Charter of the United Nations, signed at San Francisco on 26 June 1945, provides by **Article 75** for the establishment of an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed

there under by subsequent individual agreements.

The Government of Australia now undertakes to place the **Territory of New Guinea** under the trusteeship system, on the terms set forth in the present Trusteeship Agreement.

Therefore the General Assembly of the United Nations, acting in pursuance of **Article 85** of the Charter, approves the following terms of trusteeship for the Territory of New Guinea, in substitution for the terms of the Mandate under which the Territory has been administered:

ARTICLE 4

The Administering Authority will be responsible for the peace, order, good government and defence of the Territory and for this purpose will have the same powers of legislation, administration and jurisdiction in and over the Territory **as if it were an integral part of Australia**, and will be entitled to apply to the Territory, subject to such modifications as it deems desirable, such laws of the Commonwealth of Australia as it deems appropriate to the needs and conditions of the Territory.

e) **SECTION 9.**

The Territory of Papua and the Territory of New Guinea shall be governed in an administrative union to the extent and in the manner provided by or in pursuance of this Act.

f) **at Division 4, Section 30:**

- (1) There shall be a Public Service of the Territory (the Territory of Papua and New Guinea) consisting of officers appointed in pursuance of this section, and other persons employed in pursuance of Ordinances made under this Act.
- (2) The Governor-General may appoint or may delegate to the Minister or the Administrator, power to appoint, to the Public Service, such officers as are necessary for the purposes of this Act and for the proper government of the Territory.
- (3) Any delegation under the last preceding subsection shall be revocable at will and no delegation shall prevent the exercise by the Governor-General of the power to appoint officers in pursuance of that sub section.

- g) Between 1949 and 1974 (the dates for consideration of this submission), while previously the **Territory of Papua** was an Australian Territory and the **Territory of New Guinea** was an Australian United Nations Trust Territory (by UN Mandate), the **Papua and New Guinea Act 1949** provided for the whole and complete legal administration of the Territory of Papua and the Territory of New Guinea by Australia in an administrative union under the name of the **Territory of Papua and New Guinea**, and for consideration of this submission, Patrol Officers, as Australian Government Public Servants, and Commissioned Officers of Police, worked in a domestic capacity and not in a foreign country.
- h) Public Servants working in TPNG during the period of this submission were paid a “Territorial Allowance” the same as taxation allowances for Public Servants working in Australia’s Northern Territory.

D. The Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary, an Australian Police Force and Patrol Officers as Commissioned Officers of that Police Force :

- a) **The Papua New Guinea Act 1949** [Section 19 (1)] gave authority for the creation in TPNG of a Legislative Council to pass Ordinances and Regulations for the governance of the Territory, subject to assent by the Governor-General of Australia or his representative; (Section 54).
- b) **An Ordinance, No. 14 of 1955**, known as **The Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary Ordinance 1955**, to which the Governor General gave his assent on 16 June 1955, provided for the Constitution and Regulation of the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary.
- c) “Be it ordained by the Legislative Council for the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, in pursuance of the powers conferred by the **Papua and New Guinea Act 1949-54** as follows:

at Clause 6. (1);

The Force, which shall be known as the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary, shall, subject to the provisions of this Ordinance, consist of a Commandant, a Commissioner of Police and other such commissioned officers, sub officers, cadet officers, non commissioned officers, special constables and constables as are appointed to the Force.

at Clause 6. (2)

The Force shall be divided into Branches as follows:

- (a) *Regular Constabulary;*
- (b) *Field Constabulary;*
- (c) *Special Constables;*
- (d) *Native Constabulary.*

at Clause 10. (1)

District Officers and Patrol Officers shall, by virtue of their office, and while holding their office, be deemed to be Commissioned Officers of the Field Constabulary.

E. Background

a) Administrative History:

1. Certain territories and islands formerly constituting the Possession of British New Guinea and placed by the Crown under the authority of Australia were administered by Australia under the **Papua Act 1905-1940** as the Territory of Papua: [In 1905, Britain handed over administration to the newly federated Australian states and the former British colony of Papua was renamed the "Territory of Papua", which had the same status as the Northern Territory of Australia. Papua therefore, became the seventh Australian state or Australian Territory of Papua, under the Papua Act 1905. Thus, Papua was part of Australia for 70 years from 1905 to 1975. It was never a colony of Australia.]
2. In accordance with a Mandate under the Covenant of the League of Nations, certain territories and islands, being former German possessions, were administered by Australia under the **New Guinea Act 1920-1935** as the Territory of New Guinea:
3. The Territory of Papua and the Territory of New Guinea were, for a period, administered jointly by Australia under the **Papua-New Guinea Provisional Administration Act 1945-1946**:
4. Australia's administration of the Territory of Papua became subject to **Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations** in 1946:
5. In accordance **with Chapter XII of that Charter**, the General Assembly of the United Nations on 13 December 1946 approved the terms of a United Nations Trusteeship Agreement for the Territory of New Guinea, submitted to it by the Government of Australia, in substitution for the terms of the Mandate, **which agreement designates the Government of Australia as the sole Authority to exercise the administration of the Territory of New Guinea**:
6. **The Papua and New Guinea Act 1949** (Gazetted 30 June 1949) provided for the administration of the Territory of Papua and the Territory of New Guinea by Australia in an administrative union, under United Nations International Trusteeship System, by the name of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea.

Administrators of the Australian Territory of Papua and New Guinea were:

Jack Keith Murray, 31 October 1945–1952
Donald Cleland, 1952–1966

David Osborne Hay, 23 December 1966–1970

Leslie Wilson Johnson, 1970–1973

7. On 18 November 1963 a House of Assembly was established under the **Papua and New Guinea Act 1963** to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea:
8. By virtue of the **Papua New Guinea Act 1971**, the Territories governed by Australia in the administrative union became together known as Papua New Guinea:
9. On 9 July 1974 the House of Assembly resolved that Papua New Guinea move to independent nation status:
10. The General Assembly of the United Nations on 13 December 1974 noted that resolution and resolved that, on the date on which Papua New Guinea became independent, the Trusteeship Agreement would cease to be in force:
11. On 18 June 1975 the House of Assembly nominated 16 September 1975 as the date on which Papua New Guinea is to become independent:
12. On 16 September 1975 Papua New Guinea became independent.

It should be noted that:

The trusteeship system was supervised by the UN Trusteeship Council, members of the United Nations administering trust territories and an equal number of other member nations, including all permanent members of the Security Council not administering such territories. Each territory was governed by the provisions of a trusteeship agreement. Agreements covering nonstrategic areas were approved by the General Assembly and strategic areas were approved by the Security Council. Unlike territories under mandate, trusteeship territories could be fortified. **The powers of the administering state included full legislative, administrative, and judicial authority and, in certain cases, the right to treat the territory as if it were part of the administering state.** Each year the Trusteeship Council submitted to the responsible state a detailed questionnaire concerning each territory, with special emphasis on measures taken to increase self-government and educational opportunities. The council considered petitions from inhabitants of the territories and periodically made inspection tours. It met at least once a year and by majority vote (not subject to veto) adopted recommendations.

See J. N. Murray, Jr., *The United Nations Trusteeship System* (1957); C. E. Toussaint, *The Trusteeship System of the United Nations* (1957); A. G. Mezerik, ed., *Colonialism and the United Nations* (1964).

b) The Australian Patrol Officer (or Kiap)

1. Dame Rachel Cleland wrote: after all, when you saw a twenty year old boy with perhaps five local policemen keeping 30,000 warring tribesmen in happy harmony, you were just astounded at the thought, 'how does he do it!'
2. After the Second World War, when peace returned to Papua New Guinea, many of the towns and other signs of development had been destroyed, native villages and gardens were devastated and plantations damaged or neglected. The job of reconstruction lay ahead, as well as the task of establishing good relations with the native people. There were primitive 'restricted' areas to be manned and blank spots on the map that had to be brought under government control – places where cannibal warriors still practiced all sorts of unspeakable deeds.
3. **Patrol officers, similar to Defence Force personnel, went where they were posted, to a major township or a small remote jungle patrol post and served under Government direction.**
4. Young Australian men, some not yet twenty years old, were selected and trained to serve in the Australian Administration as Patrol Officers (or kiaps) who patrolled the jungles and created Patrol Posts in the primitive areas or explored and opened up others, and when an area came under control, members of other departments and agencies, missionaries and commercial people moved in and the kiaps worked with them. They were often the first trickle of civilising stones down a remote mountainside and much followed in their wake.
5. Until this happened, the kiap was the representative of all arms of government in his area. His main responsibility was law and order; he was given police powers as a sworn member of the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary, Field Constabulary and made a Magistrate of the Court of Native Affairs. He worked long hours and was on twenty-four hour call, seven days a week. As well as district administration, training of the local police, familiarising himself with the people and the country, patrolling, court work and suchlike, the kiap needed a range of knowledge to be a 'Jack of all trades'.
6. According to Ian Grosart in the *Encyclopaedia of Papua New Guinea*, '...it was the Patrol Officers with their patrol reports who were the sole sources of information for successive administrations of the Territory with regard to villages, their numbers, hopes, fears and reactions to changes'.
7. Kiaps had to plan and supervise the building of schools, roads, bridges, houses, airstrips, wharves and hospitals and as records had to be kept and reports written, he needed to be a competent clerical person. He needed to work closely with other Australian Public Servants in Education, Agriculture, Health and Public Works. His ultimate aim was to build an orderly, prosperous and unified people living in peace and harmony, with independence from Australia the long-term goal. In the main, the kiaps did not abuse the powers they held; pride gave them the integrity to handle their role and earn respect. Consistency and fairness, not fear, was always the key to maintaining respect.

8. Not all kiaps had the same experiences; they went where they were sent – some places were extremely dangerous, some not so dangerous and others were considered ‘safe’. Patrols took them through a diversity of country and experiences – some young kiaps faced dreadful situations in the ultra-primitive ‘restricted’ areas where they lived and patrolled. Some kiaps put their lives on the line several times during their long patrols – they faced the potential danger of being killed with poison-tipped arrows, spears, or axed to death, as well as the threat of accidents and sickness, including malaria and scrub typhus. Sadly, it broke the spirit of some and they returned to Australia without thanks or recognition or assistance.
9. The kiaps experienced food shortages and faced the continual torrential rain, the blazing hot sun, and the freezing temperatures in the swirling mists of the mountain areas, mud and almost impossible climbs and raging rapids; they faced the peril of crocodiles, deadly snakes, massive bush pigs and the discomfort of millions of mosquitoes as well as wasps, spiders, scrub mites and leeches.
10. There was nothing glamorous about patrolling; it was simply hard, dirty and uncomfortable work. It was the front line of Australian civilisation in a dangerous place and it was done for the Commonwealth (Australian) Government to fulfil its obligations under the United Nations Trusteeship agreement to bring an Australian Territory and an emerging nation towards independence.
11. Sir Paul Hasluck wrote in his book, *“A Time for Building Australian Administration in Papua-New Guinea, 1951-1963*, Melbourne University Press, 1976:
(From a farewell speech delivered by Nicholas Hasluck at the funeral service for Sir Paul Hasluck held on 20 January 1993).

“The year 1962 seemed to me at the time to be a turning point in the history of Papua and New Guinea. Hard work below ground had been done and progress seemed to quicken.

[I recall] a visit to a newly opened patrol post at Nomad, high in the mountains of the Southern Highlands ...

The patrol post consisted of an airstrip, which was a bit hard to find among the clouds, and two or three native material huts perched at the edge of a great declivity. Down below, a river ran invisibly but audibly between intertwined jungle growth. A score or so of the pygmies were watching from a distance when we climbed out of the two seater. One, a sort of spokesman, came close to us, gave a subdued greeting and fingered my clothing in curiosity ...

As the **two young patrol officers** and I made our inspection, the men slipped quietly from one obscure place to another and looked at us around the corners of the huts ... They were naked, except for a tough, hard belt of bark around the soft part of the body, protecting liver and spleen from the arrows of enemies. Each man carried a bow as tall as himself and a clutch of arrows. They had not yet consented to lay their weapons down when they came into the patrol post.

The pilot and I had some food and a yarn with the two boys (the Patrol Officers)... They had only been there a few weeks. There had been no incidents. These boys were completing the policy of bringing the whole of the Territory under administrative control. As keenly as ever, **I felt the immensity of the task that had been done over the last ten years and was thrilled with the young Australians who had done it.** Less than three years later the Nomad people were voting for the House of Assembly.”

12. At a workshop conducted by the **Australian National University** in 2004 with a view to gaining a clearer understanding of the dynamics of politics, development and ongoing conflict in the Southern Highlands of Papua New Guinea (The workshop was sponsored by the Centre for Conflict and Post-Conflict Studies, Asia Pacific and the State, Society and Governance in Melanesia Program within the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies (ANU), and was supported by AusAID), the following, which applied to all Districts of PNG, was noted in a paper by Laurie Bragge who served as Community Affairs Manager and Community Affairs Strategic Planner with Oil Search Ltd in PNG, (in part):

*“Authority and responsibility rested with **kiaps** to maintain the peace, order and good governance of a district or province.*

In the 1960s and 1970s the typical **kiap** in charge of a district concurrently held a number powers: he was a commissioned officer of police, district court magistrate, local court magistrate, coroner, gaoler, manager of the Commonwealth Bank agency, postmaster, meteorologist and acting departmental head of every government department not represented in the district — typically including Works, Transport and Finance. In short, to the local people the **kiap** personified gavman (the government).

Kiaps generally achieved their objectives through cultural empathy, cooperation and understanding, rather than the use of authority and force. The key to successful administration was a ‘hearts and minds’ approach.

The rule of law was fundamental to everything the **kiap** did. The establishment and maintenance of peace and order were fundamental tasks that took priority ahead of everything else. Fundamental to this, the **kiap** system was loosely based on a military system. The approach to conflict situations was first of all to achieve the objective and, secondly, to do it as safely as possible.

Kiaps were noted for going on patrol. Every village in Papua New Guinea was to be visited at least once per year for annual census. So it was that the **kiaps** and medical staff saw more or less every person in Papua New Guinea at least once per year. The census was rural Papua New Guinea’s registry of births marriages and deaths.

Time and again the **kiaps** were made aware of how much the people appreciated the annual census revision.

Typically, following the census the **kiap** would arbitrate a spectrum of disputes, ranging from compensation for pigs damaging gardens to lovers’ quarrels. Perhaps 5 per cent of these would become local or district court cases. The **kiap** typically remained in the

village until all the issues had been discussed and 'resolved'. While not every decision gave the people what they wanted, at least they received a decision.

Rural populations were always involved, directly or indirectly, with their *kiaps* in a range of activities that kept them occupied, and diverted them from such activities as warfare. Such activities typically included road building, cash cropping, and infrastructure construction such as village schools and aid posts."

13. Some faced warriors fighting one another with bows and arrows and shotguns and the kiaps stationed on the TPNG/West Irian border at the time of illegal incursions by political refugees from Irian Jaya faced the weapons of the Indonesian para-military. The Australian Army (including the PIR) was not seen during those Indonesian Military incursions into TPNG as Australia did not want any political confrontation with Indonesia at that time [konfrontasi] and it was left up to the Patrol Officers to turn sometimes up to 30 or 40 heavily armed para-military Indonesian army soldiers back from Australian soil to West Irian. Many times the Patrol Officers received fire from the Indonesian Army rifles and performed courageous acts without support or recognition.
(See Australia's Forgotten Frontier, Published in September 2007, Chris Viner-Smith - attached).
14. After discussing my own experiences with the Indonesian Army on the West Irian/TPNG border, **General Peter Cosgrove, AC MC**, stated to me that I was very lucky to have survived the encounters and that they were certainly way outside the scope of regular police or public service duties.
15. In the 1960s and early 70s, the work of Patrol Officers along the West Irian/TPNG border was security classified "**secret**" and this helps explain why so little is known by politicians or the public about the dangers these young men faced against the Indonesian Army. These young men were doing a tough job for Australia, though Australia had forgotten the frontier they walked.
16. Peter Ryan, who served in the Australian Army in World War II, when he was engaged in intelligence work behind enemy lines in New Guinea and was awarded the Military Cross, was the Director of Melbourne University Press from 1962 to 1989, and now works for the Board of Examiners of the Victorian Supreme Court, summed it up when editing 'The Encyclopaedia of PNG';

*"The enterprise, dedication, honesty and sheer bravery of the district staff, the 'kiaps'... was remarkable... the exploration [of TPNG] and the pacification of millions were achieved at the cost of a few skirmishes. The law came, without which any general softening of life is impossible. In any event, **I make no apology for this candid tribute to the kiaps, who wrote one of the most honourable pages in this [Australia's] country's history.**"*

17. **That's Australia's history. Our history. Honour is the respect we offer to the memory of glorious chapters in our history, no matter how few the number of people involved and no matter how secret or unspoken the events *at the time*. Honour is the wreath we lay at the feet of remembrance, a salute to courage. No kiap would put himself in the same class as a veteran of Kokoda, yet at the same time both share the remarkable heritage of being Australian and surviving against impossible odds to carve a new future for Papua New Guinea, an Australian Territory.**
18. **That is worth remembering, respecting, and honouring.** As noted in “*A Matter of Honour: The Report of the Review of Australian Honours and Awards (1995)*”, Patrol Officers certainly warrant the “**thanks offered by a grateful nation.**”
19. It is my belief the kiaps who penetrated and patrolled the hostile primitive areas, and those who were posted to isolated and dangerous outposts in the post-war years, and those who worked on the TPNG/West Irian border, did not get the acknowledgment they deserved from the Australian Administration. Then or now.
20. Some gave their lives (Gerald Szarka and 21 year-old Geoff Harris, were brutally murdered near Telefomin, John Absolam who was lost at sea and Gus Anderson who was drowned while crossing the inland Tauri River when investigating the Kaintiba murders in 1961, Richard Humphries, Ces Cowley and two junior Patrol Officers who were killed during the 1951 Mount Lamington eruption and District Commissioner, E.J. Emanuel, GC who was brutally murdered at Navuneram in the Gazelle Peninsular on 19 August 1971, to name but a few), many gave their youth and some their health, physical and otherwise, and some have injuries and scars that will last a lifetime, a few with what we now know as PTSD.
21. Many kiaps spent decades working for the Australian Government to make the Australian Territory of PNG a better place for having been there and they left without fanfare, or thanks, or official recognition. Kiaps returned to Australia with no thanks and disappeared into the community.
22. During peacetime young Australians are recruited into the armed forces, or Police Forces, some see overseas service for maybe six months, with the advantage of modern benefits, communications and extra pay. When they return they are feted whether or not they saw or heard a shot fired in anger, and the Australian government gives commendations and medals.
23. In recent years, Vietnam veterans have been “welcomed home” by an apologetic nation that has grown up enough to separate respect and honour for its diggers from the governments which made increasingly unpopular decisions on how they were deployed. **But the kiaps have never had a welcome home, probably because no-one ever really knew we'd gone, let alone come back. For us, we'd been to another world and there never seemed to be any 'appropriate moments' to talk about it back home.**
24. Only a few people know of the contribution the kiaps and their native police made, and it seemed that there never would be any other recognition of their

work except from this few. I wonder if people who visit (eg the Prime Minister, Mr Rudd) or those who live in Papua New Guinea appreciate the fact that the kiaps made it possible for them to be there.”

c) Australian Honours and Awards

1. Until 1975, the British Imperial system was the only system for recognition of the service of Australian citizens to Australia. Today, the Imperial system has been largely replaced by the Australian system, established in 1975.
2. On 28 February 1993, the then Minister for Administrative Services, Senator the Honourable Nick Bolkus, and the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, the Honourable Gordon Bilney, announced the Government's intention to establish a comprehensive public inquiry into the Australian System of Honours and Awards.
3. On 27 May 1993, the Minister for the Arts and Administrative Services, Senator the Honourable Bob McMullan (now the Member for Fraser, ACT and Parliamentary Secretary for International Development Assistance), and the Minister for Veterans' Affairs and the Minister for Defence Science and Personnel, Senator the Honourable John Faulkner (now Cabinet Secretary), announced that the Inquiry would be conducted in two stages.

The first stage was a comprehensive review of Defence and Defence-related areas of interest, including the application of present Australian awards in recognition of service by Australians in defence-related activities.

The second stage, which followed the completion of the first, examined the existing system of honours and awards to ensure that it met the needs of all sections of the community. It resulted in ***A Matter of Honour: The Report of the Review of Australian Honours and Awards (1995)*** which was presented to The Hon Frank Walker QC MP, Minister for Administrative Services on 17 November 1995 by Ms Clare Petre, Chairperson of the Committee. [The Committee was not to review matters recommended by the first stage CIDA report.]

4. The Introduction to the second stage Report contains the following: “We have taken the view that honours and awards ought not to be seen as entitlements to be claimed **but as thanks offered by a grateful nation**. It is the nation therefore, that should decide what is to be offered and to whom.”
5. In chapter 4 of the Report under “The distinctive elements of being Australian” the Committee states; “We believe that honours decision-makers, particularly the Council for the Order of Australia, should be encouraged to take a broader approach to their considerations of nominations. **Nominees should be assessed on their contribution to Australia and the Australian community or humanity at large.....**”
6. In late 1993 the Commonwealth Government produced the ***“Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Defence Awards (CIDA)”***
7. The following were the terms of reference for the Committee:
 - a) Examine claims for recognition of categories of service;

- b) Identify any categories of service, including those which involved non-Defence personnel in operational areas, which we considered should be recognised by an Australian award;
- c) Examine the appropriateness of extending the eligibility of existing awards for such purposes;
- d) Consider the need, if any, to introduce additional awards to recognise service in past defence-related activities of either a warlike or non-warlike nature;
- e) Consider any other relevant matters in relation to defence-related awards and make appropriate recommendations.
- f) The Committee was not to inquire into honours and awards of gallantry or meritorious or distinguished service for individuals or units for which appropriate award procedures existed or now exist, nor was it to be concerned with entitlements under the Veterans' Entitlements Act.

8. In part, the preamble contained the following:

“It is important to note that this process, initiated by the Government represents the first time that the Australian public has been consulted on the nature and operation of its national system of honours and awards. We believe this is an important process. **A national system of honours and awards should encapsulate the essence and express the aspirations of the people that it serves as well as celebrate those individuals and events which stand above the everyday and mark the extraordinary in our society.**”

9. **At Chapter 7:** “The Australian personnel involved with PIR [Pacific Islands Regiment – part of the Australian Army] and the other TPNG units before the independence of Papua New Guinea made a singular contribution to building that nation's armed forces and its self-defence capacity. The submissions in this category point to the difficulties posed by service during this time, and in particular to the **unique demands inherent to the nation building responsibilities** which were attached to Australian service in the PIR. In considering the broader issue of service in Papua New Guinea from 1951 to 1975, the Committee is guided by its Principles 1 and 8.”

“The Committee believes that this service was different to normal garrison duty, where the primary role of personnel is training of Australians and maintaining and protecting Australian assets. The training, nurturing and development roles assigned to Australian personnel serving in TPNG in the context of assisting a nation towards independence were quite unlike the requirements of normal peacetime service: they were clearly and markedly more demanding.”

This is exactly what Patrol Officers did every day and because they were located within the community and included law and order, far more so than members of the Defence Forces.

The Committee did NOT consider whether the service of Kiaps in their role as Police Officers equated to the demands of regular military service.

10. “The Committee recommends that service in the Territory of Papua New Guinea from the formation of the Pacific Islands Regiment (PIR) in 1951 until the independence of Papua New Guinea on 16 September 1975 be recognised

through the award of a new Australian Service Medal (ASM) 1945-75 with clasp "TPNG", with the relevant qualifying period of 180 days. This applies to Australian nationals of all Services including RAN personnel posted to HMAS Tarangau and attached vessels. The Committee appreciates the end for the Australian Service Medal (ASM) 1945-75 is 13 February 1975 and that there may be persons who accumulated qualifying service between this date and independence."

11. Eg. ASM 1945-75 awarded to: 30 days service with the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA) force in West New Guinea between 3 October 1962 and 30 April 1963. **Commonwealth of Australian Gazette S337 dated 5 September 1995.**
12. The Committee refers to its Principle number 3 "that care must be taken that in recognising service by some, that **comparable service of others is not overlooked**. The Committee would prefer a solution which embraces all persons within the same award, but would not wish to preclude consideration of the suitability of the current ASM in addressing this problem."
13. At Principle 4, "The Committee notes that the existing Regulations for defence and defence-related awards and decorations in the Australian system allow for access to these awards by civilians. The Committee believes this is appropriate. Access by civilians should be limited to those closely involved with military activities or in clear support of military efforts in the theatre of operations to which the award relates. Deserving civilians performing humanitarian functions in or near the operational theatre should be considered for a non-defence award."
14. On 27 September 1997, Wilson Tuckey said in relation to the ASM 1945-75, "This award was established following recommendations made by the 1993/1994 Committee of Inquiry into Defence Awards (CIDA, Gration Review) and was **designed to recognise service in prescribed peacekeeping or non-warlike operations for the period of 1945–75 where recognition had not been extended previously through another award.**"
15. The work of Australian Public Servant "Kiaps" in most cases was more arduous and dangerous than those duties conducted by the PIR or the RAN in TPNG who for political reasons at the time were prevented from interacting with the Indonesian Army. Other areas, which had been classified as "restricted" areas, were also off limits to the Defence Forces (and Regular Police Constabulary) until the Kiaps had entered them and gained control in a law and order sense. This might take months or years until they were ready to be classified as unrestricted. **In most cases Kiaps were subjected to arduous and dangerous duties for much longer and continuous periods of time than Defence Force personnel.**
16. The above statement should not be considered in any way as diminishing the efforts of the PIR or RAN nor the awarding of the ASM 1945-75 to any members of the PIR or RAN nor is it a specific claim for the awarding the ASM 1945-75 to those seeking recognition in this submission.

F. Issues:

1. **Australia has not formally recognised Patrol Officers** or the work that Patrol Officers undertook as Australian Public Servants, who were Commissioned Officers of the Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary in the Australian Territory of Papua New Guinea from 1949 to 1974, through the Australian Honours and Awards System, perhaps because no one had an understanding of what they did.
2. Andrew Laming, MP, Member for Bowman (Lib) during a speech to the House of Representatives on Monday 12 September 2005 celebrating the 30th anniversary of PNG becoming an independent State said (in part):

“As the administrative power from that time on (the end of WW2), Australia played a major role in helping to prepare the country for independence. We should not always think of these things in nationalistic terms; we need to also remember the people who gave their lives during the war and those who gave through their careers thereafter—first of all, the explorers who opened up the highlands, the very inaccessible and remote areas of central Papua New Guinea; the pilots who then flew onto dangerous airstrips to bring supplies and make it possible for those who worked with the churches to deliver social, health and welfare services to that country; **and also the Kiaps, who provided the administrative services throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s.**”

We share a rich history. It goes back to World War II, from the defence of Papua New Guinea in turning around the Japanese forces in World War II, right through to the development that has been delivered by generations of people who worked with the Papua New Guineans to take the country to where it stands now. We are Papua New Guinea’s No. 1 importer and exporter, and I think it is important that in this House that special relationship and the future partnership that we are bound to share are recognised.

It is important that we in this House pass on our congratulations to the people of Papua New Guinea on their reaching that milestone, the 30th anniversary of independence.”

Whilst agreeing with Mr Laming’s sentiments, his speech demonstrates the lack of understanding of the work of the Kiaps even by a member of the House of Representatives giving a speech relating to PNG.

After WW2, the “explorers” who opened up the highlands, the inaccessible and remote areas of central PNG were the Kiaps as they were the only people allowed into the restricted or unexplored areas.

Some airstrips were indeed dangerous but most of the “bush” airstrips were built by Kiaps and were safe. Some social, health and welfare services were delivered by the churches at their Mission stations but the Kiaps provided law and order and the other services mentioned during their patrols often accompanied by local medical officers and Agricultural officers. I am sure that I (as a Kiap) was not providing an “administrative service” when ordering 30 fully armed Indonesian soldiers to leave Australian soil!

3. **The work that Patrol Officers undertook in Papua New Guinea encapsulates the essence and expresses the aspirations of our Nation and that Australia should celebrate those individuals and events which stand above the everyday and mark the extraordinary in our society.**

4. It is submitted that this service was different to normal Public Service or general Australian domestic Police duty, where the primary role of personnel is administering policy, maintaining law and order in a developed society, training of Australians and maintaining and protecting Australian assets.
5. The law enforcement, training (including the training of local police officers), nurturing and development roles assigned to Australian Patrol Officers (Kiaps) serving in TPNG in the context of assisting a nation towards independence in pursuit of Australia's responsibilities to the United Nations, were quite unlike the requirements of normal peacetime service; they were clearly and markedly more demanding and have not been recognised by the Australian Government.

G. Recognition

Should the Australian Government consider that formal recognition and awards are appropriate;

1. Awards would be to those **Australian** Patrol Officers (Australian nationals) who served two (2) years or more in TPNG between 1949 and 1974. The generic term "Patrol Officers" includes, District Commissioners, Assistant District Commissioners, District Officers, Assistant District Officers, Patrol Officers, Assistant Patrol Officers and Cadet Patrol Officers.
2. An award should have a **post-nominal entitlement** as **recognition** is the basis of this submission.
3. The order of wearing should be at the same level as the Australian Police Medal.
4. Widows of those Patrol Officers serving between the specified dates be entitled to some form of recognition of their husband's service.
5. There is the option of the Commonwealth Government **creating an award** specifically for Australian Patrol Officers, linked to their Police duties in PNG, or
6. **The "Conspicuous Service Cross"**, awarded to members of the Australian Defence Force and certain other people such as members of philanthropic organisations for outstanding commitment to duty or outstanding application of exceptional skills, judgment or dedication, in non-war-like situations, or
7. A level of the **Order of Australia**, or
8. **The Australian Service Medal 1945-1975**, (with PNG Clasp and post-nominal entitlement) awarded to members of Defence Forces, Police Services and to other services or civilians (*eg MIN572/02 of 17 October 2002 where Defence Minister Robert Hill awarded ASMs to 15 civilians for their work assisting the Australian led Peace Monitoring Group in Bougainville [a*

prescribed operation) in prescribed peacekeeping and non-warlike operations, or

9. **The Police Overseas Service Medal** (as recommended by the Australian Peacekeeper & Peacemaker Veterans Association in a letter to the Prime Minister dated 20 October 2008), or
10. **The preferred option: The Australian Police Medal**, awarded for distinguished service by a member of an Australian Police Force (this should not diminish the value of the APM and as such should be distinguished from the regular APM by a PNG clasp or red, (thin) yellow and black stripe, representing the PNG colours, at centre).

H. Financial Implications:

1. The financial implications are minimal but are not specifically known. The cost of minting and awarding perhaps 2,500 medals would be relatively small. The Royal Australian Mint has advised the following:

“Generally master tooling costs on average \$2,000 per side. So \$4,000 will cover a two sided design medallion. In addition to this is a set up cost of \$880. Making one medal can be quite expensive as you absorb all of the costs into the one medal. In addition to these costs you are looking at about \$40 per unit for a bronze medallion and approximately \$140 for a silver medallion.

In conclusion a two sided 40mm medallion may cost between \$4,920 and \$5,020 each. However if you were to order a quantity of say 20 the costs could be between \$284 and \$344 each. (The more ordered the less the individual cost eg 2,000 medals may cost \$42 each).

The master tooling is a one off payment, so subsequent orders of the same medallion would not incur the master tooling costs.”

2. The Papua New Guinea Association of Australia (a non profit organisation) would perhaps seek a small grant to assist it in communication with potential recipients of recognition.

I. Consultations:

1. **The Papua New Guinea Association of Australia (PNGAA)** has supported this submission;

“The PNGAA supports the initiative of Chris Viner-Smith to seek formal Commonwealth Government recognition of former District Services personnel [‘Kiaps’] for their exemplary service to the people of the Territory of Papua and the Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua and New Guinea over a period of 75 years culminating with National Independence.”

Consultation with the Papua New Guinea Association of Australia will be required to ascertain those former Patrol Officers who would be entitled to receive recognition.

2. **The Police Federation of Australia** has been consulted and support recognition of Patrol Officers;

“I understand that the roles that were performed by the Australian officers were that of a Commissioned Officer of the Royal Papua New Guinea Constabulary (RPNGC), at that time PNG being a Territory of Australia. The roles included training and development of RPNGC Officers as PNG moved towards independence. I suggest similar training and development roles are currently being performed by Australian Police in the South Pacific for which due recognition is received. These types of roles are very demanding and quite different from traditional policing functions in developed societies. It is for these reasons **we likewise call upon the Australian Government to give due recognition to the service given by those Officers.**”

3. **The Ex Kiap Network of Australia** has been consulted and has given its full support to the submission.
4. **Senator Gary Humphries, Senator for the ACT**, has been consulted and has written a letter of support for formal Patrol Officer recognition by the Federal Government.

“I believe they (Kiaps) should be recognised by either modifying the criteria for an existing award or, if this is not possible, by striking a medal specifically for Australians who served in the RPNGC.”

5. **The Hon Annette Ellis, MP, Member for Canberra**, has been consulted and has written a letter of support for formal Patrol Officer recognition by the Federal Government.

“I fully support the Commonwealth Government recognition of the RPNGC (Kiaps) and believe the Commonwealth Government should either modify an existing award or create a new order to fully recognise the service committed by these brave Australians under the Australian Honours and Awards System.”

6. **The Australian Peacekeeper and Peacemaker Veterans Association**, has been consulted and has written a letter of support to the Prime Minister and Minister for Home Affairs for formal Patrol Officer recognition by the Federal government.
7. **The Hon Bob McMullan MP, Member for Fraser**, Parliamentary Secretary for International Development Assistance, has been consulted and has written a letter of support to the Prime Minister.
8. **The Hon Duncan Kerr SC, MP, Parliamentary Secretary for Pacific Island Affairs**, has been consulted and has written a letter of support to Senator Faulkner and the Prime Minister.

9. Of the three hundred or so people who have bought a copy of my book, “Australia’s Forgotten Frontier” in which recognition for Patrol Officers is a key

theme, there have been no dissenters but I have received many letters of support.

J. Recommendations:

As the relevant Australian Government Department (see note below) is no longer active (after TPNG Independence) there is no longer anyone to nominate these Public Servants for awards and it is recommended that;

- 1. the Australian Government formally recognise Australian Patrol Officers and the work they undertook in the Australian Territory of Papua and New Guinea between 1949 and 1974, and**
- 2. the Attorney-General or other relevant Minister or the Council for the Order of Australia, recommend the awarding of an appropriate award or awards under the Australian Honours and Awards System to recognise those Public Servants who were employed by the Australian Government in the Australian Territory of Papua New Guinea and who were Commissioned Officers in the Field Constabulary of the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary and generally known as Patrol Officers or locally as Kiaps between 1949 and 1974.**

[It is understood that neither the Prime Minister nor State Premiers may recommend or nominate persons for Awards]

Submission prepared by:

Chris Viner-Smith

October 2008

PO BOX 394 CURTIN ACT 2605

0412076092

Note: The Government Department, under the TPNG Administrator, in which Patrol Officers worked after the Second World War to 1956 was the Department of District Services and Native Affairs, (DDSNA), the Department of Native Affairs (DNA) between 1956-1963, the Department of District Administration (DDA) between 1964-1968, the Department of District Administration, Department of the Administrator (DDADA) between 1969-1971 and the Division of District Administration, Department of Chief Minister and District Administration between 1972 and 1975.

K. Attachments:

1. Book, "Australia's Forgotten Frontier" ISBN 978-0-646-47541-7 Printed by SOS print+media. NL 955.304092 V782V. Author: Chris Viner-Smith.
2. Papua New Guinea Association of Australia, Nancy Johnston, Review of Australia's Forgotten Frontier.
3. John Farquharson, Canberra Times, September 29, 2007. Review of Australia's Forgotten Frontier.
4. Queensland Police Union Journal, March, 2008. Review of Australia's Forgotten Frontier,
5. Letter from Papua New Guinea Association of Australia in support of Kiap recognition.
6. Letter from the Police Federation of Australia in support of recognition of Kiaps.
7. Letter from Senator Gary Humphries, Senator for Canberra, in support of recognition of Patrol Officers.
8. Letter from the Australian Peacekeeper and Peacemaker Veterans' Association, in support of recognition for Patrol Officers
9. Letter from Ms Annette Ellis, MP, Member for Canberra, in support of recognition for Patrol Officers.